



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

Friday, the Thirty First day of July Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.13106 of 2015

MUTHUKUMAR

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED No.1

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ARANTHANGI POLICE STATION,
PUDUKOTTAI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.3 OF 2014)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.T.LENIN KUMAR Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.K.V.RAJARAJAN Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who is arrayed as A1 in Crime No.3 of 2014 on the file of the respondent police, was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 29.06.2015 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 174 of Cr.P.C., @ Section 304-B of I.P.C., and hence, seeks bail.

2.According to the de-facto complainant, his sister was married to the first accused about three years ago, they lived happily six months and thereafter, her husband and her in-laws demanded dowry, despite providing 7 ¼ jewels and Rs.2,00,000/- as cash at the time of marriage and on 02.01.2014, the de-facto complainant was informed by one Palanikumar that his sister was vomiting and she was taken to the hospital and thereafter, she died on the same day and he had suspicion over the death.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that on the date of occurrence, he had been at Sabarimalai and after the deceased was admitted in the hospital and the same was informed to the petitioner and he strait-away went to the hospital, in the meanwhile, she died. The learned counsel further submitted that the medical report would show that she was 6 months pregnancy at the time of death and her child died two days prior to her death. The learned counsel further submitted that in the hospital premises itself, there was a wordy altercation between the first accused and the de-facto complainant and at the intervention of the police, they were separated.

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

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side)would submit that the deceased did not consume poison and as per the medical report, the



deceased was six months pregnant at the time of occurrence and the accused have harassed the deceased for demanding more dowry.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail on the following conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on 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 Judicial Magistrate, Aranthangi and on further condition that the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m., until further orders.

sd/-
31/07/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, ARANTHANGI.
- 2 DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, PUDUKOTTAI.
- 3 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI
- 4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ARANTHANGI POLICE STATION, PUDUKOTTAI DISTRICT.
- 5 THE OFFICER INCHARGE, SUB JAIL, ARANTHANGI.

+1. CC to M/S.T.LENIN KUMAR Advocate SR.No. 42625.

TS/31.07.2015/2P - 7C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.13106 of 2015
Date :31/07/2015