



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

Monday, the Twenty Eighth day of September Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Ms.Justice R.MALA

CRL OP(MD) No.18562 of 2015

1 M.THULASI
2 ANGAYARKANNI

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED
(RANK NOT KNOWN)

Vs

STATE REP. BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TALUK POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL.
(CR. NO. NOT KNOWN OF 2015.)

... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S V.KARUNA 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/Accused apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 379 and 506(i) IPC r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998, in Crime No.872 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The learned Counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners were charged under Sections 379 and 506(i) IPC r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998, in Crime No.872 of 2015. He further submitted that the petitioners are arrayed as A2 and A3 and they are nothing to do with the commission of offence and A1 already got anticipatory bail and hence, he prays for enlargement on anticipatory bail.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the occurrence took place on 07.09.2015 and the case was registered on 15.09.2015, however, she prays for dismissal of this application.

4.Considering the rival submissions and on perusal of the typed set of papers the alleged occurrence took place on 07.09.2015, the complaint was given on 15.09.2015 and the case in Crime No.872 of 2015 under Sections 379 and 506(i) IPC r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998 is against three persons. The argument of the petitioners counsel is that A1 was already enlarged on anticipatory bail is not correct because he was granted anticipatory bail in yet another Crime number and not in this Crime number. The first petitioner is the wife of A1 and the second petitioner is a mistress of A1. Even the occurrence took place on 07.09.2015, the complaint was given only on



15.09.2015. Considering the delay in giving the complaint and also it is not a case of the prosecution that the petitioners are interfering with the investigation or absconding so, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

5. 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.I, Dindigul, and 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 petitioners shall report before the Court concerned daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. 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/-
28/09/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I, DINDIGUL.
- 2 DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
TALUK POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S V.KARUNA Advocate SR.No.57221

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.18562 of 2015
Date :28/09/2015

NS/SKS-RR/SAR I/05.10.2015 : 2P/6C