



WEB COPY

CRL OP(MD).



23

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Date : 19/01/2023

PRESENT

**The Hon`ble Mr.Justice A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA**

CRL OP(MD) . No.1022 of 2023

1. Javeed Ali  
2. T.Padmanaban

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.2 & 3

Vs

State Rep.by  
The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch Police Station,  
Virudhunagar District.  
Crime No.22 of 2021.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : M/s.Rajamohan.R,  
Advocate.  
For Respondent : Mr.K.Sanjai Gandhi,  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.22 of 2021 on the file of the respondent Police.


ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A2 & A3, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 465, 468 and 471 of I.P.C., in Crime No.22 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with the other accused had taken an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant for securing a job in the Collectorate and thereafter, they have handed over a fabricated appointment order to the de-facto complainant. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocents and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that the main allegations are attributed only as against the first accused and thereby, he would seek for anticipatory bail.

[https://www.mhktm.in/for\\_in/judis](https://www.mhktm.in/for_in/judis)



4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) would submit at the petitioners along with the other accused had taken an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant for securing a job in the Collectorate and thereafter, they have handed over a fabricated appointment order to the de-facto complainant. He would further submit that the petitioners have got two previous cases of similar in nature. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail.

5.Heard. Perused the materials available on record including the First Information Report.

6.Taking into consideration the facts and the submissions and that the petitioners have got two previous cases of similar in nature, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

sd/-  
19/01/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/02/2023

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

SJI

TO

1. The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch Police Station,  
Virudhunagar District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER  
IN  
CRL OP(MD) No.1022 of 2023  
Date :19/01/2023

RS/VR/SAR.4(01.02.2023) 2P-3C