



WEB COPY



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 02/11/2022

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice A.A.NAKKIRAN

CRL OP(MD) . Nos.7413 and 19283 of 2022

1. Latha
2. Rajendran
3. Karthick Rajesh ... Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3
(in Crl.O.P. (MD)No.7413/2022)

4. Sangeetha ... Petitioners/Accused No.4
(in Crl.O.P. (MD)No.19283/2022)

Vs

State rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
Sivakasi Town Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.82 of 2022). ... Respondent/Complainant
(in both Petitions)

Saraswathi ... Petitioner/Intervener
(in Crl.M.P. (MD)No.5384/2022)

For PetitionerS : M/s.Prabu.M., Advocate.
(in both Petitions)

For Respondent : Mr.M.Muthumanikkam,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
(in both Petitions)

For Intervenor : Mr.M.Jothibas, Advocate
(in Crl.O.P. (MD)No.7413 of 2022)



PETITIONS FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.438 of Cr.P.C

WEB COPY

COMMON PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.82/2022 on the file of the Respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A1 to A4, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 406, 420, 120(B) and 506(i) IPC in Crime No.82 of 2022, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners by giving false promise to get Government job, received a sum of Rs.30,45,000/- from the de-facto complainant. Thereafter, the petitioners did not turned up and cheated the de-facto complainant. Subsequently, the de-facto complainant went to the petitioners' house and asked them to return the money, the petitioners gave life threat to her. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that due to some money dispute pending between the petitioners and the de-facto complainant and the petitioners have already paid a sum of Rs.24,00,000/- to the de-facto complainant on various dates, but the de-facto complainant suppressed all the facts and given a false complaint against them. Hence, he prays for anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Government Advocate(Crl. Side) would submit that it is a case of job racketing and the petitioners have received a sum of Rs.30,45,000/- from the de-facto complainant by giving false promise to secure Government job and A3 was already arrested and released on bail and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.The learned counsel for the intervenor vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the quantum of the amount involved in this case and also the fact that the investigation is still pending, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this point of time.



7. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed.

WEB COPY

/ TRUE COPY /

Sd/-
02/11/2022

/11/2022
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.IV)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

SJI

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
SIVAKASI TOWN POLICE STATION,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.
2. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.G.M.LAW OFFICE, MR.M.JOTHIBASU, Advocate SR.No.12312

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) . Nos.7413
and 19283 of 2022
Date :02/11/2022

SP/BUC/SAR IV/10/11/2022/3P/4C