



Crl.OP.No.16529 of 2022

Crl.O.P.No.16529 of 2022

WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC in crime No.398 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner induced the defacto complainant to pay a sum of Rs.7 lakhs to get Government job. The petitioner also directed the defacto complainant to deposit a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- to the account of his father, who was working as Office Assistant in the Employment Exchange. Believing the said words, the defacto complainant paid the amount and thereafter the petitioner failed to get any job to the petitioner as well as refused to return the amount. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner never insisted the defacto complainant to pay such amount and his father only insisted him and received the amount. Now his father died and as such, the present false complaint has been foisted as against the petitioner and he has nothing to do with the crime as alleged by the prosecution since the entire crime was committed by his father. Hence, he seeks for grant of anticipatory



Crl.OP.No.16529 of 2022

bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that there is a specific allegation as against the petitioner since he only induced the defacto complainant to pay the amount and assured him to secure job. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. On perusal of the complaint, revealed that there is a specific allegation as against only the petitioner. Since the petitioner's father was working as Office Assistant in the Technical Employment Exchange, Guindy, Chennai, by using his father's post, the petitioner had induced the defacto complainant to pay the amount and assured him to secure job. Thereafter, the petitioner failed to secure any job and also refused to return the amount. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required in this case and this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

15.07.2022

lok



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.16529 of 2022



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.16529 of 2022

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

lok

Crl.O.P.No.16529 of 2022

15.07.2022