



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

Wednesday, the Sixteenth day of September Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.15091 of 2015

1 VINCENT JAYAKUMAR
2 ANTONI AMMAL
3 RITA
4 KRISHNAN
5 KULANTHAI
6 DHIVYANATHAN
7 AMALAPUSHPAM
8 LEEMA
9 JOHN ALIAS JOHN KENNEDY
10 MANMATHAN
11 SOOSAI MANICKAM
12 NAYAGAM

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED NO.1 & 3 TO 13

Vs

STATE REP. BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, THIRUVADANAI,
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.
(IN CR. NO.15 OF 2015)

... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.R.MURUGAN Advocate

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

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as A1 and A3 to A13, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 498(A) and 494 of I.P.C. in Crime No.15 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The prosecution case is that the first accused had married the de-facto complainant and when the first marriage was subsisting, he contracted the second marriage and also harassed her demanding more dowry.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that due to difference of opinion between the first accused and the de-facto complainant, they are living apart for more than three years and she has filed maintenance case in MC.No.2 of 2012 against the first accused before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai and the first accused has filed I.D.O.P.No.2 of 2012 against the de-facto complainant before the District Court, Ramanathapuram, seeking divorce. When both the <https://www.secrecservices.gov.in/secretary>, the de-facto complainant preferred a police complaint in the year 2015 implicating all the family members of the first accused.



4. The learned counsel further submitted that the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre attached to this Bench to explore the possibility of settlement between the parties and the first accused was regularly appearing before the Mediation, but, the de-facto complainant did not turn up, hence, the Mediation is failed.

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the State.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, 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 arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai and 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m., until further orders and the petitioners No.A3 to A13 shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. 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/-

16/09/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, TIRUVADANAI.

2 DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, THIRUVADANAI,
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S.R.MURUGAN Advocate SR.No.55094

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.15091 of 2015

Date :16/09/2015

NS/JGB-DP/SAR I/22.09.2015 : 2P/6C