



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

Tuesday, the Thirtieth day of January Two Thousand Eighteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice R.PONGIAPPAN

CRL OP (MD) No.1359 of 2018

- 1 MUTHIRULAPPAN
- 2 ATHIMUTHU
- 3 GUNASEELAN
- 4 MUTHUSAMY
- 5 MUNIYASAMY
S/O MUTHUMUNIYANDI
- 6 BATHIMAJOTHI
- 7 SEKARAN
- 8 GNANASEKAR
- 9 MARIMUTHU
S/O SOLAI
- 10 RANJITH SING
- 11 MARIMUTHU
S/O JOTHI
- 12 SIVARAM GANDHI
- 13 MARICHAMY
- 14 MARIMUTHU
S/O MURUGESAN
- 15 MUNIYASAMY
S/O THIKKU VIJAYAN
- 16 JEYARAJ
- 17 MARISELVAM
- 18 GOBI
- 19 THAMILARASAN
- 20 AYYADURAI
- 21 PAKKIYAM
- 22 SATHAIAH
- 23 GURUSAMY
- 24 MATHU BARATHI
- 25 SELVAM
- 26 PITCHAIKANI
- 27 SIVAKUMAR
- 28 SASIKUMAR PANDIAN
- 29 APPAKANI
- 30 GANESAN
- 31 MUTHUPANDI
- 32 VELMURUGAN
- 33 ALAGUVEL
- 34 CHITHIRAI PANDI

... PETITIONERS / ACCUSED 1 to 34



Vs

THE STATE REPRESENTED BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PERUNAZHI POLICE STATION, PERUNAZHI,
KAMUTHI TALUK,
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT ,
IN CR.NO. 5/2018

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioners : Mr.T.INDRACHITHU Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.A.ROBINSON, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent Police for the offence punishable under Sections 147, 448, 427, 506(i) IPC in Crime No.5 of 2018, seek anticipatory bail.


2.The case of the prosecution is that during Pongal festival, the petitioners along with other accused trespassed into a disputed land and damaged the fences.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they are no way connected with the offences, and pleads for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that no one sustained injuries and the investigation is still pending.

5.The submissions made by the learned counsel on either side are considered. This case has been registered against the petitioners for the offence punishable under Sections 147, 448, 427, 506(i) IPC. As per the submissions of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side), no one sustained injuries during the time of occurrence. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, custodial interrogation may not be necessary for completing the investigation.

7.Taking all the above said aspects into consideration and having regard to the nature of offence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, with certain conditions. Accordingly, they are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Court, Kamuthi, Ramanathapuram District, on condition that each of the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent Police or to the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate



concerned and on further condition that:

- (i) the petitioners shall report before the respondent Police daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation.
- (ii) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.
- (iii) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.
- (iv) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioners shall stand automatically cancelled and the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]**.

sd/-
30/01/2018

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

- 1 THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KAMUTHI,
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT
- 2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PERUNAZHI POLICE STATION, PERUNAZHI,
KAMUTHI TALUK, RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI

+1. CC to M/S.T.INDRACHITHU Advocate SR.No.1599
GNS
JAM/08/02/2018/CM-VR/ SAR 1/ 3P-6C