

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 2115 of 2017

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.'), is filed to enlarge the petitioners/A-1 to A-4 on pre-arrest bail since they are apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.5 of 2017 of Police Station, Dagadarthi, SPSR, Nellore District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 447, 323, 324, 384, r/w 34 of IPC.

The case of the petitioners is that one G.Padma, native of Katarayapadu village whose source of living is agriculture. On 06.01.2017 at about 10 a.m. she was beaten by the petitioners 2 and 4 and she took treatment in Government Hospital, Kvali. While so, on 07.01.2017 at 7 a.m. her husband Gannavarapu Nageswara Rao who is dumb, unable to speak is in the house lonely, by then the petitioners 1 to 4 entered into her house, scolded her husband and beat him with hands and kicked with legs, then she took her husband to an R.M.P. doctor in her village. On 09.01.2017 due to injuries, blood is oozing from the two ears of her husband and he also complained chest pain, then at about 5 p.m. she took her husband to the government hospital, Kavali for treatment, that her husband is unable to speak, therefore, the police came and recorded her statement. Her husband told her that during the said galata, petitioner No.3/A-3 snatched away 3 sovereigns of gold chin from his neck. Thus, the petitioners committed offences as mentioned above.

The learned counsel for the petitioners contended that there was a rivalry between the parties and earlier a complaint was lodged against these petitioners, but no action was taken. A sworn affidavit of the third petitioner is filed along with the petition stating that they lodged a complaint. A copy of the C.D. of conversation recorded to establish that there was rivalry, is filed. The learned counsel further contended that no offence took place and it is only to wreak-vengeance against these petitioners for the earlier complaint, the present complaint is lodged and prayed for enlargement of the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest.

The learned Public Prosecutor for the State of Andhra Pradesh would contend that the de facto complainant's husband and the de facto complainant sustained serious bite injuries and that the third petitioner snatched away 3 sovereigns of gold chain from the neck of the de facto complainant's husband and the petitioners 1 and 2 beat him with hands and kicked with legs.

As seen from the material on record including the sworn affidavit filed by the petitioners, there were disputes between the parties earlier and that by itself is not a ground and the previous enmity may be one of the circumstances either to foist false case or to commit such offence since the motive is double edged weapon. Therefore, it is not a ground to enlarge the petitioners on bail concluding prima facie that the petitioners did commit no offence.

On the other hand, the material on record would show that the de facto complainant received bite injuries allegedly caused by the petitioners 1, 2 and 4 on her right leg and hand and they also

beat the de facto complainant's husband with hands and kicked with legs and the third petitioner snatched away 3 sovereigns of gold chain from his neck and therefore, the material on record is suffice to conclude that the petitioners are prima facie responsible for causing such injuries. The material produced by the Public Prosecutor including the statements recorded by the police during investigation under Section 161 Cr.P.C. further supports that the petitioners are the persons who caused such injuries on the body of the de facto complainant and her husband by the petitioners 1, 2 and 4 besides snatching away 3 sovereigns of gold chain from his neck by the third petitioner. Such act would prima facie constitute an offence punishable under Section 384 r/w 34 of IPC.

The power of the Court under Section 438 Cr.P.C is purely discretionary and this Court has to exercise its power judiciously based on settled principles. The power of granting 'anticipatory bail' is somewhat extraordinary in character and it is only in exceptional cases where it appears that a person might be falsely implicated, or a frivolous case might be launched against him, or "there are reasonable grounds for holding that a person accused of an offence is not likely to abscond, or otherwise misuse his liberty while on bail" that such power is to be exercised.

Here in the present case, to establish that there was enmity, no other material is produced to conclude that prima facie the petitioners did commit no offence. Therefore, as per the material available on record, it is difficult for me to conclude prima facie that the petitioners did commit no offence to grant pre-arrest bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I find that it is not a fit case to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

In the result, this Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this criminal petition, shall stand closed.

---

M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY, J

Date:30.03.2017

ccm



THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY



CRIMINAL PETITION No. 2115 of 2017

Date:30.03.2017

ccm