



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

Monday, the Tenth day of August Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

**THE HON`BLE MR JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM**

CRL OP(MD) No.8964 of 2014

1.JEGADEESHWARAN

2 .SENTHOORKANI

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NOS.1 & 2

J.NANCY

...INTERVENER

Vs

STATE, RESPRESENTED BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE

ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, THOOTHUKUDI & DT,

CRIME NO.8/2014

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.A.THIRUVADI KUMAR Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.S.PRABHA, Govt. Advocate ( Crl. Side)

For Intervener : MR.G.RADHAKRISHNAN,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 Nos.1 and 6, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 294(b), 341, 406, 506(i), 509 of I.P.C. and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Women Harassment Act r/w. Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act in Crime No.8 of 2014 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the accused have demanded more dowry and also withheld 39 sovereigns of gold jewels of the de-facto complainant and also harassed her demanding more dowry.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the first accused has pledged the jewels of the de-facto complainant in a Bank and he also filed a H.M.O.P.No.83 of 2013 before the Sub Court, Tuticorin for restitution of conjugal rights and there is no instruction from the first petitioner now and the learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission of this Court to withdraw this petition for the first accused.

4. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side).

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that both the accused have harassed the de-facto complainant and the entire jewels were received by both the accused and therefore, the second accused is also



6. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side).

7. Considering the allegations made against the second petitioner/A2, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the second petitioner with certain conditions and the first petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn. Accordingly, the second petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of her arrest or on her appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thoothukudi and on her 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 second petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required. The second petitioner shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. Scrupulously.

8. The second petitioner 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/-  
10/08/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I, THOOTHUKUDI.
2. DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRARE, THOOTHUKUDI DISTIRICT
3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, THOOTHUKUDI, THOOTHUKUDI DISTRICT.
- 4.THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR  
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI

+1. CC to M/S.A.THIRUVADI KUMAR Advocate SR.No.45058

ORDER  
IN  
CRL OP(MD) No.8964 of 2014  
Date :10/08/2015

RG.18.08.2015 KBM/SAR-I 2P.6C.