



Crl.O.P.No.1724 of 2024

Crl.O.P.No.1724 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 406, 420 & 34 of IPC r/w 43 & 66 (D) of Information Technology Act, in Crime No.1 of 2021, on the file of the second respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C, who has been accused of non-bailable offences committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction limit of the State of Tamil Nadu, has approached this Court for Interstate Anticipatory Bail, so as to enable him to approach the appropriate Court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was implicated for the offences under Sections 406, 420 & 34 of IPC r/w 43 & 66 (D) of Information Technology Act, on the file of the Inspector of Police, Cyber Cell Police Station, Commissioner Officer, Aurangabad City, Maharashtra. Further, the defacto complainant has given a



Crl.O.P.No.1724 of 2024

false complaint against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed for interstate anticipatory bail.

4. Notice issued to the respondents.

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the State (R1 and R2).

6. The issue as to whether, in respect of the persons who have been accused of a non-bailable offence committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, if his arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that he is resident of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C, came up for consideration before the Division Bench of this Court in the case of *S.P.Shanthi Swaroop v. State of Tamil Nadu , rep. By Asst. Commissioner of Police, Central Crime Branch, Madras* reported in 1992 *L.W.(Crl).475*. After elaborate discussions, decisions and considering the ratio laid down by the *Patna High Court in Syed Safrul Hassan v. State*



has passed the following order:-

WEB COPY

“For the foregoing reasons, we hold that the High Court or the Court of Session has got power under Section 438 Cr.P.C. To grant anticipatory bail irrespective of the locale of the Commission of the offence. In other words, in respect of persons who have been accused of a non-bailable offence committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, if their arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that they are residents of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail. However, we wish to observe that while granting anticipatory bail, this Court has to restrict the relief for a limited period and to direct the concerned persons to move the Court which is having jurisdiction over the matter in the meantime and also impose such condition so as to make the petitioners available for interrogation by the concerned police in the meantime. The reference is answered accordingly.”

7. Thereafter, a learned Single Judge of this Court in the case of

P.Thangavelu and others v. State, rep. By the Inspector of Police and

other reported in ***2017 (2) MWN (Cr.) 633*** has passed the following orders,

“9.Thus , it is seen that though in the State of Uttar Pradesh, the provisions of Section 438, Cr.P.C., enabling grant of Anticipatory bail has been deleted, still the Courts have power to grant Inter-State Anticipatory Bail, more particularly taking into account the provisions under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. In the light of the above Judgments and discussions, this Court is of the view that Inter-State Anticipatory Bail can be granted to the petitioners for a limited period to enable them seek appropriate Bail Orders from the concerned Court.

10.Accordingly, Interim Anticipatory Bail is



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.1724 of 2024

granted to the Petitioners herein till 01.08.2016. The Petitioners are directed to be enlarged on Bail in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before the Judicial Magistrate concerned, subject to the following conditions:

(i) Each of the Petitioner shall execute a Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.10,000- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties, to the satisfaction of the Respondent-Police or the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the Magistrate concerned;

(ii) within the said period, ie., before 01.08.2016, the petitioners shall appear before the concerned Court of Jurisdiction and move for Anticipatory Bail before the said Court.

11. This Court makes it very clear that Inerim Anticipatory Bail pertaining to Inter-State disputes cannot be sought as a matter of right and it is purely the discretion of the Court in granting the same, considering the facts, circumstances and also the nature of offences. It is also made clear that this order, on being produced, shall be punctually observed and executed by all concerned."

8. In view of the decisions cited supra, I am inclined to grant interim interstate anticipatory bail to the petitioner till 13.05.2024. The petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance before the first respondent police and on further condition that:



CrI.O.P.No.1724 of 2024

(i) the Petitioner shall execute a Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties, to the satisfaction of the Respondent-Police or the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the Magistrate concerned;

(ii) within the said period, i.e., before 13.05.2024 the petitioners shall appear before the concerned Court of Jurisdiction and file an appropriate application for regular bail before the said Court.

02.04.2024

msrm



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.1724 of 2024

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

msrm

Crl.O.P.No.1724 of 2024

02.04.2024