



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

Wednesday, the Fifteenth day of July Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.7159 of 2015

1 PERUMALAMMAL

2 GANDHI

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NOS.1 AND 2

Vs

THE STATE REP BY

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE

APPAIYANAYAGANPATTI POLICE STATION,

VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.

(CRIME NO. 60/2015)

... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.S.BALAJI Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.K.V.RAJARAJAN, Govt. 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 as accused Nos.1 and 2, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Section 506(i) of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 23 and 24 of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 in Crime No.60 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2. According to the defacto complainant, he has given his property bearing Door No.3/206 to his elder son-Perumalraj and when he was in Chennai, it was occupied by his daughter-A.1 and now his elder son-Perumalraj wanted to occupy the property, but the accused refused to vacate the same and also threatened him with dire consequences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they are falsely implicated in this case and the complaint has been given at the instigation of their brother-Perumalraj and that the defacto complainant has settled his property to the first petitioner to an extent of 6540 square feet in Survey No.163/2 of Kundalakuthur Village as vacant site by a registered settlement deed dated 15.11.2010 and thereafter, the



first petitioner had constructed two story building, while so, the defacto complainant had cancelled the settlement deed on 27.11.2014 and also demanded the property.

4. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent.

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

6. 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.I, Sattur, Virudhunagar District 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 conditions stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

7. 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/-

15/07/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1.THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I, SATTUR, VIRUHUNAGAR DISTRICT
- 2.DO THRUUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT AT SRIVILLIPUTHUR
- 3.THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
- 4.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
APPAIYANAYAGANPATTI POLICE STATION, VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.

+1. CC to M/S.S.BALAJI Advocate SR.No.39133
RL/6 C- 20/7/2015

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.7159 of 2015

Date :15/07/2015