



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Date : 09/11/2021

PRESENT

**The Hon`ble Mr.Justice K.MURALI SHANKAR**

**CRL OP(MD) . No.17283 of 2021**

Raghavan

... Petitioner/Accused No.1

Vs

State rep.by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Tirunelveli Town Police Station,  
Tirunelveli City,  
Tirunelveli District.  
(Crime No.114 of 2021).

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : S.R.A.Ramachandran, Advocate for  
M/s.J.David Ganesan, Advocate.

For Respondent : M/s.RMS.Sethuraman,  
Additional Public Prosecutor

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.114 of 2021 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/Accused, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 418 and 420 I.P.C in Crime No.114 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and other accused assured the defacto complainant to secure a job at college, using the influence of the second petitioner and received a sum of Rupees Four lakhs from the defacto complainant and without securing a job they cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.



3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that petitioner is innocent and not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, prays for bail.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent would submit that the accused persons had committed the offence of job racketing and investigation is not yet completed. Therefore, he raised his strong objection to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

5.In this case, the petitioner is the husband of second accused, who is working as an Office Assistant in the office of SC & ST Welfare Department, Office of District Collector, Tirunelveli. It is the specific case of the prosecution that the accused persons had assured the defacto complainant to secure a job at college, using the influence of the second petitioner and thereby received a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- (Rupees Four Lakhs) from the defacto complainant. It is a case of job racketing.

6.Considering the seriousness and gravity of the charges levelled against the petitioner and considering the quantum of amount involved and also the fact that the investigation is pending as stated by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7.Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

09/11/2021

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2021

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

PNM

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,  
Tirunelveli Town Police Station,  
Tirunelveli City, Tirunelveli District.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.17283 of 2021

Date :09/11/2021