



CRL OP(MD) No.1137 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the Twenty Ninth day of January Two Thousand and Twenty Four

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.1137 of 2024

RAMALAKSHMI

... PETITIONER/ ACCUSED 2

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
THIRUTHANGAL POLICE STATION,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.3 OF 2024)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.ANANDHA RAJAGOPAL.S Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.P.KOTTAICHAMY, Govt. Advocate (CrI. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.M.KARUNANIDHI, Advocate

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

PRAYER:- FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL IN CRIME NO. 3 OF 2024 ON THE
FILE OF THE RESPONDENT POLICE.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner/A2, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police

for the alleged offence under Sections 406, 409, 420, 294(b), 506(ii) of IPC and Section 4 of



CRL OP(MD) No.1137 of 2024

TNPHW Act, in Crime No.3 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the accused persons obtained a sum of Rs.29,00,00/- from the defacto complainant for securing a Government Job to the defacto complainant's daughter. After getting the amount, the accused persons neither secured the job nor repaid the said amount. Thereby, cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the wife of first accused and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. On earlier occasion, the petitioner made a complaint against the defacto complainant and the police officials and in order to wreck vengeance, the present case has been registered against the petitioner. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the State submitted that the petitioner is the wife of A1. The petitioner and her husband collected a sum of Rs.29,00,000/- from the defacto complainant for securing a government job and thereafter, they neither secured a job nor repaid the said amount. Thereafter, they had purchased a new car in their names. He further submitted that the first accused was already arrested and enlarged on bail by the Lower Court and the entire amount is with the petitioner. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the intervener did not dispute the facts submitted

by the learned Government Advocate (crl.side) and vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



CRL OP(MD) No.1137 of 2024

bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence alleged against the petitioner and the quantum of amount involved in the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

sd/-
29/01/2024

/ TRUE COPY /

/02/2024
Sub-Assistant Registrar
(C.S. I / II / III / IV)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

CP
TO
1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
THIRUTHANGAL POLICE STATION,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.

2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.1137 of 2024
Date :29/01/2024

SA/JGB/SAR. /05.02.2024/3P/3C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing certified copies in this format from 17/07/2023.

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>