



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

Friday, the Sixteenth day of April Two Thousand Twenty One

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.20309 of 2020

1 S.P.SHANKAR
2 V.NIRANJAN

[PETITIONERS / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
VELLORE.
CRIME NO.7 OF 2019.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioners : T.P.SEKAR Advocate

For Respondent : MR.S.KARTHIKEYAN Additional Public Prosecutor

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 120B, 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.7 of 2019, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that there are totally four accused involved in this case. The 1st petitioner is arrayed as A3 and the 2nd petitioner is arrayed as A4, who was working in T.C.S. as Software Engineer. A1 and A2 are husband and wife and A2 is the sister of A4. A1 and A2 collected a sum of Rs.11 lakhs from the defacto complainant for securing job in abroad on promise, the petitioners knew the foreign company so that they arranged job through the petitioners in the abroad. Thereafter, neither providing job nor returning the amount and accordingly cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, a complaint has been lodged before the Law Enforcing Agency. Since no action has been taken, the victim filed a Crl.O.P.No.21219 of 2018 before this Court and as per the order of this Court only, an FIR has been registered against the accused.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent persons and they are in no way connected with the alleged offence and that they have been falsely implicated in this case as if A1 and A2 are the relatives of the petitioners. He further submitted that they did not even receive any amount from the



defacto complainant. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that A1 and A2 collected a sum of Rs.11 lakhs from the defacto complainant for securing job in abroad through the petitioners who knew the foreign company. A1 and A2 were arrested and they were enlarged on bail. He further submitted that the investigation is pending. Though the main accused was released on bail, it is not sufficient and he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Now-a-days it is a trend to deceive people by making false promises about providing jobs in foreign lands and acquiring money. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence committed by the petitioners and that investigation of the case is still underway, this Court is of the opinion that it would not be justifiable to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this point of time.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

16/04/2021

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 INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
VELLORE.

2. THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to T.P. SEKAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR
NO. 4886

CRL OP.20309/2020

Date :16/04/2021

TK/21.04.2021