



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

Wednesday, the Twenty Fifth day of October Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.12436 of 2017

WEB COPY

1 M.MURUGAN
2 MAKESH
3 KANTHAN

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED nO.1,3 & 4

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VASUDEVANALLUR POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.206 OF 2017)

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioners : M/S.S.SENTHIL SANKARA NATHA 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 A1, A3 & A4, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 447, 294(b), 506(1) of IPC and Section 3 of TNPPDL Act, in Crime No. 206 of 2017, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and the defacto complainant are adjacent land owners. Due to the civil dispute, the petitioners entered into the defacto complainant's farm land and cut down lemon trees standing on the defacto complainant's land. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent police.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they are no way connected with the offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that the petitioners are not ready to pay the compensation amount to the defacto complainant.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the State would submit that there are 38 lemon trees were cut down by the petitioners from the defacto complainant's farm land, thereby there was a loss of huge production of oxygen, in the locality of area. He would further submit that the petitioners refused to



deposit the compensation amount. Hence, the learned Government Advocate has objected to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the gravity of offence committed by the petitioners, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
25/10/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VASUDEVANALLUR POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.12436 of 2017
Date :25/10/2017

PK/RR-BS/SAR-1/22.09.2017 : 2P/3C