## BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Monday, the Thirtieth day of December Two Thousand Thirteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice P.N.PRAKASH CRL OP(MD) No.23578 of 2013

..PETITIONER/ACCUSED (RANK NOT KNOWN)

Vs.

STATE REP BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE ECONOMIC OFFENCES WING - II, VIRUDHUANGAR DISTRICT. CR. NO. 4/2013.

S.GNANAVAN

..RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner: M/S.A.KESAVAN Advocate

For Respondent: Mr.A.P.BALASUBRAMANI, Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

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

ORDER: The Court Made the following order:-

There are totally four accused in this case and the Petitioner herein is an accused and he is apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged Commission of offences punishable under sections 406, 420, 120(B) of IPC and Section 5 of the Tamil Nadu Protection of Interest of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1997 in Crime No.4 of 2013, seeks anticipatory bail.

- 2. The case of the prosecution is that the Petitioner was involved in online Trading in the name and style of "Avafx Online Trading Company" and the present complaint was lodged against the Petitioner for not returning the deposited amount with the above said company.
- 3. The learned counsel for the Petitioner would submit that his daughter was working as Receptionist in the defacto complainant's company and she was arrested on account of the above refusal to pay the deposited money and the present Petitioner, who is her father apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent Police since the respondent police is frequently visiting his house under the guise of enquiry and hence he seeks anticipatory bail.
- 4. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) would submit that the name of the Petitioner is not found in the First Information Register registered in this case.
- 5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate(crl. Side) appearing for the State and perused the materials available on record.
- 6. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the https://hestatecourfs.goa.in/hestateco

sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Special Judge concerned and on further condition that the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 11.00 A.M for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation. The petitioner shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C., scrupulously.

7. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

sd/-30/12/2013

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

- 1 THE SPECIAL JUDGE FOR SPECIAL COURT FOR TNPID ACT CASES, MADURAI.
- THE ADDL.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, ECONOMIC OFFENCES WING II, VIRUDHUANGAR DISTRICT.
- +1. CC to M/S.A.KESAVAN Advocate SR.No.64484

ORDER IN

CRL OP(MD) No.23578 of 2013

Date :30/12/2013

PBK 31/12/2013 2P/5C