



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the Thirteenth day of December Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs Justice T.V. THAMILSELVI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.24000 of 2021

R. KARTHICK PRASANNA

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

THE STATE THROUGH
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
R5 VIRUGAMBAKKAM POLICE STATION,
VIRUGAMABAKKAM,
CHENNAI
CRIME NO.889 OF 2021

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.R. CHITHIRAPUTHIRAN Advocate

For Respondent : MR.A.GOKULAKRISHNAN, Additional public Prosecutor

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 365, 384 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.889 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 24.08.2021 the defacto complainant was abducted from Chennai Egmore near Albert theatre by the other co-accused in this case by the instigation of the petitioner to Kodaikanal and he was abandoned in Dindigul bus stand on the same day. In the event of abduction, the defacto complainant was lost his Rs.84,000/- from his account, cash of rupees 10000 and a mobile phone. On the scene of occurrence the defacto complainant narrated a story in his complaint. The petitioner offered the defacto complainant that he will be able to get Railway contracts and jobs to aspirants and collected a sum of Rs.1,25,00,000/- from some other persons through the defacto complainant eventually the petitioner failed to fulfilled his commitment. He neither paid the money nor got the job. The aspirants were demanding the defacto complainant. In furtherance of



the said act the petitioner want to prevent the defacto complainant to demanding the money from his, therefore he abducted him through other accused. 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. He further submitted that by giving a false promise all the accused were received the amount. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that more than Rs.75 lakhs was involved by giving the false promise he is one of the person of giving false promise as a son in law of a minister who belongs from Assam. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, the investigation is in initial stage, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
13/12/2021

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 INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
R5 VIRUGAMBAKKAM POLICE STATION,
VIRUGAMABAKKAM, CHENNAI

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.R. CHITHIRAPUTHIRAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.NO.14710

CRL OP.24000/2021

Date :13/12/2021

JPA 16/12/2021