



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Twenty Sixth day of April Two Thousand Twenty Two

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Dr Justice G. JAYACHANDRAN

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION Nos.8988 & 9018 of 2022

S.RAJARAM

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED
IN CRL.OP.NO.8988/2022]

1 J.HOHAN
2 NANTHA KUMAR
3 SHELLY LATHER

[PETITIONERS / ACCUSED
IN CRL.OP.NO.9018/2022]

Vs

STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
NAGAPATTINAM.
CRIME NO.14 OF 2021

[RESPONDENT
IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

For Petitioner : M/S.R.VENKATESH Advocate
[IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

For Respondent : M/S.S.SANTHOSH, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)
[IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners in both Crl.O.P's, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.14 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioners in both Crl.O.P's apprehending arrest in Crime No.14 of 2021 wherein, the defacto complainant has alleged that, these petitioners promising to grant franchisee for the business of hair transplantation, received a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- but has not given the franchisee in Coimbatore. Without rendering money receipt, they have appointed somebody as franchisee. When the defacto complainant demanded the money back, they started intimidating him.



3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that, when the matters came up on earlier occasion, he submitted that the statement of defacto complainant is false. In fact, franchisee was given to the defacto complainant and he also commenced his business in Coimbatore. But, due to pandemic, he was not able to continue the business and hence closed. When the defacto complainant explained his difficulty for not continuing the business, the petitioners herein refunded Rs.2,00,000/-.

4. However, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent would submit that there is no franchisee granted to the defacto complainant.

5. Considering the fact that there are some complaints against these petitioners and from few other valuable investors, custodial interrogation of these petitioners is very much required. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed.

-sd/-

26/04/2022

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,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
NAGAPATTINAM.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+2 CC to M/S.R.VENKATESH Advocate on payment of necessary
charges SR.NO. 6345 & 6346

CRL OP.Nos.8988 & 9018 /2022

Date :26/04/2022

RW 04/05/2022