



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

Friday, the Third day of June Two Thousand and Sixteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Ms.Justice V.M.VELUMANI

CRL OP(MD) No.8129 of 2016

1 L. RAJAN SILVA
2 L. ROSEBUD SILVA

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED
RANK NOT KNOWN

Vs

THE STATE
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TUTICORIN POLICE STATION,
SOUTH POLICE STATION,NH7A, SUBBIAH PURAM,
THOOTHUKUDI.TAMILNADU - 628002
CR.No.9 OF 2016

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.K.MUKUND RAO Advocate
For Respondent : Mr.K.ANBARASAN, Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as accused Nos.2 and 3, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Harassment Act and Section 4 of Domestic Violence Act, in Crime No.9 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with other accused demanded dowry and harassed the defacto complainant. On her complaint, a case has been registered against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the marriage between A1 and defacto complainant was solemnised on 06.01.2014 and both were lived together only till 25th April 2014. Subsequently, the defacto complaint left the matrimonial home voluntarily and started living with her parents. He further contended that the petitioners are only in laws of the defacto complainant and they were not in India, immediately, after marriage, they left India. When the petitioners were in India, the defacto complainant threatened the petitioners with dire consequences and sent notice claiming a share in the property belonging to the



second petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the investigation of the case is pending.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the petitioners are in laws of the defacto complainant, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram, Chennai 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 petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

6. 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.

sd/-

03/06/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, TAMBARAM, CHENNAI.
- 2 -DO- THRO' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, CHENNAI DISTRICT.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TUTICORIN POLICE STATION, SOUTH POLICE STATION, NH7A,
SUBBIAH PURAM, THOOTHUKUDI, TAMILNADU - 628 002.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to Mr.K.MUKUNT RAO, Advocate, SR No.27759

ORDER IN
CRL OP(MD) No.8129 of 2016
Date :03/06/2016