



WEB COPY

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

Date : 12.11.2024

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice N.ANAND VENKATESH
CRL OP(MD). No.19466 of 2024

Arumugam

... Petitioner / Accused No.6

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by the Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Tenkasi District.
(Crime No.9 of 2024)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s.A.Arputharaj,
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh,
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.R.J.Karthick

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS Act.

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.9/2024 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police
for the alleged offences under Sections 120(B), 406, 420 and 506(2) of IPC, in Crime



No.9 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that a sum of Rs.89,50,000/- was taken from the defacto complainant and he was cheated on the ground that he will be able to get double the money, if this money is given to the accused persons. There are totally 8 accused persons in this case and the petitioner has been arrayed as A6.

3. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the material records of the case.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a false case has been foisted against the petitioner and he is no way connected with the alleged offence.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), on instructions, submitted that the petitioner was issued with summons to attend the enquiry and without attending the enquiry, the petitioner filed the present petition before this Court. He further submitted that out of Rs.89,50,000/- received from the defacto complainant, a sum of Rs.12,00,000/- has gone to the petitioner (A6) and a sum of Rs.77,50,000/ has gone to all the other accused persons. He further submitted that the investigation is pending and that there are 2 previous cases against the petitioner for similar offence.

6. The learned counsel for the defacto complainant submitted that the accused persons had induced the defacto complainant to give the money with the promise that he will be able to get the amount doubled. Considering the family



circumstances, the defacto complainant had parted with the money. Thereafter, the defacto complainant realized that he has been cheated and he was pleading with the accused persons to get back the money which he has already paid.

7. In the considered view of this Court, the manner in which this incident had taken place and the fact that there are 2 previous cases against the petitioner, the same requires investigation and if so warranted even a custodial interrogation. The petitioner was already asked to attend for an enquiry and without attending the enquiry, the petitioner has chosen to file this petition before this Court. This Court does not find any ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. In the result, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

sd/-
12/11/2024

/ TRUE COPY /

/11/2024

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

pal

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
TENKASI DISTRICT.

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



ORDER IN
CRL OP(MD) No.19466 of 2024
Date :12/11/2024

WEB COPY

BV (25/11/2024) 4P/ 3C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing certified copies in this format from 17.07.2023.