



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

Monday, the Eighth day of June Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.10024 of 2015

1 C. VIJAYAVANI

2 C. PARVATHI AMMAL

3 A. NAMBI AMMAL

... PETITIONER(S) / ACCUSED 1 to 3

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PATHAMADAI POLICE STATION, TIRUNELVELI
CRIME NO.49 OF 2015

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.T.LAJAPATHI ROY Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.A.P.BALASUBRAMANIAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl.Side)


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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners\A1 to A3, who were remanded to judicial custody by the respondent police on 25.05.2015 for the alleged offence under Sections 294 (b), 309, 353, 323 and 307 IPC in Crime No.49 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that when the Sub Inspector of Police was on duty in the respondent police station, the accused had abused her for the case registered against the father of the first accused and poured kerosine on the Sub-Inspector of Police and also poured kerosine on themselves in an attempt of self immolation.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the first petitioner is B.E. Graduate and she is working in a Software Company at Chennai and the petitioners 2 and 3 are her mother and paternal aunty. The learned counsel further submitted that the father of the first petitioner had given complaint against some of the official of the respondent police station and case was registered in Crime No.211 of 2015 and the second petitioner has filed Crl.O.P.No.3552 of 2015 for change of investigation on the ground that her husband was falsely implicated in that case. The learned counsel further submitted that no one sustained injury and the petitioners, who are women, have been in judicial custody for more than 15 days.



4. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.side) appearing for the State submitted that the Sub Inspector of Police is the defacto complainant in this case and the accused have used unparliamentary words and attempted to set fire. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) submitted that no one sustained injury and the petitioners have no bad antecedents.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail on the following conditions. Accordingly, they are directed to be released on bail on each of them 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 District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Cheranmahadevei, Tirunelveli District, and on further condition that the petitioners shall appear before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Cheranmahadevei, Tirunelveli District, daily at 10.30 a.m for a period of one week and thereafter as and when required.

sd/-
08/06/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

- 1 THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, CHERANMAHADEVEI.
- 2 DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, TIRUNELVELI.
- 3 THE ADDL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
- 4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PATHAMADAI POLICE STATION, TIRUNELVELI.
- 5 THE OFFICER IN-CHARGE,
SUB JAIL, KOKKIRAKULAM WOMEN PRISON, TIRUNELVELI.

+1. CC to M/S.T.LAJAPATHI ROY Advocate SR.No. 28424.

TS/08.06.2015/2P-7C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10024 of 2015
Date :08/06/2015