



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

Wednesday, the Twenty Fifth day of November Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.22015 of 2015

1 THANGA MANOHARAN
2 SATHISH
3 AADHI RAJESH
4 BALA
5 PARI @ KARTHICK
6 MANICKAM
7 ELANGO

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED 1 TO 6 & A9

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PATTUKOTTAI POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT,
CR NO.536/2015

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.VEERA KATHIRAVAN, Advocate

For Respondent : MR.K.ANBARASAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : MR.S.J.CHAKKRAVARTHY, Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as accused 1 to 6 and 9 in Crime No.536 of 2015, on the file of the respondent police, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b) and 307 I.P.C. read with Section 3 of TNPPDL Act and hence seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 31.07.2015 at 11.15 p.m., the accused persons waylaid the *de facto* complainant and the second accused attacked him with an aruval on his head, however, it fell on the hands severing the little finger of the *de facto* complainant. The third accused attacked him with iron rod and the seventh accused attacked the *de facto* complainant with wooden log on his head. The fourth accused damaged the two wheeler of the *de facto* complainant causing loss to the tune of Rs.3,000/-.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

<https://hcservices.court.gov.in/hcservices/> The Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submitted that the investigation is pending and the petitioners are absconding. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) further submitted that the accused



persons tried to attack the *de facto* complainant and they severed the little finger of the *de facto* complainant and custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary.

5.This Court, by order, dated 28.10.2015, dismissed the earlier petition filed by the petitioners for anticipatory bail. This Court considered the issue in detail and dismissed the petition. On the very next day, the accused 1 and 5 filed Crl.O.P(MD)No.21044 of 2015 for anticipatory bail and the same was dismissed by this Court on 03.11.2015 on the grounds that the petition was filed on the very next day and there was no change in circumstances. Again, the petitioners have come up with the present petition for anticipatory bail.

6.The submissions of the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) that the petitioners are involved in number of cases of serious nature and they are habitual offenders and custodial interrogation is necessary, are acceptable. Considering these facts and also considering that there is no change in circumstances and the petitioners were involved in many number of cases, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and accordingly the petition is dismissed.

sd/-
25/11/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PATTUKOTTAI POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT,
2. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.T.Muruganandham Advocate SR.No.67313

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.22015 of 2015
Date :25/11/2015

SH/NGM-SS/SAR-I:27.11.2015:2P/4C