



CRL OP(MD). No.12784 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 16/10/2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD). No.12784 of 2023

Gothandaraman @ R.K.Raman

... Petitioner/ Accused No.1

Vs

State Rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch
Ramanathapuram
Ramanathapuram District.
Crime No.2/2016.

... Respondent/ Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s.Palanivel.M, Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.R.Sureshkumar, Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.2 of 2016 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/ Accused No.1, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 IPC in Crime No.2 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution as per the defacto complainant is that the petitioner and other accused were running a company manufacturing Masala Food Products and thereafter, they started Mutual Fund business and collected deposits



CRL OP(MD). No.12784 of 2023

WEB COPY

from various persons and regularly repaying the amount till 2015 and thereafter, the petitioner and other co-accused failed to make repayment. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is wife of A2 and not connected with the collecting amount she is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and his name has been falsely implicated in this case.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that A2 and A3 are doing business and there is no material to show that the petitioner participated in the Mutual Fund Business and collecting the amount from subscribers and the investigation of the case is pending and hence, strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it is noticed that there is no material to show that the petitioner participated with regard to the collection of amount from the subscribers and he has only canvassed for Mutual fund business.

6.Taking into consideration the principles stated by the Honourable Supreme Court in Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia Etc., vs. State of Punjab reported in 1980 AIR 1632 and Lal Kamendra Pratap Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others reported in (2009)4 SCC 437 and Joginder Kumar vs. State of U.P. and others reported in (1994) 4 SCC 260 and taking into consideration the origin of crime, it is seen that the offence



CRL OP(MD). No.12784 of 2023

WEB COPY

alleged as against the petitioner is not a case of heinous crime. Further the petitioner is having permanent residents at Chennai. Hence the principles stated in Hussainara Khatoon & Ors vs. Home Secretary, State Of Bihar reported in AIR 1979 SC 1360 is taken into consideration. In that case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has cautioned that pre-trial detention is not to be encouraged nor is to be encourageable pre-trial release on sureties; that if the Court is satisfied after taking into consideration that the accused has his roots in the community and is not likely to abscond, he can safely be released on his personal bond.

7. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram, on condition that the petitioner shall execute own bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that :

[a] the petitioner shall appear before the trial Court on receipt of summons as directed by the trial Court.



CRL OP(MD). No.12784 of 2023

WEB COPY

[b] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[d] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[e] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

sd/-
16/10/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/10/2023

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

TRP
TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.II, RAMANATHAPURAM.

2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH
RAMANATHAPURAM, RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.



CRL OP(MD). No.12784 of 2023

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

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.12784 of 2023

Date :16/10/2023

RS/JGB/SAR-(25.10.2023) 5P 5C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing
certified copies in this format from 17/07/2023