



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

Tuesday, the Fifteenth day of December Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.21641 of 2015

1 G. BOOPATHY
2 J.GEORGE LIVINGSTON
3 G.CHANDRA

..PETITIONERS/ACCUSED 1 to 3

Vs.

STATE REP.BY

1 THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
DINDIGUL RURAL, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
DINDIGUL TALUK POLICE STATON,
DINDIGUL,DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
CR.NO. 1100 OF 2015

..RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S J.LAWRANCE Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.K.ANBARASAN, Government 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 147, 294(b), 323, 498(A), 506(i) of IPC r/w 4 of TNPHW Act, in Crime No.1100 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the first accused tortured the de-facto complainant at the instigation of the other accused and neglected the defacto complainant and thrown out her from the matrimonial home.

3.The case of the petitioners is that they are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the first petitioner is employed as Assistant Manager in Puducherry and after the marriage both first petitioner and the de-facto complainant were living together in the matrimonial home at Puducherry. In the wedlock, they were blessed with one female child. Only in the month of October 2015, due to some dispute, the defacto complainant without informing the petitioner, left the matrimonial home on her own volition. The first petitioner approached the defacto complainant, she refused to live with the first petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that all the accused demanded more money and tortured the de-facto complainant.

5.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 No.I, Dindigul 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 the petitioners 2 and 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.

6. 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/-

15/12/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I, DINDIGUL.
- 2 -do-thro' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, DINDIGUL.
- 3 THE ADDL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
- 4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, DINDIGUL TALUK POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 5 THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, DINDIGUL RURAL,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

+1. CC to M/S J.LAWRANCE Advocate SR.No.71740

ORDER IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21641 of 2015
Date :15/12/2015

PBK/NGM-SS/SAR-II 17/12/2015 ::2P-7C::