



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

Tuesday, the Fifth day of July Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.9158 of 2016

1 DHAMODRAPANDIAN
2 INDRA
3 KARTHI
4 PONSANKARI
5 ANNATHAI
6 VASU
7 BANU
8 ANANDH

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED 1 to 8

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
THILAGARTHIDAL,
MADURAI CITY.

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : No Appearance

For Respondent : MR.K.ANBARASAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : No Appearance

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The first petitioner, who is arrayed as accused No.1, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 341, 406, 294(b) and 506(i) of IPC, in Crime No.9 of 2016, on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant was solemnized on 15.04.2013. At the time of marriage, the parents of the defacto complainant gave 80 sovereigns of gold jewels and household articles worth Rs.5,00,000/- to the first petitioner's family as dowry. After the marriage, the defacto complainant came to know that the first petitioner had illicit intimacy with one Anbarasi. Due to the fact, dispute arose and on her complaint, case has been registered for the above said offences.

3.The case of the first petitioner is that the he is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The first petitioner is working as Junior Assistant in Services Corporation, Madurai and he has not demanded any dowry. The defacto complainant left the matrimonial home on her own volition and at that time, she has taken all the jewels and other household articles.



The de facto complainant alleged that the first petitioner is having illicit relationship with one Anbarasi and the first petitioner filed a petition for divorce before the Family Court, Madurai against the de facto complainant and the same is pending.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that the petitioner has thrown out the de facto complainant from the matrimonial home and the de facto complainant was not permitted to take her basic things including clothes. On complaint, case has been registered for the above said offences.

5.Today, there is no representation on the side of the first petitioner.

6.When the matter was taken up for hearing on 15.06.2016, Mr.G.Anbusaravanan, learned counsel, represented that he is appearing for the intervenor, but, today, there is no representation for the intervenor.

7.This Court vide order dated 15.06.2016, granted anticipatory bail to the petitioners 2 to 8 and the matter was posted for appearance of the first petitioner along with his mother and on 22.06.2016, they appeared before this Court and submitted that there is no possibility of settlement and denied to give the jewels and household articles to the de facto complainant.

8.Considering the serious nature of allegations made against the first petitioner, this petition is dismissed as against the first petitioner is concerned.

sd/-
05/07/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
THILAGARTHIDAL,
MADURAI CITY.

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

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.9158 of 2016
Date :05/07/2016

AM/GSV.PM/SAR-III/13.07.2016/2P/3C

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