



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

Monday, the Third day of August Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.10962 of 2015

1 M. VINCENT DASS
2 M. JOSEPH FATHIMA MARY
3 M. CHINNAPPAN @ DAVID

..PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.1 TO 3

Vs.

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
THIRUVADANAI, RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.
CRIME NO.10/2015.

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINAN

For Petitioners : M/S.T.ANTONY ARUL RAJ Advocate

For Respondent : MRS.S.PRABHA,
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : MR.A.K.MANICKAM, Advocate

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

The petitioners who are arrayed as A1 to A3, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 498A, 294(b), 323 and 506(i) IPC r/w Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, in Crime No.10 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2. According to the de-facto complainant the accused joined together and demanded Rs.3,00,000/- from the daughter of the de-facto complainant and harassed her.

3. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the case has been registered based on the complaint of the third petitioner's father-in-law; that the third petitioner filed I.D.O.P.No.27 of 2014 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Pudukottai, for divorce and the daughter of the de-facto complainant entered her appearance in the original application and the dispute was compromised between them and the third petitioner paid a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- by way of Demand Drafts dated 21.01.2015, and also returned the entire articles and after recording the same the learned Principal District Judge, dissolved the marriage by a decree dated 29.01.2015. He further submits that after the settlement of the dispute, a false case has been registered against the petitioners.



4. Mr.A.Manickam, learned Counsel appearing for the intervenor submitted that the petitioners agreed to pay a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- to the de-facto complainant, but paid Rs.7,00,000/- only and some of the jewels are still with the accused and as per the order of this Court the accused have not appeared before the Mediation Centre to resolve the dispute.

5. Heard the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Counsel appearing for the intervenor and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned Counsel, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, with certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvaadaanai, 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 Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the first and second petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required and the third petitioner shall appear daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of two weeks. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

8. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

sd/-
03/08/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, THIRUVAADAANAI.
2 -DO- THRO' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, RAMANATHAPURAM.
3 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI
4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, THIRUVADANAI, RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

+1. CC to M/S.T.ANTONY ARUL RAJ Advocate SR.No.43897

akm/05.08.2015 /2p-6c/

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10962 of 2015
Date :03/08/2015