



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

Monday, the Twenty Second day of January Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice R.PONGIAPPAN

CRL OP (MD) No.874 of 2018

1 SANGILIPANDI
2 AYYAPPAN

...PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.1 & 2

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KAYATHAR POLICE STATION,
THOOTHUKUDI DISTRICT.
CRIME NO.11/2018

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioners: M/S.M.PRABU Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.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/Accused Nos.1 & 2, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 353 and 506(ii) IPC., in Crime No.11 of 2018, seeking relief to grant of anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 11.01.2018 when the defacto complainant, who is the Sub Inspector of Police checking the petitioner's vehicle, the petitioners scolded the defacto complainant and used with filthy language, thereby the respondent police registered a case as against the petitioners.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that they are innocent person and and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

4.The learned Government Advocate(Criminal Side) submitted that the petitioners and other accused abused the defacto complaint, who is working as a Sub Inspector of Police only for the purpose that he advised the first petitioner has not to drove the vehicle in a speedy manner, due to which, wordy quarrel arose between them. Hence, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the submissions made on either side, it disclose that the offence under Sections 294(b), 353 and 506(ii) I.P.C., in



Crime No.11 of 2018 has been registered against the petitioners. It is alleged that during the time of occurrence, the petitioners and the other accused abused the defacto complainant who is working as a Sub Inspector of Police, only for the purpose that he advised the first petitioner that not to drive the vehicle in a speedy manner. Even though, the offence committed by the petitioner is not a serious one. Considering the other circumstances, particularly, in order to restrain to perform the duty of the defacto complainant, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
22/01/2018

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KAYATHAR POLICE STATION, THOOTHUKUDI DISTRICT.
2. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.874 of 2018
Date :22/01/2018

MS/PM-PN/SAR.2/31.01.2018/2P.3C