



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

Wednesday, the Tenth day of June Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) Nos.6408 & 10312 of 2015

1 M.MANIKANDAN

2 M.MURUGAYEE

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED

RANK NOT KNOWN

IN CRL OP(MD) No.6408 of 2015

SHANMUGAVALLI

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED No. 3

IN CRL OP(MD) No.10312 of 2015

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE  
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, TALLAKULAM,  
MADURAI CITY,  
(CRIME NO. 24 OF 2015)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT  
IN BOTH PETITIONS

For Petitioner : M/S.V.THIRUMAL Advocate IN BOTH PETITIONS.

For Respondent : M/S.K.V.RAJARAJAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)  
IN BOTH PETITIONS.


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

**COMMON ORDER :** The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as A1 to A3, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 498(A) and 406 of I.P.C. in Crime No.24 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that A1 demanded the de-facto complainant to transfer the property from the name of his father-in-law to his name and also harassed her.

3. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the marriage was solemnized between the first accused and the de-facto complainant on 05.03.20103 and thereafter they were living happily and they have begotten two children. He further submitted that the first petitioner/A1 attacked the brother of the de-facto complainant due to which a case was registered against him in the year 2012 in Silaiman Police Station. He further submitted that the first accused had already filed a case in H.M.O.P.No.264 of 2015 before the Family Court, Madurai



against the de-facto complainant seeking divorce. He further submitted that the first accused had also filed CrI.O.P.(MD).No.6071 of 2015 praying for not to harass and the same was ordered.

4. The learned further submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this.

5. The learned Government Advocate (CrI.side) would submit that all the accused have joined together and harassed the de-facto complainant demanding transfer of property.

6. Considering the facts and circumstance of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, with certain conditions.

7. 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, Madurai 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 petitioners 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.

8. 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/-  
10/06/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, NO.II, MADURAI.
  - 2 DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, MADURAI.
  - 3 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR  
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI
  - 4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE  
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, TALLAKULAM, MADURAI CITY.
- +2. CC to M/S.V.THIRUMAL Advocate SR.No. 29459 & 29460
- TS/12.06.2015/2P-7C