

**G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.**

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Section 420 IPC and 5 of TNPID Act in Crime No. 2 of 2022, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. There are totally four accused in this case, in which the petitioner is arrayed as A3. The case of the prosecution is that the accused persons ran a real estate business, in which the defacto complainant joined as an agent, paid monthly installments of Rs.650/- for 63 months and also introduced many people into the company of the accused and collected monthly installments from several persons and paid them in total a sum of Rs.27,97,000/- and got commission, all the payment were receipted by A1. Thereafter, when the defacto complainant approached for registration of the plot, the accused sought time for a period of one month, subsequently they closed the office. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He would

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in further submit that A1 and A2 were released on bail. Hence, he prays to



G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

WEB COPY

Anu

anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioner is alleged to have collected a sum of Rs.2,24,88,000/- and odd from 1,400 victims. Since the offence committed by the accused persons are serious in nature, A1, A2 and A4 are still in judicial custody. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner, this Court finds that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

10.08.2022

Anu

Crl.O.P.No.18839 of 2022