



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

Thursday, the Twenty Eighth day of December Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice S.VAIDYANATHAN

CRL OP(MD) No.18004 of 2017

VEERAIYAN

... PETITIONER /ACCUSED NO NOT KNOWN

Vs

1 STATE REP.BY

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
THANJAVUR TALUK POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR.

... 1st RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

2 VINAYAGARAMAN

... 2nd RESPONDENT/ DEFACTO COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.S.E.MONICA VINCENT, 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 :-


Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 457 and 302 IPC in Crime No.455 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent police, the petitioner has come forward with this petition seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent police.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner snatched the chain of the mother of the defacto complainant and the villagers caught hold A2 and A3, who accompanied the petitioner and petitioner is the prime culprit.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution and the case has been foisted against the petitioner as a counter blast to the Writ Petition filed by him before this Court in W.P.(MD) No.21211 of 2017 to take action against the police.

5. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that A2 and A3 are still in custody and the petitioner is the prime culprit, who is having 18 previous cases.



6. Though the petitioner has filed W.P.(MD) No.21211 of 2017 to take action against the police, the same cannot be a ground for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Further, taking note of the fact that the petitioner has bad antecedents and also the fact that the petitioner is alleged to have involved in a serious offence, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary in this case and therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to him.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
28/12/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
THANJAVUR TALUK POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR.
2. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.18004 of 2017
Date :28/12/2017

MS/CM-VR/SAR.1/02.01.2018/2P.3C