



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

Monday, the Twenty Third day of February Two Thousand Fifteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice P.N.PRAKASH

CRL OP (MD) No.3024 of 2015

WEB COPY

BAGAVATHY

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED
(RANK NOT KNOWN)

Vs

THE STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
MADURAI SOUTH,
MADURAI.
CR.NO.7 OF 2015.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.R.VENKATESAN Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.A.P.BALASUBRAMANI,
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for an alleged offence punishable under Sections 120(b), 193, 196, 203 and 294(b) and 420 of IPC in Crime No.7 of 2015, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. This case has been registered pursuant to the direction issued by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.22900 of 2014 for the offences under Sections 120(b), 193, 196, 203 and 294(b) and 420 of IPC. The de facto complainant in this case is one Kumaran, who is the husband of Bagavathy, the petitioner herein.

3. It is seen that the de facto complainant/Kumaran, got married to one Bagavathy on 12.12.2013. After marriage, Bagavathy came to know that the defacto complainant was already married to one Nandhini, through whom, he has also one son and that the de facto complainant had suppressed the same and got married to Bagavathi. In this regard, Bagavathy has given several complaints against the defacto complainant and also filed HMOP against the de facto complainant before the Matrimonial Court. Bagavathy also admitted that she had received all the ornaments and had taken back all her jewellery and other items, that were given to her during marriage.

4. While so, it is alleged by the de facto complainant that, after having stated so, she has given a false complaint against the de facto complainant that he is having those ornaments and jewellery with him.



5. On a reading of the complaint, it is seen that that allegations are not indeed very serious. Under such circumstances, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Madurai on condition that the petitioner shall execute 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 respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.

[b] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[d] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]**.

sd/-

23/02/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, NO.I, MADURAI
- 2 -DO-THRO'THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE MADURAI
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, MADURAI SOUTH, MADURAI.
- 4 THE ADDL.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.R.VENKATESAN Advocate SR.No.8202

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.3024 of 2015

Date :23/02/2015