



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

Monday, the Twelfth day of February Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice R.PONGIAPPAN

CRL OP (MD) No.1138 of 2018

RENGANATHAN

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED No.1

Vs

STATE REP.BY,
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
UTHAMAPALALAYAM,
THENI DISTRICT.
(CR.NO.36 OF 2017)

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.S.MAHENDRAPATHY, Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.A.ROBINSON, Government 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 A1, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent Police for the offence punishable under Sections 498(A), 406 and 506(i) of IPC , in Crime No.36 of 2017 and seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to matrimonial dispute, the petitioner is alleged to have hidden the certificates of the defacto complainant and his children and also threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences. Hence, on complaint, a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and his name has been falsely implicated in this case.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that the investigation is not yet completed.



5. The submissions made by the learned counsel on either side are considered.

6. It is alleged, during the time of occurrence, the first petitioner, being the husband of the defacto complainant, due to wordy quarrel, hide the Plus Two Certificate and Bank Pass book and other certificates, which stands in the name of the defacto complainant and refused to hand over the same, for which, accused nos. 2 and 3 lent their support to the petitioner herein and hence, the de facto complainant suffered a lot. However, there is no allegation in respect of demand of dowry and the other harassment made by the petitioner is nothing but a grave one. So, this type of petitioner is granted with anticipatory bail, there may a chance for tampering the witnesses and hampering the investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
12/02/2018

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
UTHAMAPALALAYAM,
THENI DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) No.1138 of 2018
Date :12/02/2018

PK/RR-CSL/SAR-1/20.02.2018 : 2P/3C