

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Friday, the Twenty Third day of April Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs Justice V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.7698 of 2021

K.INDUMATHI

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU REP. [RESPONDENT]
BY ITS, SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CENTRAL CRIME BRANCH, EDF-II,
TEAM IXA, VEPERY,
CHENNAI-600 007.
CCB CR.NO.375 OF 2018.

For Petitioner : M/S.R.SUGUMARAN Advocate

For Respondent : MR.T.SHUNMUGA RAJESWARAN,
Government Advocate (crl.side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offences under Section 420 of IPC in CCB Crime No.375 of 2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was working as a Senior Relationship Officer in Bajaj Capital Limited (Insurance company), Chennai Branch. According to the defacto complainant, the petitioner canvassed him and advised to make investment in the Insurance Policies and Mutual Funds etc., in India. The defacto complainant was working as a Dentist in Muscat and wanted to settle in India after his retirement. Hence, believing the words of the petitioner, he invested huge money by taking Insurance Policies in his name as well as his family members name. After investing huge amount, the defacto complainant did not receive any message or acknowledgment from the petitioner. When enquired, it was informed that on account of series of allegations against the petitioner, she was terminated from service. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner used to visit the defacto complainant to canvass the defacto complainant to invest him in the insurance policies and Medical Insurance policies. However, the defacto complainant with an ulterior motive has made this false complaint. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate would submit that the petitioner has cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.88Lakhs by making him to invest in the Insurance Policies. The learned counsel submitted that already this petitioner has filed a petitioner seeking anticipatory bail in Crl.O.P.No.27591 of 2018 and the same was dismissed as withdrawn and now she has filed the present petition. He further submitted that investigation is still pending and vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner and also taking note of the fact that huge amount is involved in this case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

23/04/2021

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 SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CENTRAL CRIME BRANCH,
EDF-II, TEAM IXA,
VEPERY, CHENNAI-600 007.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

CC to M/S.R.SUGUMARAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.7698/2021

Date :23/04/2021

cs 28/06/2021