



CRL.O.P.No.9876 of 2024

CRL.O.P.No.9876 of 2024

T.V.THAMILSELVI,J.

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC r/w Section 5 of Protection of Interests of Depositors (In Financial Establishments) Act in Crime No.51 of 2024, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the one Rajakumari/A1 and her husband Mr.Satish Kumar had induced the de-facto complainant with fancy schemes and made him to invest with the assurance that he will get good returns. Believing them, the de-facto complainant has invested the amount to the tune of Rs.2,00,000/-, whereas, the accused persons failed to repay the same as assured and cheated him. Hence, the complaint has been registered against the Directors of the company.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and a false case has been foisted against her. He would further submit she is only working as a Collection Manager in the



CRL.O.P.No.9876 of 2024

company and to manage the returns from the business, a separate company was started and she is no way connected with the affairs of the company.

Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the respondent police submitted that the petitioner along with other accused persons had cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.2,00,000/-. He would submit that now only FIR has been registered and started to receive some more complaints and the investigation in this case is in initial stage. He would further submit that petitioner also actively participated in the company affairs. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, considering the gravity of the offence and also considering the submissions made by learned Government Advocate(Crl.side) that investigation is in initial stage and also the fact that whether the petitioner actively participated in the company affairs or not shall be decided only after completion of the investigation, this Court is of the view that the case needs detailed



CRL.O.P.No.9876 of 2024

investigation and may require custodial interrogation of the petitioner and not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

24.04.2024

nr



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.9876 of 2024

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.
nr

CRL.O.P.No.9876 of 2024

24.04.2024