



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

Thursday, the Second day of July Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.7068 of 2015

1 JOSEPH RAJ,
2 AROON,
3 GANAPATHI,
4 RANI,
5 CHIRSTY

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NOS.1 TO 5

Vs

STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, MELUR, MADURAI DISTRICT,
(CRIME NO.19 OF 2015). ... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

J.JAYACHITHRA ... INTERVENOR

For Petitioner : M/S.R.ALAGUMANI Advocate
For Respondent : M/S.K.V.RAJARAJAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)
For Intervenor : M/S.C.AROCKIA SELVI, Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as A1 to A5, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 494, 498A, 506(ii) and 511 of I.P.C., in Crime No.19 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.According to the de-facto complainant, she was a widow with two children and the first accused had married her and also entered into an agreement dated 26.06.2014 and when the marriage was subsisting the first accused contracted second marriage. It is further alleged that all the accused harassed the de-facto complainant for demanding dowry of Rs.4 lakhs.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the marriage between the first petitioner and the de-facto complainant, was not informed to the other accused and as per the complaint, the



first accused left the matrimonial home on 21.10.2014, but the complaint was given only on 18.11.2014, which shows that the entire complaint is false. It is further submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

4.The learned counsel for the intervenor vehemently opposed the application stating that the de-facto complainant is a widow and she was having two children and the accused having known about the pathetic condition of the de-facto complainant, married her on 26.06.2014 and within a period of four months, her husband left the matrimonial home and married another lady, leaving the defacto complainant in lurch.

5.It is further submitted that the accused Nos.2 to 5 were aware of the earlier marriage and harassed the de-facto complainant demanding more dowry.

6.Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the State.

7.Considering the nature of the allegation made against the petitioners, this Court is of the view that the petitioners are not entitled for anticipatory bail. Hence, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

sd/-
02/07/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1.THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI
2.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, MELUR, MADURAI DISTRICT,

+1. CC to M/S.C.AROCKIA SELVI, Advocate SR.No.35550
RL/4 C- 8/7/2015

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.7068 of 2015
Date :02/07/2015