

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Friday, the Eighteenth day of June Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION Nos.6015 & 6260 of 2021

RAGUL [PETITIONER / ACCUSED
IN CRL.OP. 6015 OF 2021]

RAMAKRISHNAN [PETITIONER / ACCUSED
IN CRL.OP. 6260 OF 2021]

Vs

STATE REP BY [RESPONDENT
INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
NAGAPATTINAM,
CRIME NO.3/2021
IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

For Petitioner : M/S M.VINOTH Advocate
[IN CRL.OP. 6015 OF 2021]

For Petitioner : M/S J.ANTONY JESUS Advocate
[IN CRL.OP. 6260 OF 2021]

For Respondent : MR. A.GOPINATH, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)
[IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

FOR INTERVENOR : M/S G.PUGAZHENTHI Advocate
[IN CRL.MP. 6192 OF 2021 IN CRL.OP. 6015 OF 2021]

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :

The petitioners who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC, in Crime No.3 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.Totally there are nine accused in this case and the petitioners herein arrayed as A7 and A2. The case of the prosecution is that the A2 approached the defacto complainant and asked Rs.45,00,000/- as hand loan. Hence the defacto complainant gave Rs.17,00,000/- and 45 sovereigns of gold and borrowed Rs.18,00,000 from other persons and gave it to A2. The allegation against this petitioner is that at the time of receiving money from the defacto

complainant the petitioner pretended himself as a Income Tax Officer and gave assurance that the money will be re-paid as early as possible. Hence, the complaint was registered against this petitioners.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submits that it is a case of cheating. He would further submit that the petitioners along with other accused persons had swindled the money from the defacto complainant and from various other persons to the tune of Rs.45,00,000/- and also borrowed 45 sovereigns of gold from the defacto complainant and failed to pay the same. Hence, he vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.Considering the gravity of offence committed by the petitioners and also this Court observes that these type of offence are increasing day by day, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6.Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petition are dismissed.

-sd/-

18/06/2021

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 INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
NAGAPATTINAM,

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

CC to M/S J.ANTONY JESUS Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.Nos.6015 & 6260/2021

Date :18/06/2021

RW 16/07/2021