



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

Thursday, the Fifth day of November Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.21285 of 2015

1 SUNDARESAN
2 JEYALAKSHMI
3 BHARATHI

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED No. 1 to 3

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
B1 MELUR POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT.
CR.NO. 867/2015

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S R.RAJARAMAN 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 offences punishable under sections 420, 342, 294(b), 506(i) and 379(NB) of IPC, in Crime No.867 of 2015, on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Palanivelrajan, husband of the third petitioner and son-in-law of the petitioners 1 and 2, gave a complaint before the respondent police stating that the petitioners 1 and 2 received a sum of Rs.20,00,000/- to purchase a property in his name. But, they have purchased a property in their name and on 21.06.2014, the first petitioner and another person obtained several signatures in the blank paper.

3. The case of the petitioners is that the marriage was solemnized between the de-facto complainant and the third petitioner on 25.03.2010 and due to some misunderstanding, the de-facto complainant has filed H.M.O.P.No.128 of 2015 on the file of Sub-Court, Melur Camp [I Additional Sub-Court], Madurai, for divorce. After contest, on 21.08.2015, the learned I Additional Sub-Judge, Melur Camp, Madurai, granted divorce, dissolving the marriage between the de-facto complainant and the third petitioner.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices>
The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution.



5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent and he has submitted that as per the Court direction, the complaint has been registered.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and there is no allegation about the amount received by the petitioners in H.M.O.P. filed by the de-facto complainant, in HMOP filed by defacto complainant, 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 Judicial Magistrate, Melur, 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 report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. The petitioners shall comply with the conditions 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/-
05/11/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
MELUR

2 DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
MADURAI DISTRICT

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
B1 MELUR POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S R.RAJARAMAN Advocate SR.No.65115.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21285 of 2015
Date :05/11/2015

AM/06.11.2015/AAL.MPA/SAR-II/2P/6C

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>