



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

Tuesday, the Eighteenth day of August Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.15952 of 2015

1 KAMATCHI
2 MUTHU
3 VIJAYAMALAR
4 CHELLADURAI
5 MANICKAM
6 CHELLAPAPPA
7 SOMASUNDARAM
8 NEIKANTHAN
9 RAJENDRAN

... PETITIONERS / ACCUSED Nos.2 to 5,7 to 11

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
JEEYAPURAM ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DIST.
CR. NO. 11 OF 2015

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.M.PITCHAI MUTHU Advocate

For Respondent : MRS.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 A2 to A5 and A7 to A11, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for an alleged offence punishable under Sections 120(b), 147, 294(b), 494, 498(A), 506(i) r/w. 109 of IPC in Crime No.11 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. According to the de facto complainant, she married the first accused in the year 2009 and the accused have demanded additional dowry and for non-fulfilment, he was treated her cruelly and harassed by her in laws.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the first accused had filed HMOP.NO.121 of 2010, before the Sub Court, Trichy, for divorce. While so the de facto complainant filed HMOP.No.3895 of 2010, before the Family Court, Chennai, for restitution of conjugal rights and the petition filed by the husband was dismissed for non-prosecution on 24.02.2012. He further submitted that the de facto complainant has filed Maintenance Case in M.C.No.485 of 2010 and the petition was dismissed holding that she is earning sufficiently as an employee in Postal Services. The learned Counsel further contended that the petitioners are in laws of the de facto complainant and they have been falsely implicated in this case.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the investigation of this case is pending.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thuraiyur, Trichy District and on each of them executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two common sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that petitioners 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.

6. 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/-
18/08/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, THURAIYUR, TRICHY DISTRICT.
2. THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, TRICHY DISTRICT.
3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, JEEYAPURAM ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, TRICHY DIST.
4. THE ADDITIONAL POLICE PROSECUTOR, MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.M.PITCHAI MUTHU Advocate SR.No.47735.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.15952 of 2015
Date :18/08/2015

2P/6C
AM/MPA-DP/SAR- (J) /20.08.2015.