

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.03.2021

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.BHARATHIDASAN

Cr1.O.P.No.4420 of 2021

Rajasekar Reddeyar @ R.T.Mani

... Petitioner

-Vs-

The State by
The Inspector of Police,
Krishnagiri Town Police Station,
Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District.
(Crime No.1396 of 2020)

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.1396 of 2020 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Krishnagiri Town Police Station, Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Senthilkumar

For Respondent : Mr.S.Karthikeyan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conference

Totally, there are eight accused and the petitioner is arrayed as A1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 417 and 420 of I.P.C, in Crime No.1396 of 2020, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant was engaged in jewellery business. A2 and A3 approached the defacto complainant stating that A1 is engaged in gold business and he has purchased gold in a cheap rate. Hence, the petitioner had took him to Krishnagiri and he has also received a sum of Rs.95 lakhs. At that time, a Skoda car belongs to the petitioner came there and taken the

defacto complainant with money. Thereafter, they have followed the petitioner and other accused and took money. When he questioned the same, they have criminally intimidated and cheated him. Hence, a criminal case has been registered against the petitioner and now apprehending arrest, the present petition has been filed.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not involved in the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case and only the car belongs to the petitioner has been used by the driver and he is no way connected with the occurrence. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioner is the main accused and he is already having three cases. On some ill-motive, he used to collect money from various jewelery shop owners and cheated them. Hence, he vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that there is bad antecedents against the petitioner and he has cheated more than Rs.95 lakhs, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
22/03/2021

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 JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
NO.I, KRISHNAGIRI.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

WEB COPY


3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KRISHNAGIRI TOWN POLICE STATION,
KRISHNAGIRI,
KRISHNAGIRI DISTRICT.

+1 CC to M/S.M.SENTHILKUMAR Advocate on payment of necessary
charges SR.No.3910

CRL OP.4420/2021

Date :22/03/2021

cs 17/04/2021



WEB COPY