

CrI.O.P.No.2932 of 2016**K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.**

The petitioners, who are arrayed as A1 to A3 apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable originally registered under Section 174 of Cr.P.C., and altered to 306 IPC in Crime No.951 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner is the son in law of the defacto complainant. The petitioners 2 and 3 are parents of the first petitioner. The marriage between the first petitioner and the daughter of the deceased N.Pushpalakshmi was performed on 20.05.2015. From the day one of her marriage, all the accused have joined together and harassed the daughter of the defacto complainant by demanding dowry, despite the defacto complainant has provided all the household articles and a bike as dowry. The daughter of the defacto complainant was assaulted by the first accused at the instigation of the accused 2 and 3. On 29.11.2015, daughter of the defacto complainant's thali was snatched by the first accused and she was also physically assaulted by him, due to which, she committed suicide on 08.12.2015.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Further, it is submitted that on 07.12.2015 the deceased herself has given a complaint to the Inspector of Police, Samayanallur All Women Police Station stating that she was not interested to pursue the complaint and she was ready to reside with her husband and on the very next day, she committed suicide.

K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.

ari

4.Mr.R.Ramasamy, the learned counsel appearing for the intervenor would vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners contending that the complaint given by the deceased to the Inspector of Police, Samayanallur, Madurai would reveal that the harassment met out by the deceased. It is further submitted that one Madhu is the brother of the first accused and at the influence of the said Madhu, the deceased was forced to give a letter on 07.12.2015. Further, it is submitted that the deceased had successfully completed M.A.M.Ed., but a letter written by the deceased would show that she was forced to write the said letter.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that all the accused have harassed the deceased from the day one of the marriage, so she committed suicide and since specific overt acts have been made against the accused, they are not entitled to get the relief of anticipatory bail.

6.Considering the submissions on either side and also taking note of the allegations made against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

21.03.2016

ari

Crl.O.P.No.2932 of 2016