



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

Thursday, the Nineteenth day of November Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP (MD) No.21270 of 2015

WEB COPY

1 RANI
2 AJAY GHOSE
3 JANAKI
4 DEVI
5 KALYANASUNDARAM
6 MURUGESAN@V.K.M.MURUGAN
7 DHAMAYANDI
8 VANAJA
9 SUSAIMARY

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED 1 OT 9

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
THADICOMBU POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO. 322 OF 2015)

... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.D.SELVARAJ 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 9, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 143, 188 of IPC, in Crime No.322 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners participated in a Dharna before the Dindigul District Collector Office on 20.07.2015 to remove the TASMACH shop situated at Sitharevu Village and therefore, a case has been registered for the above said offences.

3.The case of the petitioners is that they are innocent persons and they have not involved in the incident as stated by the prosecution. All the petitioners are in service and if they are arrested they will lose their job.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that without the petitioners conducted Dharna in front of the District Collector Office and threatened the general public and disturbed the District Administration by conducting Dharna.



5. At the time of arguments when the learned counsel for the petitioner was directed to furnish the details where the petitioners are working, the learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that they are not in service but they are only villagers and they are agricultural coolies.

6. From this it is seen that petitioners have come up with false case for obtaining anticipatory bail.

7. Considering this fact, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
19/11/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
THADICOMBU POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S D.SELVARAJ Advocate SR.No.66293

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21270 of 2015
Date :19/11/2015

NS/SKS-RR/SAR I/24.11.2015 : 2P/4C