



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

Tuesday, the Tenth day of October Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.12437 of 2017

1 RAMIJIA KANI
2 SALEEM
3 SHABINA
4 SENTHILMURUGAN

... PETITIONERS 1 TO 4 / ACCUSED

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PERAVURANI POLICE STATION, PATTUKOTTAI TALUK,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT.

(CRIME NO.210/2017)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

B.SYED MOHAMMED

... PETITIONER / INTERVENOR

For Petitioner : Mr.R.VENKATESHWAR Advocate

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

For Intervenor : Mr.S.RAVI, Advocate for
Mr.D.R.MURUGESAN, Advocate

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.1 to 4, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 448, 294(b), 323, 324, 379 and 506(ii) of IPC, in Crime No.210 of 2017, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners 2 and 3 are the son and daughter of the defacto complainant. The first petitioner is the wife of his brother and the fourth petitioner is the son-in-law of the defacto complainant. Since, the defacto complainant had sold some properties and have cash in his hand, the petitioners 2 and 3 demanded their share. Thereafter, on 22.08.2017, they trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and scolded him with filthy language and attacked him and his father (the grandfather of the petitioners 2 and 3) and took away Rs.9,25,000/- and 244 sovereigns of gold from Almirah and also took away two cars, namely, Swift Dezire and HV Mahindra. Aggrieved by the said illegal activities of the petitioners 2 and 3, the defacto complainant



lodged a complaint before the law enforcing agency. Hence, the case has been registered for the above said offences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that he admitted the relationship of the petitioners and the defacto complainant. However, he denied the entire allegations made against the petitioners. He further submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they are falsely implicated in this case for some other purpose and they did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent on instructions, would submit that based on the complaint given by the father of the defacto complainant, the case was registered and investigation is still pending. He further submitted that till now, no properties were recovered from the petitioners.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), and since no properties were recovered from the blood relatives, who are none other than the son and daughter of the defacto complainant, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-

10/10/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PERAVURANI POLICE STATION, PATTUKOTTAI TALUK,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to Mr.D.R.MURUGESAN, Advocate SR.No.32421

JAM/11.10.17/CM-MSA/SAR 3/ 2p-4c

ORDER

IN

CRL OP (MD) No.12437 of 2017

Date :10/10/2017