



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Dated: 05/08/2022

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice G.ILANGO VAN

Crl.OP(MD)No.12912 of 2022

Sudha Priya

... Petitioner/Accused No.2

Vs.

State rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch (DCB),
Madurai District.
(Crime No.12 of 2022)

... Respondent/Complainant

M.Hari Murugan

... Petitioner/Defacto Complainant
in CRL MP(MD).8361/2022 in CRL OP(MD).12912/2022

For Petitioner : Mr.D.S.Haroon Rasheed, Advocate
For Respondent : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh
Government Advocate (Criminal side)
For Intervenor : Mr.T.Chandrasekaran, Advocate

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

PRAYER: -

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.12 of 2022 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order:-

The petitioner, who is arrayed as A2 apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 120(B), 406, 420, 468, 471 and 506(i) IPC, in Crime No.12 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant has lodged a complaint stating that A1 namely Navaneetha Krishnan introduced himself stating that he arranged Government job for various persons. It is also informed that A2-Sudha Priya is a Government Doctor and she has also arranged Government job for the friends of A2. On the promise of arranging Government job, they



received Rs.7,00,000/- on various occasions. The amount transferred through the Bank account of A2 namely Sudha Priya. She also introduced several persons and A1 collected enormous amount from others also. A1 also issued fake appointment orders. After coming to know about the cheating, they approached A1. But he refused to return the amount and also criminally intimidated, over which, the present complaint has been registered.

3. Seeking anticipatory bail, this petitioner, who is the wife of A1 moved this petition on the ground that absolutely, no involvement of this petitioner has been stated in the complaint.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor/de-facto complainant would submit that the amount was also transferred in the account of this petitioner and A1 has cheated many persons like this, for which this petitioner is also colluding. So, according to him, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that A1 is the person, who issued fake appointment orders and thereby cheated several persons.

6. But however, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that absolutely, no record is available to show that this petitioner was also receiving money along with A1.

7. Reading of the complaint shows that only A1 said to have represented that he can arrange Government job for any people and he has also arranged Government job for the relatives of A2. Except stating so, it appears that the involvement of this petitioner has not been stated in the FIR. But however, a total amount of Rs.98,000/- has been deposited to the account of the petitioner. Who has transferred the amount is a matter for investigation.

8. So considering the limited role that has been played by the petitioner and also considering the fact that the petitioner is a Government Doctor, this court is inclined **to grant anticipatory bail** to the petitioner with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Madurai and on her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) to the credit of Crime No.12 of 2022 before the concerned court** and the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police once in a week I.e., on every Sunday at 10.00 a.m. until further orders. The petitioner shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously. The petitioner



shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

sd/-

05/08/2022

/ TRUE COPY /

WEB COPY

/08/2022

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 JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I, MADURAI.
- 2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, MADURAI DISTRICT.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH (DCB),
MADURAI DISTRICT.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to M/s.D.S.HAROON RASHEED, Advocate (SR-8277[I] dated 08/08/2022)

+1 CC to M/S.T.CHANDRA SEKARAN, Advocate (SR-8269[I] dated 08.08.2022)

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.12912 of 2022

Date :05/08/2022

er

RS/SVR/SAR.3 (18.08.2022) 3P-7C