



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

Thursday, the Twenty Second day of January Two Thousand Fifteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice P.N.PRAKASH

CRL OP(MD) No.1015 of 2015

WEB COPY

MAYANDI

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED

Vs

STATE.REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
USILAMPATTI,
MADURAI.
CR. NO.33/2014.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.M.RAJAVELU Advocate

For Respondent : MR.C.RAMESH, Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervener : MR.S.RAMACHANDRA PRADEEP, Advocate

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.
ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 498(A), 417, 420 I.P.C and Section 4 of D.P.Act in Crime No.33 of 2014 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner is working as a Sub-Inspector of Police and his son got married to the defacto complainant on 20.08.2012. There is one child born through the wedlock. It is seen that the petitioner's son had already married to One Asha Lidya and suppressing that marriage, the petitioner appears to have been performed the marriage of his son with the defacto complainant.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not at all aware about his son's antecedents. This Court is unable to accept the theory.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor would strongly object to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



5. It is alleged that after marrying the defacto complainant second time, the petitioner is now looking for third marriage for his son and the accused in this case including the husband of the defacto complainant has been granted anticipatory bail by the Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.6975 of 2014 and 7322 of 2014.

6. In my considered opinion, that may not be a good ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. In view of the serious nature of the allegation against the petitioner especially in the light of the fact that he is a Sub-Inspector of Police and he has been behind all these episodes, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-

22/01/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, USILAMPATTI, MADURAI.

2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.M.RAJAVELU Advocate SR.No.3276

+1cc to Mr.S.RAMACHANDRA PRADEEP, Advocate, SR.No. 2874

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.1015 of 2015

Date :22/01/2015

PA/28.01.15/2P/5C