



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

Thursday, the Thirtieth day of November Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.15974 of 2017

1 MUTHUVEERAN @ MUTHUCHAMY
2 DHANALAKSHMI

... PETITIONERS / ACCUSED
Rank Not Known

Vs

THE STATE REPRESENTED BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
USILAMPATTI, MADURAI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.NOT KNOWN OF 2017)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioners : Mr.C.JEGANATHAN Advocate

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


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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners/Accused Rank Not Known, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Women's Harassment Act 1998, in Crime No.Not Known of 2017, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the defacto complainant and one Muthukrishnan / son of the petitioners was solemnized in the year 2013. Out of the wedlock, they were blessed with one female child. They went to Chandigarh for their business purpose, where the defacto complainant has illegal intimacy with one Harish and left from Chandigarh without any information to her husband. Aggrieved over the same, the petitioners harassed the defacto complainant and used with filthy language. Hence, the defacto complainant gave a complaint before the respondent police. Against which, the petitioners filed this petition for seeking anticipatory bail.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. According to them, since the family members of the first petitioner denied the partition of their family properties, the defacto complainant made allegations against the petitioners and lodged a false complaint against them.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the State, on instructions, would submit that based on the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and as per the direction of this Court, each and every District have formed a District Level Committee in order to settle the issues related to Section 498(A) of IPC cases. Accordingly, the case was referred to the District Level Committee for proper decision. Hence, this anticipatory bail petition is pre-matured one.

5. Recording the statement made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), this Criminal Original Petition is closed as pre-matured. However, if any adverse order passed by the District Level Committee, it is open to the petitioners to work out the remedy in the manner known to law.

sd/-
30/11/2017

/ 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, USILAMPATTI,
MADURAI DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S.VEERA ASSOCIATES SR.No.35504

JAM/19/01/2018/RR/ SAR 3/2P-4C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.15974 of 2017
Date :30/11/2017