



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

Thursday, the Second day of December Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs Justice T.V. THAMILSELVI
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.22824 of 2021

K.ANBALAGAN

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP BY ITS
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH
CUDDALORE DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO. 8 OF 2021)

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S. A.ARASU GANESHAN Advocate

For Respondent : MR. N.S.SUGANTHAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : M/S Y.VENKATESAN Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 406, 468, 471, 420 and 506(i) of IPC, in Crime No.8 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is the de facto complainant had paid an amount of Rs.10,30,000/- to the petitioner who is an retired Sub-Inspector of Police and other accused for obtaining Site in charge Job in Neyveli Lignite Corporation Limited (NLC) for his son and thereafter, the petitioner neither secured the job as promised nor returned the money. Hence, the 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. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.



4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would raise objection stating that there are totally 3 accused in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2. He would further submit that the respondent police have been receiving complaints against the petitioner and others for like nature and hence, the case needs a detailed enquiry.

5.The learned Counsel for the intervenor would raise strong objection stating that the petitioner along with other accused cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.10,30,000/- under the guise of obtaining Government job for his son.

6. On seeing nature of allegation levelled against the petitioner and the fact that the respondent police have been receiving complainants from other victims, this case needs a detailed enquiry. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

02/12/2021

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
CUDDALORE DISTRICT.

CC to M/S. A.ARASU GANESHAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.22824/2021

Date :02/12/2021

RVR 15/12/2021