

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.11.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P.No.17061 of 2020

A.Ragu

... Petitioner/Accused-

1

Vs.

State by Inspector of police, Respondent

W-16 All Women Police Station, Pulianthope,

Chennai-600 002.

[Crime No.9 of 2020]

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of their arrest by the respondent police concerned in Crime No.9 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Thanjan

For Respondent : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(The case has been heard through video conference)

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under **Sections 417, 376, 109 of IPC**, in Crime No.9 of 2020, on the file of the respondent, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution as per the defacto complainant is that A1 had fell in love with the defacto complainant and on false promise, he had physical relationship with the defacto complainant and thereafter, refused to marry her and cheated her. A2 and A3 have threatened and demanded money from the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that this is the second bail application and earlier application was dismissed in Crl.O.P.No.13253 of 2020 on 07.09.2020. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that this Court earlier considered the application on merits and granted anticipatory bail to A2 and A3, however, finding no merits in the case of the petitioner, dismissed the application of the petitioner herein. He would further submit that there is no change of circumstances after dismissal of the earlier application. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Taking into consideration of the facts and submissions of the learned Counsel and that there is no change of circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
04/11/2020

This order, on being produced, be punctually observed and carried into execution by all concerned

TRUE COPY

Sub-Assistant Registrar (Statistics/C.S.)
High Court, Madras - 600 104.

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
W-16, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, PULIANTHOPE,
CHENNAI-12.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.R.THANJAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.NO.7563

CRL OP.17061/2020

Date :04/11/2020

TA-19/11/2020

WEB COPY