



Crl. O.P. No.19705 of 2024

Crl. O.P. No.19705 of 2024

WEB CO P.DHANABAL.J.,

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offences under Sections 465, 468, 471 and 420 of IPC in Cr. No.600 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant, as a MBA graduate, was an aspirant for employment at Singapore, that the 1st petitioner had introduced himself as the Managing Director of JBS Commercial Singapore PTE Limited and also represented that he was running a company both in India and Singapore and also promised the defacto complainant to get employment as financial advisor in the 1st petitioner's company at Singapore and demanded Rs.40 lakhs towards application fee, visa formalities and processing fee etc., that on 12.12.2019, the defacto complainant handed over Rs.15 lakhs in cash as advance fee to the 1st petitioner and he further demanded and collected Rs.12 lakhs from the defacto complainant through bank transactions and Rs.13 lakhs in cash on various dates from 12.12.2019 to March 2020 and the accused neither get employment to defacto complainant in Singapore nor returned the amount collected from the defacto complainant in the



Crl. O.P. No.19705 of 2024

guise of getting employment in foreign. Hence the case.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that based on the false complaint given by the defacto complainant, the respondent police have registered this false case, that the 1st petitioner has made payments to the defacto complainant's account in several instalments, that the defacto complainant, while being a partner, took all the documents of the 1st petitioner and used them in his favour and gave false complaint, that the 1st petitioner did not give any experience certificate dated 12.12.2019, which is a forged one, that the Hon'ble High Court has also given directions to ascertain whether the said employment certificate dated 12.12.2019 was prepared by the defacto complainant or the 1st petitioner, that no proper enquiry was conducted by the respondent police and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and they have been falsely implicated in this case and the defacto complainant was given employment and sent to Singapore as promised by the accused and hence he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The defacto complainant, who appeared in person as intervener would contend that the accused, by showing so many documents, falsely



Crl. O.P. No.19705 of 2024

represented that they are the Directors of two companies in India and Singapore and they will arrange job for the defacto complainant at Singapore as Finance Director and demanded Rs.40 lakhs towards application fee, visa formalities and processing fee etc. and on 12.12.2019, the defacto complainant handed over Rs.15 lakhs in cash as advance and on receipt of the same, the accused issued appointment order as Principal Consultant and also promised to give free accommodation to work at Singapore, that further they demanded amount and collected Rs.12 lakhs from the defacto complainant through bank transactions and Rs.13 lakhs in cash on various dates from 12.12.2019 to March 2020, but failed to get employment at Singapore for the defacto complainant and also failed to return the amount collected by the accused under the guise of employment at Singapore and on enquiry, it came into light that the accused were running the companies without any valid Government license and they have already indulged in similar kind of offence and cheated many people under the guise of getting employment to them and hence he prays that the petition for anticipatory bail may be dismissed.

5. The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) appearing for the State would submit that the petitioners have created forged documents, received money to the tune of Rs.40 lakhs with dishonest intention under



Crl. O.P. No.19705 of 2024

the guise of getting employment at Singapore and deceived the defacto complainant, that the petitioners neither arranged employment for the defacto complainant at Singapore nor returned the amount received by the petitioners under the guise of arranging employment at Singapore and that investigation is at initial stage and hence he strongly objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions put forth on either side and considering the gravity of offences and investigation is at initial stage and there are previous cases pending against the petitioners, I am declined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage.

7. In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

30.08.2024

mjs

P.DHANABAL,J

mjs

To

1. The Inspector of Police, T3 Korattur Police Station, Chennai



CrI. O.P. No.19705 of 2024

2.The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY

CRL O.P. No.19705 of 2024

30.08.2024