



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

Tuesday, the Thirtieth day of June Two Thousand Fifteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.6031 of 2015

WEB COPY

1 R.DURAIRAJ
2 R.SELVAM
3 SAVITHIRI
4 KOKILA

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED (RANK NOT KNOWN)

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
KULITHALAI, KARUR DISTRICT,
CRIME NO.7/2015

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

RUKMANY @ GAYATHIRI

... INTERVENOR

For Petitioner : M/S.M.M.IQBAL Advocate
For Respondent : MR.K.V.RAJARAJAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)
For Intervenor : MR.R.SIVALINGAM, 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, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 498(A) of I.P.C. in Crime No.7 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.According to the de-facto complainant, the accused have demanded Rs.3,00,000/- to secure employment of the first petitioner in Transport Corporation. It is further alleged that the accused harassed her for demanding more jewels also.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the first accused, who is the husband of the de-facto complainant joined in service of Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation on 05.12.2008 and their marriage was solemnized on 22.08.2010. However, in the compliant, the de-facto complainant alleged that the accused demanded Rs.3,00,000/- to secure the employment of her husband in Transport Corporation, which is obviously false averment. The learned counsel further submitted that the de-facto complainant is also implicated all the family members of her husband. He further submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

4.The learned counsel for the intervenor has vehemently opposed this petition stating that all the accused have joined together and harassed the de-facto complainant for demanding more dowry.



5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that the second petitioner is not an accused in this case. Therefore, this petition is dismissed in respect of the second petitioner.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 with certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kulithalai 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. for period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation and the petitioners No.3 and 4 shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrgoation. The petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

8.The petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 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/-
30/06/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.II,
KULITHALAI.

2 DO-THRO'THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
KARUR.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, KULITHALAI, KARUR DIST.

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

+1. CC to M/S.M.M.IQBAL Advocate SR.No.34861

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.6031 of 2015

Date :30/06/2015