



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No. 30449 of 2022

CrI.O.P.No. 30449 of 2022

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.10.2022 for the alleged offence under Sections 406, 420, 465, 468 of I.P.C. in Crime No.1 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of prosecution is that this is the case of job racketing. A1 was running a party in the name and style of Sarvathesa Makkal Urimai Kazhagam and she conducted a meeting at Dharmapuri, at that time, A1 assured that she will arrange loan for educated youths. So, the defacto complainant met A1 at Athiyaman Palace Hotel, Dharmapuri, wherein A1 promised that she get a job for the defacto complainant in S.B.I., for which she asked a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- and he also gave the same to A1. But, A1 sent fake orders to the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is no specific overtact attributed against the petitioner and he has not at all



CrI.O.P.No. 30449 of 2022

WEB COPY

committed any offence as alleged by the respondent police and he is no way connected with the offence. He would submit that as a staff of 1 company and he forwarded e-mail of appointment orders only and there is no other role played by him. He would further submit that a false case has been foisted against him and the petitioner has been suffering incarceration from 16.10.2022. Hence, he prayed to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (CrI. Side) appearing for respondent would submit that totally, there are 8 accused and the petitioner is ranked as A8. He would submit that as a staff of A1 company, he has sent fake appointment orders through e-mail. He would submit that other co-accused were released on bail and if he is released on bail, he will tamper the witnesses and hamper the investigation and the investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by both counsel and considering the fact that even



CrI.O.P.No. 30449 of 2022

WEB COPY

though he is staff of A1 concerned, he has also sent fake appointment orders through e-mail, thereby he has committed the offence and also considering the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner and also considering the fact that there is possibility of tampering the witnesses and hampering the investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

09.12.2022

rpp



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No. 30449 of 2022

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

rpp

Crl.O.P.No. 30449 of 2022

09.12.2022