



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

Friday, the Twenty Third day of January Two Thousand Fifteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.SATHYANARAYANAN

CRL OP(MD) No.1119 of 2015

WEB COPY

PRABU @ KRISHNAN

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.6

Vs

THE STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
VADAMADURAI,
DINDIGUL DT, CRIME NO.21/2014

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.C.M.ARUMUGAM Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.A.P.BALASUBRAMANI,
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)


PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under sections 498(A) read with 109, 506(i) I.P.C. and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and Section 4 of Women Harassment Act in Crime No.21 of 2014 on the file of the respondent police and hence seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there are totally six accused in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A.6 and the marriage between the defacto complainant and the first accused was solemnised on 03.06.2011 at Veadasanthur and at the time of marriage, the jewels, articles and cash were given.

3. It is the case of the defacto complainant that her husband/A.1 is a military person and though he has promised to take her with him, he did not do so, on the other hand, started harassing her by making unreasonable dowry demand and when it was questioned, he abused her with filthy words and also threatened with dire consequences. It is further alleged by the defacto complainant that she later on came to know that the first accused has married the second accused and also begotten a child and on 26.07.2014, her mother-in-law and the petitioner/A.6 came to her house and informed the fact of the first accused's marriage with the second accused and once again they came on 31.07.2014 and persuaded her to live with A.1 and A.2 and when it was refused by the defacto complainant, A.6 threatened her with dire consequences.



4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that except the fact that this petitioner happens to be the friend of A.1, he is nothing to do with the alleged commission of offence.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that based on the complaint received from the defacto complainant, the investigation is being conducted.

WEB COPY

6. This Court, taking into consideration the above facts and circumstances and the nature of allegations, is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Veadasanthur and on executing a personal 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 11.00a.m. for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation. The petitioner shall comply with the conditions stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

7. The petitioner 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/-

23/01/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, VEADASANTHUR

2 -DO-THRO' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE DINDIGUL DISTRICT

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, VADAMADURAI,
DINDIGUL DT, CRIME NO.21/2014

4 THE ADDL.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.C.M.ARUMUGAM Advocate SR.No.3362

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.1119 of 2015

Date : 23/01/2015

NA/27/01/2015/P2/6C

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