

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.06.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.O.P.Nos. 9273 & 9272 of 2020

C.Rajesh @ Puratchi Rajesh
S/o. Chandran
No.53, Amman Koil Street,
Lakshmipuram, Chennai – 99 ... Petitioner in both Crl.O.Ps

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police (Law & Order),
M-3, Puzhal Police Station,
Chennai.
Cr. Nos.27 & 28 of 2020 ... Respondent in both Crl.O.Ps

Prayer in both Crl.O.Ps: Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest by the respondent police in Crime Nos.27 & 28 of 2020 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner

in both Crl.O.Ps : Mr.M.Jaikumar

For Respondent

in both Crl.O.Ps : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz,
Additional Public Prosecutor

COMMON ORDER

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 294 (b), 323, 324, 384 and 506 (ii) of IPC, in Crime No.27 of 2020 in Crl.O.P.No.9273 of 2020 and offence punishable under Section 307 of IPC in Crime No.28 of 2020 in Crl.O.P.No.9272 of 2020, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that he is a supervisor of RB Enterprises and doing contract work for connecting Sewage Pipe line connection at Bhajanai koil street, Villivakkam. While being so, the petitioner/A1 came to the work spot and demanded a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- every month as Mamool and also threatened him with dire consequences and waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted him.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is a social worker and he never involved such activities. He

would further submit that since the petitioner questioned the defacto complainant about his pipe line work which he was doing during night time, he has been falsely implicated in this case and he is not a politician and he did not demand any bribe. Therefore, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and there is a counter complaint in which the opposed parties have already been granted Bail, hence prayed Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the other hand would submit that the petitioner had demanded bribe from the construction company. Likewise he also demanded a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- from the defacto complainant. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submitted that there are six previous cases against the petitioner and another case in Crime No.28 of 2020 on the file of the same respondent police, for the offence that he attacked the counsel who appeared for counter parties. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender. Hence he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and taking note of the allegations made against the petitioner in previous cases pending in Cr.No. 27 of 2020 that he demanded a sum of RS.1,00,000/- as bribe from the defacto complainant and in Crime No.28 of 2020 and that he assaulted the counsel who appeared for counter parties, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Hence, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed.

24.06.2020

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-Speaking order
dh

सत्यमेव जयते
WEB COPY

To

1. The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Madhavaram.
2. The Inspector of Police (Law & Order),
M-3, Puzhal Police Station,
Chennai.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J

dh



Crl.O.P.Nos.9273 & 9272 of 2020

WEB COPY 24.06.2020