



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

Thursday, the Tenth day of December Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.23438 of 2015

WEB COPY

1 CHIRISTHURAJA

2 MARIA PRAKASI @ PAPPATHI

3 MARIA RATHINAM @ RATHINAM

... PETITIONER(S) / ACCUSED 1 TO 3

Vs

1. THE STATE REP.BY

THE STATE REP.BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE

ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,

DINDIGUL. (CRIME NO. 11 OF 2015)

...1ST RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

2 RAMYA DARATHI

...2ND RESPONDENT /

DEFACTO COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S M.R.SREENIVASAN Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.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 accused Nos. 1 to 3, in Crime No.11 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 294(b), 341, 498(A) and 506(i) IPC and Section 4 of Tamilnadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the defacto complainant and the first petitioner was solemnized on 22.05.2013 and out of their wedlock, a male child, who is aged 9 months old, born. The petitioners 2 and 3 are the in-laws of the defacto complainant and the petitioners used to pick up quarrel with the defacto complainant for no reason and at the instigation of the third petitioner, the first petitioner compelled and threatened the defacto complainant to leave the matrimonial home within a period of 3 months of marriage and demanded dowry. The first petitioner used to torture and attacked her and thereafter the petitioners had driven out her from matrimonial home.

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

3. The case of the petitioners is that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence and the defaco



complainant left the matrimonial home on her own volition and on advise of the elders, the first petitioner lived along with the defacto complainant at her parental home for six months and after that, the petitioners requested to come down to the native place and the defacto complainant refused and gave a false complainant. The defacto complainant did not allow the petitioners to see new born child.

4.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.II, Dindigul, and on their executing a separate 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 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 for interrogation. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. Scrupulously.

5.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/-
10/12/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, NO.II, DINDIGUL.
 - 2 DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, DINDIGUL.
 - 3 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
 - 4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL.
- +1. CC to M/S M.R.SREENIVASAN Advocate SR.No.70814.

TS/11.12.2015/2P-6C/NGM-SS/SAR - II

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.23438 of 2015
Date :10/12/2015