



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 06/01/2023
PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) . No.22413 of 2022

1. Ganesan,

2. Geethagrace Irin,

... Petitioners/Accused 1 & 2

Vs

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Theni.
(Crime No.32 of 2022).

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners: M/s.Sudhakar V P,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.A.R.Kannappan, Advocate

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

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.32 of 2022 on the file of the Respondent Police.


ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 417, 420, 120(b) IPC in Crime No.32 of 2022, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution as per the defacto complainant, is that the accused had introduced the defacto complainant that they will get him a job in Sathiya Saibaba Multi Estate Co-operative House Building Society Limited at Tamil Nadu and Kerala and asked him to give a sum of Rs.4 lakhs and cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and a false complaint has been lodged against them and a money dispute has been projected as job racketing.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that the petitioners have projected that they were running a Society



by name Sathiya Saibab Multi Estate Co-operative House Society at Tamil Nadu and Kerala and they have introduced the defacto complainant and several others on the premise of giving them job and received Rs.10 lakhs and cheated them. The accused have also given two cheques to the defacto complainant and later they have closed the account. He would also submit that the first petitioner is concerned, he has got 2 previous cases and the second petitioner is concerned, she has got 1 previous case for similar offence and he would object for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the petitioners have on the promise of securing a job in Building Society had received Rs.4 lakhs from the defacto complainant and Rs.6 lakhs from the another victim and later cheated them and thereby he prays for dismissal of this application.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the bad antecedent of the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-

06/01/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/01/2023

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

CM

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
THENI.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.22413 of 2022
Date :06/01/2023

SA/BUC/SAR.3/31.01.2023/2P/3C