

Crl.O.P.No.8705 of 2016**K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.**

The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC, in Crime No.170 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to wordy quarrel, with regard to the land dispute, the petitioners are alleged to have attacked the defacto complainant with wooden log and caused injuries.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case and they have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital.

5.Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.

vs

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Uthukottai and on each of them executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the second petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders for interrogation and the first and third petitioners being ladies shall appear before the respondent police as and when required. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

7. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

20.04.2016

vs

CrI.O.P.No.8705 of 2016