



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

Thursday, the Nineteenth day of December Two Thousand Thirteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.SATHYANARAYANAN

CRL OP(MD) No.22890 of 2013

MARUTHUPANDI

... PETITIONER/ ACCUSED No.2

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
DINDIGUL SOUTH TOWN PS. DINDIGUL.
CR. NO. 371/2013.

... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.A.K.AZAGARSAMI Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.P.KANDASAMY Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec. 439 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

There are totally two accused in this case and A-1 is a juvenile and the petitioner, who are arrayed as A-2 was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.11.2013 for the alleged commission of offence punishable under Section 302 @ 341 and 302 of I.P.C., in Crime No.371 of 2013 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks bail. The alleged offence is said to have been committed on 11.11.2013.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there was a wordy quarrel between the deceased and the accused. A-1 is a juvenile and A-2/petitioner is said to have caught hold the deceased and A-1/juvenile accused had stabbed the deceased and consequently he died.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that even as per the version of the prosecution, the petitioner is said to have caught hold the deceased and he has not been attributed with any fatal overt act.

4. The learned Government Advocate(Crl. Side) would submit that A-1/Juvenile accused had stabbed the deceased and the petitioner is said to have caught hold the deceased and thereby preventing him from fleeing away from the scene of occurrence. He would further submit that the petitioner is not having any bad antecedents.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the State and also perused the materials available on record.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail on the following conditions. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on executing a 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 learned



Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul, and on further condition that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 11.00 a.m., until further orders.

sd/-
19/12/2013

WEB COPY

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, NO.III, DINDIGUL.
- 2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 3 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI
- 4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE DINDIGUL SOUTH TOWN POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL.
- 5 THE SUPERITENDENT CENTRAL PRISON, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.A.K.AZAGARSAMI Advocate SR.No.63510.

TS/20.12.2013/2P-7C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.22890 of 2013
Date :19/12/2013