



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

Thursday, the Twenty Third day of March Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs.Justice J.NISHA BANU

CRL OP(MD) No.3348 of 2017

1 KANNADASON
2 VETRIENDAN
3 MURUGAIYAN

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.1 TO 3

Vs

STATE REPRESENTED BY,
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PAPPANADU POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT,
CRIME NO. 41 OF 2016.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.M.R.R. SIVASUBRAMANIAN Advocate

For Respondent : MRS.S.PRABHA, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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 3 in Crime No.46 of 2017 on the file of the respondent police, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 324, 506(ii) and 379 of IPC and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate(Crl. Side) for the respondent/State.

3.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners borrowed car from the defacto complainant and went along with her brother Ramamoorthy and thereafter, the petitioners attacked the said Ramamoorthy and stolen away the car and some jewels and Rs.25,000/-.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners and the defacto complainant are relatives and infact, the defacto complainant's husband borrowed money from the petitioners and did not repay the same and hence, the petitioners taken away the car of the defacto complainant, for which, the defacto complainant has lodged this false complaint.

5.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent on instructions submitted that the petitioners and the defacto complainant are relatives and that there was a wordy quarrel



between them due to borrowal of the car.

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the petitioners and the defacto complainant are relatives, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Orathanadu and on each of them executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police once in a week i.e. on every Monday at 10.30 a.m., until further orders, for interrogation. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. Scrupulously.

6.The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

sd/-
23/03/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, ORATHANADU.
- 2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT AT KUMBAKONAM.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PAPPANADU POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.T.A.EBENEZER, Advocate SR.No.17232

RJ2
CSL/KKR/SAR-III/06.04.2017 : 2P/6C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.3348 of 2017
Date :23/03/2017