



CRL OP(MD). No.22016 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 13/12/2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice V. SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD). No.22016 of 2023

1. B.Nandheeswaran

2. R.Ragul

... Petitioners/ Accused No.5 & 6

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Madurai District
Crime No.31/2023.

... Respondent/Respondent

P.Shanthi

... Petitioner/Intervenor/Defacto complainant
in CRL MP(MD)No.17496 of 2023

For Petitioners : M/s.Vijaiboominathan.L.M,
Advocate.

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

For intervenor : Mr.M.Gopala Krishna Lakshmana Raja
Senior counsel
for M/s. SGL.Rishwanth, Advocate

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.31/2023 on the file of the respondent police



CRL OP(MD). No.22016 of 2023

WLB COPY
ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners / accused, who apprehends at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 66D Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 INFC and Sections 120(b), 406, 420, 465, 468 and 471 IPC in Crime No.31 of 2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners herein, who are working as Branch Manager and Assistant Manager have permitted the accused persons to pledge the jewels of the defacto complainant in the name of five persons in their Bank. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and their names have been falsely implicated in this case and hence he seeks anticipatory to the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent submitted the petitioners herein have illegally permitted the accused persons to pledge the jewels of the defacto complainant in the name of five persons in their Bank. He would further submit that the investigation of the case is pending.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the petitioners have



WEB COPY

colluded with the accused persons and permitted them to pledge the jewels of the defacto complainant in different names.

6. On perusal of the FIR, it is noticed that that A1 had received 358 sovereigns of jewels from the defacto complainant and pledged the same in the name of other accused persons.

7. 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 Kamlendra 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 alleged as against the petitioners is not a case of heinous crime. Further the petitioners is having permanent residents at Theni District. 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 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.



CRL OP(MD). No.22016 of 2023

WEB COPY

8. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai on condition that the petitioners shall execute own bonds 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 petitioners shall appear before the trial Court on receipt of summons as directed by the trial Court.

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

[c] the petitioners 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 petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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].



CRL OP(MD). No.22016 of 2023

[e] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under

WEB COPY

Section 229A IPC.

sd/-
13/12/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/12/2023

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

TRP

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I
MADURAI.

2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
MADURAI.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CYBER CRIME POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT

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

+1 CC to M/s.L.M.VIJAI BOOMINATHAN, Advocate (SR-17857[I] dated
15/12/2023)

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.22016 of 2023

Date :13/12/2023

SS/JGB/SAR- /28/12/2023/5P/6C

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