

In the Court of the Principal District Judge, Madurai.

Present : **Thiru.M. Balakumar, B.A., M.L.,**

(V Additional District Judge, Madurai)

Principal District Judge, Madurai. (i/c)

Thursday, this the 10th day of September -2020.

Crl.M.P.No.3928/2020

Mayan, S/o.Mayathevar

... Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,

CCB Madurai P.S. Cr.No.14/2020

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition taken up today for hearing at request through e.mail/ e.petition and after hearing the arguments of Thiru.K.Srinivasan, Advocate for the petitioner and of Thiru.M. Tamil Chelvan, the Public Prosecutor for the state over conference call, this court passed the following

Order

1. Bail applications u/s. 439 of Cr.p.c.
2. The offences alleged are U/s. 465, 466, 468, 471, 473, 474 and 420 of IPC.
3. Heard both sides.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the accused was a heart patient and under went Angio surgery. Hence, the petition has to be considered.
5. The learned public prosecutor argued that the accused forged the signature of the Joint Registrar and issued an order of raising the attachment over the properties which was already attached. The above said properties have been purchased in the name of his wife Vanmathi, out of the fund swindled by him when he was holding the post of Secretary in Madurai Urban Co-operative

Bank. Subsequently, by utilizing the raising of attachment order, the same was sold to one Rajeswari who is the 3rd accused and for 3rd accused anticipatory bail application is pending before the Hon'ble High Court. He is in custody only for 22 days. Hence, he strongly objected to release the petitioner on bail. The petitioner's counsel stated that the 2nd petitioner, his wife was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. On perusal of records the 2nd petitioner has no direct involvement in this case except that the properties have been purchased in her name.

6. There is no support of documents produced on the side of petitioner to prove that the petitioner underwent surgery. Considering the initial stage of the judicial custody and as well as the investigation and also considering the fact, the present petitioner has involved as a main tool in the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. In the result, the bail petition is dismissed accordingly.

Pronounced by me in Open Court on the 10th day of September -2020.

Sd/- M. Balakumar
V Additional District Judge, Madurai
Principal District Judge, Madurai.(i/c)

Copy to

1. The Judicial Magistrate concerned.