



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

Thursday, the Twenty First day of June Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.9772 of 2016

N.SARAVANAN

... PETITIONER/ 4th ACCUSED

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
OTHAKADAI POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT.
CR NO. 310 OF 2016.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S A.S.VAIGUNTH Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.P.KANNITHEVAN Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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


ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who is arrayed as accused No.4, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 364(A) I.P.C. @ Sections 147, 120 (b), 364 and 323 I.P.C., in Crime No.310 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that one Daisy Rani borrowed money from one Jancy and did not repay the same, even after a long time. Hence, Jancy approached her relative one Ponnupandi, who is a practising Advocate. The Advocate Ponnupandi and his friends kidnapped the Daisy rani in Maruthi vehicle bearing Regn.No.800 DX and threatened her with dire consequences and also misbehaved with her and also beaten her with stick. On complaint, a case has been registered against the petitioners.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that since the petitioner is the relative of A1 his name has been falsely implicated in this case and prays for anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the petitioner and other accused kidnapped the de facto complainant and misbehaved with her and also threatened her with dire consequences to pay the amount to the said Jancy and earlier, the petitioner filed a petition for anticipatory bail in Crl.O.P(MD)No.8974 of 2016 and this Court dismissed the same vide order dated 10.06.2016 and



there is no change of circumstance and the investigation of the case is pending.

5. Considering the serious nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner and also there is no change of circumstance, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

WEB COPY

sd/-

21/06/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, OTHAKADAI POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT,

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

Smn

JA-PEK-SAR.I/27.06.2016/2P-3C

ORDER

IN

CRL OP (MD) No.9772 of 2016

Date :21/06/2016