



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

Wednesday, the Eleventh day of March Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

WEB COPY

The Hon`ble Mr Justice P.N.PRAKASH

CRL OP (MD) No.21114 of 2014

1 RAMESH
2 SELVARATHINAM
3 RAJAKUMARAI

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO. 1 TO 3

Vs

STATE REP BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, KARAIKUDI,
SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT.

CR.NO. NOT KNOWN OF 2014. ... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.G.MARIMUTHU Advocate

For Respondent : MR.A.P.BALASUBRAMANI Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Crime No.not known of 2014, on the file of the respondent police for offences under Sections 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, the petitioners are now before this Court seeking Anticipatory Bail.

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the respondent.

3.Initially, this matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre and a failure report has been received on 06.02.2015.

4. This case has been filed showing the crime number as 'not known' and therefore, this Court granted anticipatory bail to the petitioners on 11.02.2015 for a period of two weeks by directing the first petitioner to appear before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m. Today, the respondent police have filed a status report, in which, in paragraph Nos. 6 and 7, they have stated as follows:

"6.I humbly submit that the investigation reveals that the said Paranilakshmi is a mental disordered person and she is not cooperated with the 1st petitioner herein further the 1st petitioner herein not interest to lead the



matrimonial life with the said Paranilakshmi due to her mental disorder and problem in her eyes. Further, the enquiry reveals that the 1st petitioner herein also a handicapped person and the gold ornaments which was given by the de-facto complainant to his daughter at the time of marriage is kept by Paranilakshmi only. And the allegation stated by the de-facto complainant that the petitioners herein not tortured the Paranilakshmi for want of more dowry and the 1st petitioner herein not ready to continue his matrimonial life with his wife and seek remedy through family Court.

7.I humbly submit that based on the above facts, the respondent police closed the petition enquiry and there is no petition enquiry and First Information Report pending against the petitioners herein."

4. In view of the above, this petition is closed. This Court records its appreciation to Ms.S.Vasantha, Sub Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Karaikudi, for the fair manner in which, she has conducted the investigation and file the status report in this case.

sd/-
11/03/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, KARAIKUDI,
SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S.G.MARIMUTHU Advocate SR.No.11768

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21114 of 2014
Date :11/03/2015

AA/12.03.2015/2p- 4c/