

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JIUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.06.2020

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

Cr1.O.P.No.8865 of 2020

Srinivasan

.. Petitioner/Accused 1

Vs.

State represented by
The Inspector of police,
Krishnagiri Town police station,
Crime no: 83/2020 .. Respondent/Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 83 of 2020 on the file of Inspector of Police, Krishnagiri Town police station, Krishnagiri.

For Petitioner : Mr.Annamalai

For Respondent : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences under Section 294 (b), 323, 324, 342, 380, 506(II) of Indian Penal Code 1860 & section 66E of Information Technology Act 2000 in Crime No.83 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant had an acquittance with A3 through social media. It is the further allegation that the de facto complainant had borrowed some money from A1 and A2. A1 and A2 had used the services of A3 and made the defacto complainant come to a particular place. Thereafter, the de facto complainant was confined in a room and nude photographs were taken. The de facto complainant was thereafter threatened by showing these photographs and he was assaulted and various blank forms and cheque leaves were received by getting his signature. There are totally three accused persons in this case and the petitioner is ranked as A1.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a simple civil dispute between the parties has been given a criminal colour by inventing a lot of facts. Learned counsel

further submitted that A2 was arrested in this case and he was later enlarged on bail.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed this petition and submitted that there is a pattern to the entire incident and after A2 was arrested, the mobile phone was seized and it contained nude photograph of the de facto complainant. Learned counsel further submitted that A3 has a habit of getting acquittance with persons through social media and later exploiting them. Learned counsel further submitted that A3 is still absconding in this case.

5. This Court has carefully considered the submission made on either side.

6. Considering the seriousness of the allegations made in the complaint and the mode adopted by the accused persons to recover money from the de facto complainant, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. In this case, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. In view of the same, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

bri

To

1.The Inspector of police,
Krishnagiri Town police station

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Cr1.O.P.No.8865 of 2020

PVS (CO)
CB(16/07/2020)

WEB COPY