



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

Monday, the Twelfth day of October Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.19563 of 2015

THIYAGARAJAPERUMAL

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED RANK NOT KNOWN

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE(AWPS)
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
SANKARANKOVIL,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S A.RAJARAM Advocate

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

For Intervenor : S.SUKUMAR

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who is arrayed as accused, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 294(b), 498(a) and 506(i) of I.P.C., in Crime No.11 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.According to the de-facto complainant, she was harassed by demanding additional dowry and the accused insisted the de-facto complainant to hand over her credit card.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is working as a teacher in Maaveeran Poolithevan Government Higher Secondary School, Nelkattuseval, Tirunelveli District and it is further submitted that the de-facto complainant is working as a Veterinary Doctor and due to matrimonial dispute, a false complaint was given against the petitioner.

4.The learned counsel for the intervenor opposed the bail petition stating that when the earlier application was pending, the accused have



moved another application before the Sessions Court for the same relief and the same was granted in Cr.M.P.No.4755 of 2015 and later it was cancelled. It is further submitted that the father of the petitioner is a retired constable and therefore, the respondent police insisted to register the case against his in-laws. and therefore, the conduct of the petitioner would show that the petitioner is not entitled to get anticipatory bail.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that the respondent has completed the investigation and laid a charge sheet, which was not taken on file.

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

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sankarankovil 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 of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 06.00 p.m., until further orders The petitioner shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. Scrupulously.

8. The petitioner 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/-
12/10/2015

/ TRUE COPY /



TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE (AWPS)
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
SANKARANKOVIL,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

2 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
SANKARANKOVIL.

3 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S A.RAJARAM Advocate SR.No.60332

+1 cc to M/s.S.SUKUMAR, ADVOCATE, SR No.60472.

SH/AMF/SAR-II:14.10.15/2P-7C

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.19563 of 2015

Date :12/10/2015