

Crl.O.P.No.6165 of 2016**K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.**

The petitioner, who is arrayed as A-1, was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 01.03.2016 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 498[A], 294[b] of IPC r/w Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act in Crime No.9 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner / A-1 was married to the de facto complainant on 30.10.2014 and at the time of marriage, 70 sovereigns of gold jewels, Rs.10 lakhs as cash and spent about Rs.25 lakhs towards marriage expenses. However, they lived happily only four months and thereafter, she was harassed by demanding additional dowry and she was driven out by the matrimonial home. It is further stated that the accused have demanded more dowry for re-union and therefore, the present complaint has been preferred.

3.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the de facto complainant was not happy with the marriage with A-1 and she left matrimonial home, within a period of three months from the date of marriage and subsequently, after lapse of one year, she preferred this present complaint. It is further submitted that the main allegation against the accused is that A-2 to A-4 were not permitting A-1 to live happy with the de facto complainant. It is also submitted that co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.4952 of 2016 dated 07.03.2016.

K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.

sri

4.Ms.S.Sengkodi, learned counsel appearing for the intervenor vehemently opposed to grant bail stating that the de facto complainant was provided with jewels and cash at the time of marriage. But the accused were not satisfied with the dowry and harassed the de facto complainant by demanding additional dowry and she was driven out by the matrimonial home within a period of four months from the date of marriage. It is further submitted that the de facto complainant is interested for re-union with the petitioner and the matter can be referred to mediation for amicable settlement.

5.Heard the learned Government Advocate [Criminal Side] appearing for the respondent.

6.Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

7.Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- [Rupees Ten Thousand only] with two sureties each for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram and on further condition that the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.00a.m. for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation and there is a possibility of amicable settlement, this Court refers the matter to the Tamil Nadu Mediation and Conciliation Centre, High Court of Madras, Chennai - 600 104. Accordingly, petitioner and the de facto complainant, are directed to appear before the said Mediation Centre on 30.03.2016.

sri

22.03.2016
Crl.O.P.No.6165 of 2016
2/2