



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 08/07/2021

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice G.CHANDRASEKHARAN

CRL OP(MD). No.9031 of 2021

Muruganandam

... Petitioner/Accused No.3

Vs

The State Rep by its
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul,
Dindigul District.
(Crime.No.17/2021).

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.Karthick Kumar.A.,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabakar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

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

PRAYER :

For Anticipatory bail in Crime No.17 of 2021 on the file of the Respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 420, 466, 468, 473 and 120(B) of I.P.C., in Crime No.17 of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is a graduate in B.E. The second accused/Dhanapal has become his friend. He told him that the recruitment process is going on in Dindigul District Court and if the defacto complainant pays amount, he would make arrangement to get employment. The defacto complainant paid a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- to the first accused on 06.07.2017, believing the words of the second accused. The first accused



introduced himself as an advocate. After two weeks the first accused/Karthick informed defacto complainant through phone that he got employment and asked him to come for certificate verification along with original certificates with Rs.2,00,000/-. The defacto complainant arranged Rs.2,00,000/- for interest and paid the same to the first accused and his father/Muruganandam, who is the petitioner herein. He also handed over his certificates. He did not get any information from the first accused or second accused about his employment. When he visited the second accused and asked about first accused and his employment, the petitioner herein told the defacto complainant that the first accused had gone to District Court to meet the District Judge to get his employment order. He also informed him that first accused has close relationship with the District Judge and he would definitely get job for him. The defacto complainant was informed that the District Judge passed order with regard to his employment and asked him to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/-. He mortgaged his house and arranged money and paid the amount to account of the first accused in City Union Bank on 28.11.2017. Then the first accused showed the defacto complainant a sealed cover with the signature of the District Judge and asked him to pay a sum of Rs.1,50,000/-. Without any option, he made arrangements to pay a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- by pledging the jewels and paid the amount to the first accused in the presence of the third accused. He was given the copy of the order and told that original order will be produced in the Court. When the defacto complainant showed the copy of the order, the District Court staff has informed him that it is a forged order copy. Therefore, the present complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes this petition on the ground that the investigation is not completed. He further submitted that it is case of job racketing and accused were dare enough to cheat innocent public on the promise of getting employment in Court. Therefore, he seeks dismissal of this anticipatory bail petition.

5.As narrated above, the facts of case shows that all the accused conspired together and made the defacto complainant to pay more than Rs.6,50,000/- on the promise of getting employment in the District Court, Dindigul. The first accused said to have introduced himself as an advocate and claimed to have close relationship or influence over the District Judge to get employment. The defacto complainant was made to believe that the first accused has close relationship with the District Judge by the third accused, who is the petitioner herein. This is a daring act of cheating committed by all the three accused. The custodial of the interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to find out other vital details with regard to this case. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



6. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

WEB COPY

sd/-
08/07/2021

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2021
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

Note : In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
DINDIGUL, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
2. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) No.9031 of 2021
Date :08/07/2021

IAS
TE/VR/SAR-III : 12/07/2021 : 3P/3C