



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

Tuesday, the Twenty Ninth day of September Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

THE HON`BLE MR JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.16500 & 16721 of 2015

INDUMATHI

... PETITIONER/RANK NOT KNOWN
IN CRL.OP (MD) NO.16500/2015

1 RAVIKUMAR
2 DINESH SANKAR
3 NAGARAJAN

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED 1, 3 & 5
IN CRL.OP (MD) NO.16721/2015

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL DIST,
CRIME NO.NOT KNOWN OF 2015

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT
IN CRL.OP (MD) NO.16500/2015

STATE REP BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
IN CRIME NO. 26 OF 2015

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT
IN CRL.OP (MD) NO.16721/2015

For Petitioner : M/S P.SENTHURPANDIAN Advocate IN BOTH THE PETITIONS

For Respondent : M/S.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, A3 to A5, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 294(b), 120-B and 498(A) of I.P.C. * and Section 4 of **TNPWH Act**. in Crime No.26 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.According to the de-facto complainant, she married the first accused on 20.02.2013 and they were leading their married life happily whileso, the second accused, who is the elder brother of the first accused, came from abroad and sexually harassed the de-facto complainant, when it was informed to the other accused, they requested the de-facto complainant to adjust with the second accused, otherwise she has to leave her matrimonial home.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the



occurrence said to have taken place in they year 2013, but no complaint was given till 25.08.2015. The complaint has been given belatedly with an ulterior motive and it is further submitted that the matter was referred to Mediation and the de-facto complainant has also appeared, but, the matter could not be settled between the parties.

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

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

6. 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 No.II, Dindigul 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/A1 shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m., until further orders and the petitioners No.3 to 5 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.

7. 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/-
29/09/2015

***corrected order issued**
/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

***To be substituted corrected order already dispatched**

1. THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.II DINDIGUL
2. DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, DINDUGAL DISTRICT
3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
+2CC to Mr.P.Senthur Pandian Advocate Sr.No.57159, 57158

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.16500 & 16721 of 2015
Date :29/09/2015