



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

Wednesday, the Fifteenth day of July Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) Nos.20996 and 20997 of 2014

1 RAJKUMAR
S/O. RAJENDRAN
2 MURUGAN
3 THIRUMURUGAN
S/O.PALANISAMY

... PETITIONER(S) / ACCUSED 2 - 4 in OP.20996 OF 2014

1 RAJKUMAR
S/O. RAJENDRAN
2 VELLAISAMY
3 MUTHUKUMAR
4 THIRUMURUGAN
S/O.PALANISAMY

... PETITIONER(S) / ACCUSED 1 TO 3 & 5 in OP.20997 OF 2014

Vs

STATE REP BY:: THE SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE
NATHAM POLICE STATION, NATHAM, DINDIGUL DT
CRIME NO. 394 OF 2014 - OP 20996/14
CRIME NO. 184 OF 2014 - OP 20997/14

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT


For Petitioner : M/S.P.VAIRAVA SUNDARAM Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.K.V.RAJARAJAN, Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners in Crl.O.P(MD)No.20996 of 2014, who are arrayed as A2 to A4 and the petitioners in Crl.O.P(MD)No.20997 of 2014, who are arrayed as A1 to A3 and A5 apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under sections 448, 294(b), 355, 324, 506(ii) of IPC



r/w section 4 of Tamil Nadu Women Harassment Act in Crime No.394 of 2014 and under sections 147, 148, 447, 448, 341, 323, 379(NP) and 506(ii) of IPC, in Crime No.184 of 2014 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail respectively.

WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution in Crl.O.P(MD)No.20996 of 2014 is that the accused threatened the de-facto complainant to withdraw the earlier complaint registered against them in Crime No.184 of 2014.


3.The case of the prosecution in Crl.O.P(MD)No.20997 of 2014 is that on 01.02.2014, the accused trespassed into the land of the de-facto complainant and threatened his son Jayamuthu and also threatened the de-facto complainant with dire consequences.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that after completion of the investigation, the respondent has laid a charge sheet under sections 294(b), 447 and 506(i) of IPC.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the respondent has completed the investigation and laid a charge sheet in this case.

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

7.Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Natham 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 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.

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/-
15/07/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

1 THE DIST MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
NATHASM

2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE DINDIGUL

3 THE ADDL.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

4 THE SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE
NATHAM POLICE STATION, NATHAM, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

DM 22 7 15 - 3P 5C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) Nos.20996 and 20997 of 2014
Date :15/07/2015