



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Wednesday, the Fourth day of August Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.13067 of 2021

S.MUTHU @ NAGARAJ

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CITY CRIME BRANCH,
COIMBATORE CITY.
CR.NO.25 OF 2021.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.A.D.GANESHAMOORTHY Advocate

For Respondent : M/S. 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 Sections 120B, 406, 420, 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.25 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is the close relative of A1 and A2. All the accused persons induced the defacto complainant to join in their profit giving Company, viz., M/s.Prabha Trading Ltd., at Singapore, as Partner and to make investments. Believing their words, the defacto complainant made an investment to the tune of Rs.60 lakhs, who promised the defacto complainant to make his son as Partner in their Company. However, the accused persons neither make the son of the defacto complainant as Partner nor repay the money. Hence the defacto complainant lodged a police complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he did not receive any from the defacto complainant. The learned counsel



further submitted that he only worked as staff in the said Company and prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor / defacto complainant submitted that the petitioner along with other accused persons assured that they will join the defacto complainant's son as partner in their business and induced for investments. Thereby swindled huge amount from the defacto complainant and cheated. Therefore, the learned counsel strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the the investigation is pending in this case.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and further the fact that an huge amount was involved in this case and the investigation is in crucial stage, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

04/08/2021

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,
CITY CRIME BRANCH,
COIMBATORE CITY.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

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

CRL OP.13067/2021

Date :04/08/2021

APN 13/08/2021



WEB COPY