



CRL OP NO. 30611 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-12-2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP NO. 30611 of 2024

Geetha

Wife Of Suresh, Residing At No.2, 14th Street,
Lakshmipuram Extension, Tambaram West,
Tambaram, Chennai - 600 045.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Of Tamil Nadu, Represented By
The Inspector Of Police (crime), Tambaram Police
Station, Tambaram.

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s):

S.Deenadayalan

For Respondent(s):

Mr.S.Santhosh
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener:

Mr.V.Bhavanidaran

ORDER

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of Indian Penal Code in Crime No.624 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the accused induced the de-facto



complainant that she is going to purchase a property and received a sum of Rs.20,00,000/- and repaid only a sum of Rs.9,40,000/-, thereby refused to repay the balance amount. When the de-facto complainant demanded the remaining amount, the accused has threatened her with dire consequences. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there there was a money transaction between the petitioner and the de-facto complainant. Even admittedly as per the FIR, a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- has been repaid to the de-facto complainant. Further, he would submit that the petitioner is running a vegetable shop and the defacto complainant is running a hotel. The de-facto complainant has purchased vegetables for her hotel from the petitioner and also not repaid the remaining amount.

4. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioner had cheated the de-facto complainant to the tune of Rs.20,00,000/- and a sum of Rs.9,23,000/- is yet to be paid by the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the Intervener would vehemently opposed stating that the petitioner had cheated the de-facto complainant.



5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Advocate for the respondent police and also the learned counsel for the Intervener and also perused the materials available on record including the complaint.

6. Taking note of the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions made by the learned counsels on either side, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before **the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Tambaram** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a separate bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only)** with **two sureties each** for a like sum 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 petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure



their identity.

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent Police Station, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m., until further orders;

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] 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].

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

12.12.2024

jd

To

1. The State Of Tamil Nadu, Represented By
The Inspector Of Police (crime), Tambaram Police Station,
Tambaram.

2. The learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Tambaram.



WEB COPY



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA,J.,

CRL OP NO. 30611 of 2024

12.12.2024