



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the Fourteenth day of June Two Thousand Twenty One

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.8880 of 2021

E.D.CHARLES

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

THE STATE REPRESENTED BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
VILLUPURAM.
CRIME NO.10 OF 2021.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S. GOVIND CHANDRASEKHAR Advocate

For Respondent : MR.C.E.PRATAP Govt. 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 at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 408, 420, 477A, 120B and 109 of IPC, in Crime No.10 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant had maintained the church property and the Hon'ble Mr.Justice J.Kanagaraj, former Judge of Madras High Court was appointed as an administrator of the society to publish the General Publication for selling the property and the property was eventually sold to Saravana stores, Ranganathan Street, T,Nagar,for the sale consideration of Rs.13,64,60,000/- and out of the sale consideration an advance amount to an extent of Rs.6,84,00,000/- was received, and the amount was illegally transferred in the name of the petitioner and thereby the petitioner swindled the money from the society. Hence, the complaint was registered.

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



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that the petitioner had swindled money belongs to church and investigation reveals that the petitioner had illegally transferred the amount to his account. He further submit that the custodial interrogation is required. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted that the petitioner along with other accused persons had swindled money belongs to church and investigation reveals that the petitioner had illegally transferred the amount to his account. Hence, he strongly opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that the case is under investigation and the gravity of offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
14/06/2021

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 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

CC to M/S. G.BALAJI VENKATESWARAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.8880/2021

Date :14/06/2021

MK:19/07/2021