



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

Monday, the Twenty Seventh day of March Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs.Justice J.NISHA BANU

CRL OP(MD) No.20047 of 2016

1 KOSALRAM
2 M.RENGARAJAN
3 R.AMSAVALLI
4 R.SHANTHI
5 R.DHANALAKSHMI
6 N.SEENIVASAN

... PETITIONERS/ ACCUSED 1 TO 6

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
SATTUR,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT
(IN CRIME NO. 22 OF 2016)
2 V.SIDHUJA

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

(R2 IMPEADED AS PER ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE COURT MADE IN CRL.MP(MD).
10377/16 IN CRL.OP(MD).20047/16 DATED 26.10.16 BY BGJ)

For Petitioner : M/S.P.SUBBURAJ Advocate

For Respondent : M/S 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 6, in Crime No.22 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of IPC and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Protection of Women Harassment Act and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 in Crime No.22 of 2016 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. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that earlier the matter was referred to Mediation Centre for arriving at an amicable settlement, but, it did not yield any fruitful result.

4. The learned Government Advocate(Crl. Side) on instructions submits that it is the case of matrimonial dispute.



5. It is seen that earlier the matter was referred to the Tamil Nadu Mediation and Conciliation Centre and the same was failed. However, this Court thought it fit to refer the matter once again whether there would be any mediation and posted the matter today in the chambers. While the matter was discussed in the Chamber, it seems that the girl is not willing to live with her husband and she feels that her husband was not truthful to her by not telling that engagement that had taken place even before her marriage and though he was not employed, her husband said that he was employed at the time of marriage and therefore, she did not want to live with him and she had been separated from him for the past one year.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the allegations levelled against the petitioners, 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, No.I, Sattur, Virudhunagar District 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 as and when required for interrogation. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

7. 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/-
27/03/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I, SATTUR.
2. DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
VIRUDHUNAGAR AT SRIVILLIPUTTUR.
3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
SATTUR, VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.
4. ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
- +1. CC to M/S.P.SUBBURAJ Advocate SR.No.18053
- +1. CC to M/s.V.Sasi Kumar, Advocate SR.No.18808

ORDERIN
CRL OP(MD) No.20047 of 2016
Date : 27/03/2017