

**CrI.O.P.No.14611 of 2022**

WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506(2) of IPC in Crime No.77 of 2022, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is working as a Manager in M/s.Adinath Private Limited Company, which deals with trading business. The defacto complainant had met the petitioner for getting supply of first quality sugar and it is alleged that the petitioner had assured to supply huge quantum of first quality sugar within a short period to the defacto complainant. Believing the assurance made by the petitioner, the defacto complainant has transferred the money through the bankers for a sum of Rs.1,59,66,500/-. After receipt of the said amount, the petitioner has not supplied the goods to the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and she has nothing to do with the alleged offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

Lpp

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent would submit that the petitioner is sole accused. The petitioner, after receipt of Rs. 1,59,66,500/- from the defacto complainant to supply sugar, failed to supply any goods to the defacto complainant. He would further submit that there are three previous cases, similar in nature, pending against the petitioner. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of offence committed by the petitioner and taking note of the fact that the petitioner is having three previous cases, similar in nature, therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

30.06.2022

Lpp