



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

Tuesday, the Twenty Seventh day of January Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice P.N.PRAKASH

CRL OP(MD) No.914 of 2015

S. BUHARI

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED rank not known

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE

THALLAKULAM POLICE STATION, MADURAI,

CRIME NO.42/2015

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.S.M.A.JINNAH Advocate

For Respondent : MR.C.RAMESH, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For intervener : MR.M.SRIDHARAN,ADVOCATE

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 364A, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.42 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned counsel for the Intervenor and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant in this case is one Natharsha. According to the defacto complainant, when he was going to the Mosque for his prayer in the early morning on 13.01.2015, he was waylaid by four persons, who bundled him into a car bearing Reg. No.TN 18 7420 and had taken him to an undisclosed destination by blindfolding him. There, they had taken away his mobile and cash of Rs.3,000/- and also made him to sign in several stamp papers and forms. Thereafter, they pushed him out of the car near Tirumangalam Toll Gate and fled from the spot. The defacto complainant suspected involvement of this petitioner in this offence, because there appears to be animosity between the two.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that this petitioner has been falsely implicated by the defacto complainant, because there are litigations pending against each other and that this petitioner has also given a complaint to against the defacto complainant to the Police.

5. On reading the FIR, it is seen that the defacto complainant has given a complaint to the Police of the vehicle in which he was abducted and the Police have also recovered the vehicle. Investigation is at the crucial stage and custodial interrogation of this petitioner is essential. Therefore,



this is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to this petitioner.
Hence, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
27/01/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

WEB COPY

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
THALLAKULAM POLICE STATION, MADURAI

2. THE ADDL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.S.M.A.JINNAH Advocate SR.No.3651

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.914 of 2015
Date :27/01/2015

RG.28/01/2015 2P.4C.