



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

Thursday, the Twenty Sixth day of November Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Ms.Justice V.M.VELUMANI

CRL OP(MD) No.21127 of 2015

1. VINOTH KUMAR
2. CHRISTHANI MARY
3. VANITHA

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED
RANK NOT KNOWN

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY
THE INSEPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
LALGUDI, TRICHY.
CRIME NO NOT KNOWN OF 2015

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S M.PALANI RAJA Advocate

For Respondent : MR.K.ANBARASAN, 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 accused Nos.1 to 3, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 406 of IPC and Section 4 & 6 of Dowry Prohibition Act, in Crime No.5 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the defacto complainant and the first petitioner was solemnized on 12.11.2014. After the marriage, the petitioners demanded dowry and harassed the defacto complainant and hence, the case has been registered for the above said offences.

3.The case of the petitioners is that they are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Earlier on 16.05.2015, the defacto complainant gave a complaint before the Perambalur All Women Police Station against these petitioners for the very same offence. At that time, all the Sreedhana articles have been returned to the defacto complainant by the petitioners. In the circumstances, the first petitioner issued a legal notice to the defacto complainant for divorce and hence, the defacto complainant has given a false complaint against the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that the first petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant and other petitioners are in-laws and all the petitioners have demanded more dowry and tortured the defacto complainant.

<https://hcservices.ecourt.gov.in/hcservices/> The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the third petitioner name is Vanitha and in the FIR her name has been wrongly mentioned as Vanitha Mery.



6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Lalgudi 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 shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m., until further orders and petitioners 2 & 3 shall appear before the respondent police as and when required. 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/-
26/11/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
LALGUDI
 2. -DO- THRO' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
TRICHY DISTRICT
 3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
LALGUDI, TRICHY DISTRICT
 4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
- +1. CC to M/S M.PALANI RAJA Advocate SR.No.678117

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21127 of 2015
Date :26/11/2015

SH/SKS-JGB:30.11.2015:2P/6C