



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Friday, the Eighth day of October Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.18680 of 2021

IN CRL.M.P.NO.10500 of 2021

RAM KUMAR

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, (EAST)
PULIYAKULAM,
COIMBATORE DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.21/2021)

[RESPONDENT]

REVATHI

[INTERVENER/DE-FACTO COMPLAINANT]

[ORDERED AS PER ORDER OF THIS COURT DATED 08/10/2021 IN
CRL.MP.10500/2021 IN CRL.O.P.NO.18680/2021]

For Petitioner : M/S.M.NAGARAJ Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.C.E.PRATAP, Govt. Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener : M/S.KINGSLY SOLOMON J, Advocate

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 406, 417, 420, 506(II) IPC, in Crime No.21 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had false promised to marry the defacto complainant and received a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- from her and also sexual intercourse with her. Thereafter, he refused to marry her and not returned the money. Hence, the complaint.

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. He further submitted that there is no transaction pending between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that the petitioner had false promised to marry the defacto complainant and received a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- from her and also sexual intercourse with her. Thereafter, he refused to marry her and not returned the money. He further submitted that the investigation is still pending. Hence, he vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant submitted that the petitioner had received a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- from the defacto complainant and false promise to marry her and also sexual intercourse with her. 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 petitioner has involved in very heinous offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

08/10/2021

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
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, (EAST)
PULIYAKULAM,
COIMBATORE DISTRICT.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

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

+1 CC to M/S.KINGSLY SOLOMON, Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.NO.11335

CRL OP.18680/2021

IN CRL.M.P.NO.10500 of 2021

Date :08/10/2021