

CrI.OP No.5188 of 2016**K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.**

The petitioners who are arrayed as accused apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for alleged offences punishable under Sections 294(b) and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.8 of 2016, on the file of the respondent police and hence seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that after performing betrothal with the defacto complainant, the accused alleged to have cancelled the marriage demanding more dowry from the parents of the defacto complainant.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the family of the defacto complainant has suppressed the biological father of the bridegroom and therefore the marriage was cancelled and it was informed to the family members of the defacto complainant in advance. It is further contended that the ingredients for the offences are totally absent in this case.

K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.

rgr

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor and the learned Government Advocate (crl.side) vehemently opposed the bail petition contending that the accused, after performing the betrothal with the defacto complainant, had cancelled the marriage demanding more dowry.

5. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

21.03.2016

rgr

Crl.OP No.5188 of 2016