



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

Friday, the Twenty Second day of December Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.17876 of 2017

C.SUNDARAM

... PETITIONER / SOLE ACCUSED

Vs

THE STATE REPRESENTED BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CITY CRIME BRANCH (CCB),
TRICHY CITY,
TRICHY DISTRICT,
CR NO. 67/2017.

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.N.SATHISH BABU 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 petitioner, who is arrayed as Sole Accused, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b) and 506(i) of I.P.C., and Sections 66D and 66E of Information Technology (Amendment) Act 2008, in Crime No.67 of 2017, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is the son-in-law of the defacto complainant. The petitioner and the defacto complainant's daughter fell in love. The marriage between the petitioner and the defacto complainant's daughter was solemnised on 20.05.2015 and they were blessed with a female child. After the birth of the female child, the petitioner tortured the defacto complainant's daughter and her family. Unable to bear the torture mounted by the petitioner, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent police.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he is an innocent and he did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that the petitioner sent improper message through Social Media to his wife.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the State submitted that the petitioner used filthy language



against his wife and her family members and the entire conversation of the petitioner and the defacto complainant was placed before this Court.

5. On perusal of the conversation, it is found that the petitioner used filthy language against his wife and her family members and it is unable to accept as a common man who wants to live in the Society in a decent manner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) and also considering the gravity of offence made by the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

sd/-
22/12/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CITY CRIME BRANCH (CCB),
TRICHY CITY, TRICHY DISTRICT,
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI

JAM/10/01/2018/PN/ SAR 3 / 2P-3C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) No.17876 of 2017
Date : 22/12/2017