



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Friday, the Twenty First day of October Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice S.VAIDYANATHAN

CRL OP(MD) Nos.20242, 20259 and 20260 of 2016

1 M.ARAVIND @ ARAVIND RAJA

... PETITIONERS / ACCUSED(A2)
IN ALL THE PETITIONS

2 C.KUMAR @ ESSAKI KUMAR

... PETITIONERS / ACCUSED(A3)
IN ALL THE PETITIONS

Vs

THE STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PALAYAMKOTTAI POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT .
CRIME NO.378 OF 2014

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT
IN CRL OP(MD)NO.20242/16

THE STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PALAYAMKOTTAI POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT .
CRIME NO.992 OF 2016

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT
IN CRL OP(MD)NO.20259/16

THE STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PALAYAMKOTTAI POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT .
CRIME NO.1014 OF 2016

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT
IN CRL OP(MD)NO.20260/16

For Petitioner : M/S.I.MURUGESAN Advocate in all the petitions


For Respondent : MR.A.P.BALASUBRAMANI, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)
in all the petitions

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for



the alleged offences punishable under Section 379 IPC in respect of Crime Nos.378 of 2014, 992 of 2016 and 1014 of 2016, the petitioners have come forward with these petitions seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners are alleged to have indulged in theft of two wheelers on 13.05.2014, 08.09.2016 and 27.09.2016 respectively, which resulted in registration of these two cases against them.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the petitioners are habitual offenders and that they have several previous cases of similar in nature pending against them.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners did not involve in any such offences and false cases are being foisted against them in order to detain them under Goondas Act.

6. Taking note of the fact that the petitioners have very bad antecedents, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary in these cases and therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them.

7. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed.

sd/-
21/10/2016

/ TRUE COPY /



TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PALAYAMKOTTAI POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT .

2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI .

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) Nos.20242, 20259
and 20260 of 2016

Date :21/10/2016

SMA/GSV-PM/SAR-1/07.11.2016:2P/3C