



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 12/05/2022
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) . No.7874 of 2022

Nagarani

... Petitioner/Accused No.2

Vs

The State rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul DCB Police Station,
Dindigul District.
Crime No.11 of 2022.

... Respondent/Complainant

C.Marimuthu

... Petitioner/Defacto Complainant
Crl.MP(MD).5779/2022 in
Crl.OP(MD).7874/2022

For Petitioner : M/s.THALAIMUTHARASU.G,
Advocate.

For Respondent : S.RAVI,
Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervenor : AN.RAMANATHAN
Advocate.

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

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.11 of 2022 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 120(b), 406, 420, 294(b) and 506(i) of I.P.C., in Crime No. 11 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 contacted the defacto complainant over phone and they promised to secure Government Teacher Job and obtained Rs.9,80,000/-. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is A2 and she is the wife of A1. The entire allegation is only against the A1 and not against the petitioner. The petitioner is a house wife and she has to take care of her female child studying in Chennai. The defacto complainant and other



persons were continuously threatening the petitioner, in which, the petitioner has also made a complaint. However, the respondent police has not taken any steps on the complaint given by the petitioner. Accordingly, she prayed for granting of Anticipatory Bail.

WEB COPY

4.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submits that though the enquiry is in preliminary state, after enquiry it reveals that there are several persons have been cheated by the the petitioner and her husband and vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State submits that initially the complaint was lodged by the defacto complainant as if he has given a sum of Rs.9,80,000/- (Rupees Nine Lakhs Eighty Thousand only) to the petitioner and her husband for securing a Government job. After investigation it reveals that there are 24 persons were cheated by the petitioner and her husband and the petitioner's husband cheated Rs.2,70,54,000/- (Rupees Two Crores Seventy Lakhs and Fifty Four Thousand only). However, further investigation reveals after securing a huge amount they have invested the said amount in the name of the petitioner and also purchased huge properties in and around Dindigul. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6.It appears that the petitioner and her husband said to have cheated the defacto complainant and other innocent persons as if they would secure Government jobs to them.

7.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the allegation and amount involved in this case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8.Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

sd/-

12/05/2022

/ TRUE COPY /

16/05/2022

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

Note :In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate / litigant concerned.



TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DINDIGUL DCB POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.7874 of 2022

Date :12/05/2022

SA/JM/SAR.2/16.05.2022/3P/3C