



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

Tuesday, the Seventh day of November Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.15037 of 2017

1 AJITH
2 THANGALINGARAJA
3 ARIHARASUTHAN @ SUTHAN

... PETITIONERS

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
KANYAKUMARI,
KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.13/2017)

... RESPONDENT

For Petitioners: M/S.G.VAIRAM SANTHOSH, Advocate
For Respondent : M/S.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, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Section 4 of Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, Sections 366(A) & 506(i) IPC and Section 4 of the Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, 2008, in Crime No. 13 of 2017, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the mother of the minor victim girl filed a complaint before the respondent police stating that the first accused namely, Anandh, kidnapped her daughter/the minor girl. Prior to that incident eve-teasing was brought to the knowledge of the defacto complainant, when the defacto complainant asked about her daughter/the minor girl, the petitioners used filthy language against the defacto complainant. Aggrieved by the illegal act of the petitioners and A1, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent police.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are the father and in laws of the first accused. The first accused was already arrested by the respondent police and remanded in Judicial custody and he further submitted that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the State would submit that the investigation is in initial stage. However, the petitioners committed the offence in a secured manner and he vehemently opposed for grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the gravity of offence committed by the petitioners and A1, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
07/11/2017

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

+1. CC to M/S.G.VAIRAM SANTHOSH Advocate SR.No.33996

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.15037 of 2017
Date :07/11/2017

MS/PM-PN/SAR.1/16.11.2017/2P.4C