



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the Twenty Fifth day of October Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.19859 of 2021

SAVITHRI ANJURI

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE [1st RESPONDENTS/COMPLAINANT]
CHINNAGANJAM POLICE STATION,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
(CR NO.150/2021)

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE [2ND RESPONDENTS/COMPLAINANT]
R-4, PONDY BAZAAR POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI-600 017.

For Petitioner : M/S.K. BALASUBRAMANIAM 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 Section 420 of I.P.C. and Section 76 of the Chit Fund Act in Cr.No.150 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The petitioner filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., who has been accused of non-bailable offences committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction limit of the State of Tamil Nadu, has approached this Court for Anticipatory Bail, so as to enable her to approach the appropriate Court.

3.The case of the prosecution is that A1 in the case is alleged to have made false promises to the innocent general public in a Village in Andhra Pradesh and made them to invest in Chit Fund business and thereafter purchased properties in the names of A2 and A3 and cheated them. The petitioner has purchased house property from A1. Hence, apprehending arrest the petitioner has filed this petition.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that this Court, in similar circumstances, has granted interim anticipatory bail to the accused to enable him to seek appropriate Bail Orders from the concerned Court.

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate appearing for the State.

6. The issue as to whether, in respect of the persons who have been accused of a non-bailable offence committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, if his arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that he is a resident of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C, came up for consideration before the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **S.P.Shanthi Swaroop v. State of Tamil Nadu , rep. By Asst. Commissioner of Police, Central Crime Branch, Madras** reported in **1992 L.W. (Cr1) .475**. After elaborate discussions, decisions and considering the ratio laid down by the **Patna High Court in Syed Safrul Hassan v. State** has passed the following order:-

"For the foregoing reasons, we hold that the High Court or the Court of Session has got power under Section 438 Cr.P.C. To grant anticipatory bail irrespective of the locale of the Commission of the offence. In other words, in respect of persons who have been accused of a non-bailable offence committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, if their arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that they are residents of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail. However, we wish to observe that while granting anticipatory bail, this Court has to restrict the relief for a limited period and to direct the concerned persons to move the Court which is having jurisdiction over the matter in the meantime and also impose such condition so as to make the petitioners available for interrogation by the concerned police in the meantime. The reference is answered accordingly."

7. Thereafter, a learned Single Judge of this Court in the case of **P.Thangavelu and others v. State, rep. By the Inspector of Police and other** reported in **2017 (2) MWN (Cr.) 633** has passed the following orders,

"9.Thus , it is seen that though in the State of Uttar Pradesh, the provisions of Section 438, Cr.P.C., enabling grant of Anticipatory bail has been deleted, still the Courts have power to grant Inter-State Anticipatory Bail, more particularly taking into account the provisions under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. In the light of the above Judgments and



discussions, this Court is of the view that Inter-State Anticipatory Bail can be granted to the petitioners for a limited period to enable them seek appropriate Bail Orders from the concerned Court.

WEB COPY

10. Accordingly, Interim Anticipatory Bail is granted to the Petitioners herein till 01.08.2016. The Petitioners are directed to be enlarged on Bail in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before the Judicial Magistrate concerned, subject to the following conditions:

(i) Each of the Petitioner shall execute a Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.10,000- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties, to the satisfaction of the Respondent-Police or the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the Magistrate concerned;

(ii) within the said period, ie., before 01.08.2016, the petitioners shall appear before

the concerned Court of Jurisdiction and move for Anticipatory Bail before the said Court.

11. This Court makes it very clear that Interim Anticipatory Bail pertaining to Inter-State disputes cannot be sought as a matter of right and it is purely the discretion of the Court in granting the same, considering the facts, circumstances and also the nature of offences. It is also made clear that this order, on being produced, shall be punctually observed and executed by all concerned."

8. In view of the decisions cited supra, I am inclined to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner for a period of eight weeks i.e., till 20.12.2021. Accordingly, interim anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner till 20.12.2021. The petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance before the second respondent police and on further condition that:

(i) the Petitioner shall execute Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only), with two sureties, to the satisfaction of the Respondent-Police or the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the Magistrate concerned;



(ii) within the said period, i.e., before 20.12.2021 the petitioner shall appear before the concerned Court of Jurisdiction and file an appropriate application for regular bail before the said Court.

WEB COPY

-sd/-
25/10/2021

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 METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE,
NO.XVII, SAIDAPET, CHENNAI.

2 THE CHIEF METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE,
EGMORE, CHENNAI. [FOR INFORMATION]

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CHINNAGANJAM POLICE STATION,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
R-4, PONDY BAZAAR POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI-600 017

5 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S K. BALASUBRAMANIAM Advocate on payment of
necessary charges SR.NO.11705

CRL OP.19859/2021

Date :25/10/2021

TA-26/10/2021