



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 30/11/2020

PRESENT

WEB COPY

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL OP(MD). No.13533 of 2020

A.Jebharaj

... Petitioner/Accused No.1

Vs

The State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Madurai District.
Crime No.19 of 2020

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.Niranjan.S.Kumar, Advocate.
For Respondent : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.438 of Cr.P.C

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.19 of 2020 on the file of the Respondent Police.


ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who is arrayed as Accused No.1, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 406, 420, 506(i) and 120B of IPC, in Crime No.19 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and other accused persons have received a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- from the defacto complainant for getting job in the Electricity Department. Thereafter, the petitioner did not repay the said amount and not providing any job. Hence, the present complaint.

3.Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that even according to the prosecution, the second accused has only received a sum of Rs.5 lakhs. Insofar as the petitioner is concerned, he is nothing to do with the alleged prosecution. He further submitted that the second accused was introduced by the friends of the defacto complainant's father-in-law for getting job



by unlawful manner. He further submitted that the petitioner was merely the bystander in all the occasions and there is absolutely no transaction between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), appearing for the respondent Police submitted that the petitioner and other accused persons have received a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- from the defacto complainant for getting job in the Electricity Department. Thereafter, the petitioner did not repay the said amount and not providing any job.

6. It is seen that the petitioner along with other accused persons have received a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- from the defacto complainant for getting job in the Electricity Department. Thereafter, they failed to get job and also refused to return back the amount to the defacto complainant.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that there are specific overt act attributed against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

sd/-

30/11/2020

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2020

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

Note : In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
MADURAI DISTRICT.
2. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to M/s.NIRANJAN.S.KUMAR, Advocate (SR-7795[I] dated 01/12/2020)

ORDER IN

CRL OP (MD) No.13533 of 2020

Date : 30/11/2020