



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 26/10/2022

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) . No.7695 of 2022

WEB COPY

Chitra

... Petitioner/1st Accused

Vs

1. The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Theni.
Crime No.4 of 2022.

... Respondent/Complainant

2. Bagavathi Raja
3. Johnny Roy
4. Manoj Paul
5. T.S.T.Sivasubramani
6. P.Vinoth
7. Kurian Abraham
8. V.Sandeep Kumar

... Intervene Petitioners/
Proposed Respondent Nos.2 to 8

For Petitioner : M/s.Rangesh.D,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervenor : Mr.M.Jerin Mathew, Advocate

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.4 of 2022 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/A1, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 120B and 420 IPC, in Crime No.04 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and her husband by giving false assurance to the de-facto complainant to get loan in the bank for the purpose of purchasing house property, received a sum of Rs.24,90,000/- from him and thereafter, cheated him. Hence, the complaint.



3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there is a civil dispute pending between the parties, a false case was foisted against the petitioner and the petitioner is innocent and she has no way connected with the alleged occurrence. Hence, he prays for anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioner and her husband by giving false assurance to the de-facto complainant to get loan in the bank for the purpose of purchasing house property, received a sum of Rs.24,90,000/- from him and thereafter, cheated him. He would further submit that the accused persons had received a sum of Rs.1,47,57,000/- from seven victims. The investigation is not yet completed and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the total amount involved in this case is Rs.1,47,57,000/- and the investigation is not yet completed and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much necessary in this case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
26/10/2022

/ TRUE COPY /

/11/2022

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

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH, THENI.
2. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to M/s.A.PRASANNA RAJADURAI, Advocate (SR-11970[I] dated 27/10/2022)

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.7695 of 2022
Date :26/10/2022

sjj

<https://www.csb.gov.in/> I/03.11.2022/2P/4C