

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Monday, the Fifth day of July Two Thousand Twenty One
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.11212 of 2021

K.SATHIYAMOORTHY

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
DHARMAPURI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.NOT KNOWN)
[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S. M.D.THIRUNAVUKKARASU 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 offence under Section 420 of I.P.C, in Crime number 7 of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner who is single accused in this case cheated the defacto complainant by receiving Rs.21,00,000/- (Rupees Twenty One Lakhs Only) obtaining job as an Engineer in TNSTC. Thereafter the petitioner neither return the money to the defacto complainant nor obtained job for him and cheated him. Hence, the law enforcing agency registered a complaint against the petitioner.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would 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 prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that the petitioner who is single accused in this case cheated the defacto complainant by receiving Rs.21,00,000/- (Rupees Twenty One Lakhs Only) obtaining job as an Engineer in TNSTC. Thereafter the petitioner neither return the money to the defacto complainant nor obtained job for him and cheated him.

5. Considering the fact that large amounts of money is involved and that the petitioner had cheated under the guise of job racket and also taking into consideration the fact that investigation is still going on, enlarging the petitioner on anticipatory bail at this point of time, when the offence is serious in nature and there is likelihood of the petitioner indulging in activities which would be prejudicial for investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

05/07/2021

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 PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
DHARMAPURI DISTRICT.

CC to M/S. M.D.THIRUNAVUKKARASU Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.11212/2021

Date :05/07/2021

MK:13/07/2021

WEB COPY