



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

Thursday, the First day of October Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.17725 of 2015

1 VEEERAAIAH
2 ASHOK KUMAR

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED
(RANK NOT KNOWN)

Vs

THE STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
FORT POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DISTRICT.
CR.NO.859 OF 2015.,

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S K.P.NARAYANAKUMAR Advocate

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

For Intervenor : Mr.G. Madhavan, Advocate.

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners who are arrayed as A2 and A3 apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Section 366 of I.P.C in Crime No. 859 of 2015 and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.According to the de-facto complainant, his daughter Sangeetha was studying B.Sc at Srimathi Indira Gandhi College in Trichy and on 26.8.2015, the accused have kidnapped her for the purpose of marriage.

3.The learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted that the first Petitioner is the father of the second Petitioner and his another son namely, Nirmal Kumar had fallen in love with the daughter of the defacto complainant and they eloped in the month of June 2015 and she was produced before this Court in H.C.P.No.910 of 2015 and thereafter, the matter was compromised.

4.The learned counsel further submitted that again the daughter of the de-facto complainant has eloped with the son of the first Petitioner for which the Petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that it is a case of love affair and the accused have been unnecessarily harassed by the respondent Police.

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

5.The learned counsel for the Intervenor vehemently opposed granting of anticipatory bail to the Petitioners contending that the victim is a



minor and earlier she was kidnapped by the accused in the month of June 2015 and thereafter compromise reached between the parties and the accused have agreed to pursue the studies of the daughter of the de-facto complainant and now violating the earlier compromise, he has kidnapped the victim and therefore they are not entitled for any indulgence by this Court.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that this is a case of love affair and the daughter of the de-facto complainant eloped with the first accused and she has not been secured so far.

7. Considering the allegations made against these Petitioners, I am inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Trichy, and 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 to the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 A.M. Until further orders. 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/-
01/10/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.1
TRICHY,

2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
TRICHY

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
FORT POLICE STATION, TRICHY DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S K.P.NARAYANAKUMAR Advocate SR.No.58167

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.17725 of 2015
Date :01/10/2015

AM/05.10.2015/KBM/SAR-I/2P/6C

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