



CrI.O.P.No. 3021 of 2024

CrI.O.P.No.3021 of 2024

WEB CO **T.V.THAMILSELVI,J.**

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 120(B), 406, 420 of IPC and Section 5 of TNPID Act, 1997, in Crime No.02 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with A2, who is the husband of the petitioner was running a Jewellery Shop under the name and style of Lalithambigai Silver Jewellery at Salem and canvassed that on deposit of amount for the Jewellery, the depositors are able to purchase the jewellery without any wastages and various other schemes in respect of deposit. Believing their words, the defacto complainant one Saraswathy deposited total sum of Rs.10,75,600/-. After maturity, she has not received any amount nor jewellery from the accused as promised by him. Hence, the complaint.



3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that he had not received any amount from the depositors, but she has been falsely implicated in this case and due to the confession of A2 , she was mentioned in R.C. of A1 jewellery shop. He would also submit that there is no specific overt act against the petitioner and this is the third anticipatory bail peition before this court. Hence he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) would submit that the husband of the petitioner was running a Jewellery Shop under the name and style of Lalithambigai Silver Jewellery at Salem. The petitioner along with other accused persons have collected a sum of Rs.10,75,000/- under the Jewels Savings Scheme from the defacto complainant assuring that the depositors are able to buy the jewellery without any wastages and also various other schemes in respect of deposit. But, after maturity of the scheme, the petitioner neither returned the Jewels and nor repaid the amount as promised by him. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No. 3021 of 2024

5. Considering the submissions of both sides and also on seeing the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner and the fact that there is no change in circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

21.02.2024

rpp



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No. 3021 of 2024

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

rpp

CRL.O.P.No.3021 of 2024

21.02.2024