

**Crl.OP Nos.6557 & 6558 of 2016****K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.**

The petitioner, who is arrayed as Accused, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for alleged offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 324, 384 & 506(i) IPC, in Crime No.148 of 2016 and 385, 427 & 506(i) IPC, in Crime No.2822 of 2016 respectively, on the file of the respondent police and hence seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had gone to the shop of the defacto complainant and demanded rowdy mamool at the knife point. When the defacto complainant refused to pay, the accused damaged a two wheeler and also an auto. Subsequently, when the police was searching the accused, again he went to the shop of the defacto complainant and threatened him to withdraw the earlier complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case.

**K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.**

sms

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail stating that already the petitioner has seven previous cases, out of which, one under Section 302 IPC. He further submitted that the petitioner is a history sheeter and there is no change of circumstances to consider this petition. Therefore, he is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

5. Considering the fact that the offence alleged against the petitioner is grave in nature; he has involved in seven previous cases, out of which, one under Section 302 IPC and the earlier three petitioners were dismissed in Crl.OP.Nos.2685 of 2016, 3993 of 2016 and 3989 of 2016 on 08.02.2016 & 01.03.2016 respectively. Hence, I do not find any change of circumstances to consider these petitions. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed.

sms

**30.03.2016**

**Crl.OP Nos.6557 & 6558 of 2016**