



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.11.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CrI.O.P.No.20935 of 2021

G.Sathish Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

1. The State, represented by
Inspector of Police,
J-1 Police Station,
Saidapet, Chennai - 600 015.

2. The State of Karnataka,
Rep by Inspector of Police,
Kaggalipura Police Station,
Ramanagara District,
Karnataka State.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to enlarge the petitioner on Inter-state anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in FIR No.0191 of 2021 pending on the file of the second respondent police.

For Petitioner : M/s.Nalini Chidambaram, Senior Counsel
M/s.Kanchi Kailasam

For Respondent : Mr.N.S,Suganthan
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who is arrayed as accused, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 405, 415, 417 and 420 of IPC, in Crime No. 0191 of 2021, on the file of the second respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was implicated for the offences under Sections 405, 415, 417 and 420 of IPC, on the file of the Inspector of Police, Kaggalipura Police Station, Ramanagara District, Karnataka State, in



which, the Karnataka police has issued summons to the petitioner for his appearance. Further, he contended that with regard to purchase of land there was valid agreement between himself and the trust and for the alleged advance amount was duly secured by way of letter of guarantee and also deposit of title deeds. He was not indulged in any of the fraudulent act as alleged in the complaint. But due to Covid-19 pandemic he was not able to travel Bangalore and to give proper instruction to his counsel. But he took all efforts to get an anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. In the meantime, he is under the apprehension of arrest. Hence, he prayed for interstate anticipatory bail.

4. Notice issued to both the respondents.

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the State (R1).

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.(Crl).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



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.

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 till 27.12.2021. Accordingly, interim anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner till 27.12.2021. The petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance before the first respondent police and on further condition that:

(i) 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;



WEB COPY

(ii) within the said period, i.e., before 27.12.2021 the petitioner shall appear before the concerned Court of Jurisdiction and file an appropriate application for regular bail before the said Court.

-sd/-
25/11/2021

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 CHIEF METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE,
EGMORE, CHENNAI.

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
J-1 POLICE STATION, SAIDAPET,
CHENNAI 600015.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KAGGALIPURA POLICE STATION,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT,
KARNATAKA STATE.

4 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1CC to M/S C.UMA Advocate on payment of necessary charges
SR.NO.13510

CRL OP.20935/2021

Date :25/11/2021

CSK 02/11/2021