

Crl.O.P.No.17766 of 2015**R.SUBBIAH, J.**

The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.10.2014 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 376, 397, 302, 201 r/w 120(b) IPC in Crime No.620 of 2012, seeks the relief of bail.

2.The case of the prosecution, in brief, is as follows:- The complaint was lodged by one Krishnan stating that his mother Ponnammal used to graze the cattle at forest and on 28.11.2012, his mother requested him to do the said work, but he refused to do the same. Hence, the defacto-complainant's mother went to graze the cattle. In the afternoon, the defacto-complainant went to the forest in order to relieve his mother, but his mother was found dead with cut injuries. Hence, the complaint was lodged by him. On the basis of the complaint, a case in Crime No.620 of 2012 under Section 302 IPC was registered. Thereafter, the Inspector of Police took up the investigation and examined the witnesses and conducted inquest over the body of the deceased. While so, on 13.10.2014 one Elayaraja (A3) surrendered before the Village Administrative Officer, Parikal and has given a confession statement stating that he along with other accused persons waylaid the deceased Ponnammal, robbed gold

jewels and committed rape. During the course of investigation, the Inspector of Police came to know that the petitioner and other accused persons were already arrested in connection with the case in Crime No.549 of 2013. Then, the Inspector of Police made formal arrest of the petitioner by P.T.Warrant on 28.10.2014.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner/A1 submitted that the petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Further, the petitioner is in inside the prison for more than ten months. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that after completion of the investigation, the Police has filed chargesheet and the same has been taken on file in PRC.No.4 of 2015 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ulundurpet, Villupuram District. Thus, the learned counsel for the petitioner sought for the relief of bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), by filing a detailed counter, opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner stating that the petitioner is having bad antecedents and he is involved in three murders cases also, which are as follows_

So.No.	P.S. & Crime No.	Offences	Stage
1.	Thiruvannainallur	U/S.376, 397, 302, 201	P.R.No.20/2014

So.No.	P.S. & Crime No.	Offences	Stage
	P.S. Cr.No.515/2012	IPC r/w 120(b) IPC	J.M-II,- Pending Trial
2.	Thirunavalur P.S., Cri.No.620/2012	U/s.302 IPC	Pending Trial
3.	CBCID, Cr.No.2/2014, Villupuram District	U/s 302 IPC	Pending Trial

The learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) would further submit that if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he would tamper the evidence. Thus, he sought for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. I have heard the submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and taking note of the bad antecedents of the petitioner, I am of the opinion that the petitioner is not entitled for the relief of bail. Further, as contended by the learned Government Advocate, if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he will tamper the evidence. Hence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In fine, the criminal original petition is dismissed.

31.07.2015

SSV

R.SUBBIAH, J.

Pre-delivery order

in

Crl.O.P.No.17766 of 2015

31.07.2015