



WEB COPY

CRL OP(MD). N



22

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.18568 of 2022

J.Vel Murugan

... Petitioner/Accused No.3

Vs

The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Kanyakumari Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
Crime No. 274 of 2022.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s.Manivel Pandian M.M.,
Advocate.

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

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


PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.274 of 2022 on the file of
the respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/A3, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the
respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 465 and
420 IPC in Crime No.274 of 2022 on the file of the respondent
police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the accused persons had
started a private company at Veerapandiapattanam near Tiruchendur,
Thoothukudi District for the service of arranging private jobs at
abroad. The de-facto complainant contacted A1 through his relative
and is abroad job proposal, for which, he had paid a sum of



Rs.6,00,000/- to A1's bank account. Subsequently, A1 sent a flight ticket to the de-facto complainant, on the date of travel fixed on 25.01.2022, in fact, on that day, the de-facto complainant could not travel to abroad by way of that flight ticket. After that, he came to know that the flight ticket was forged one. Hence, the de-facto complainant demanded his amount of Rs.6,00,000/- from the accused persons, the same was not repaid by them. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he has not received any amount from the de-facto complainant and he did not start any private company along with A1 and A2 and he did not maintain any strongly relationship between A1 and A2. Hence, he prays for anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) would submit that totally three accused in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A3. The petitioner along with A1 and A2 cheated the de-facto complainant by giving assurance to secure job at abroad and received a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- from him. The investigation is in preliminary stage and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.Considering the gravity and nature of the offence and also considering the conduct of the petitioner and the investigation is in preliminary stage 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
KANYAKUMARI POLICE STATION, KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT.

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

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.18568 of 2022

Date :26/10/2022

SS/GB/SAR II/02/11/2022/ 2P 3C

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>