



WEB COPY

1

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON : 20.09.2018

DELIVERED ON : 05.10.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN

Crl.A(MD)No.395 of 2018

Sureshkumar

.. Appellant/Petitioner/
Accused No.26

Vs.

1.The State through the
Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Manamadurai Sub-Division,
Sivagangai District.

.. Respondent /
Investigating Officer

2.The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Pazhayanoor Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
(in Crime No.32 of 2018)

.. Respondent / Complainant

3.Maheswaran

.. Victim/ de facto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 14A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 as amended by Act 1 of 2016 and 439 of Cr.P.C., against the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.1912 of 2018 dated 31.07.2018 on the file of the Learned Sessions Judge, Sivagangai for bail in Crime No.32 of 2018 dated 29.05.2018 on the file of the respondent for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 302 of I.P.C. and Section 3 of T.N.P.P.D.L and 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of Sc/ST (POA) Amended Act 2015.

For Appellant :Mr.V.Kannan

For R1 & R2 :Mr.K.Chellapandian,
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by:
Mr.A.Robinson,
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

For R3 : Mr.G.Bhagavath Singh

J U D G E M E N T

This Criminal Appeal is filed by one of the accused facing trial in Special Case No.32 of 2018 before the Special Court for Exclusive trial of cases under SC/ST (POA) Act, 1989, Sivagangai. The brief facts leading to the present bail petition are as below:-

WEB COPY

2. Katchanatham Village of Manamadurai Taluk at Sivagangai District is a small hamlet, mostly inhabited by people belonging to the Schedule Caste (SC) community. One family of this hamlet and villagers surrounding this hamlet belong to other community. It appears that there was a personal feud between that one family, belonging to the non-SC Community and the members of the SC Community.

3. On 31.07.2017, the members of the SC Community have given a complaint to the District Collector, alleging that Suman, son of Chandrakumar, is causing disturbance to the members of the SC Community and they are threatening their lives. They have made a specific allegation of events which had taken place in the village on 02.07.2017, 17.07.2017, 18.07.2017 and 29.07.2017 which are cause for their fear. The said representation was given to the District Collector seeking protection for their lives and properties by one Mr.M.Sundaram and nine other villagers. It appears that, thereafter, when the temple festival was conducted on 25.05.2018, Chandrakumar of non-SC community had picked a quarrel with one Shanmuganathan of SC Community. As a result, on 26.05.2018, Shanmuganathan has lodged a complaint against Chandrakumar and others. Consequently, Chandrakumar was enquired by the police.

4. The case under consideration is in respect of the unfortunate event which had taken place on 25.05.2018 at about 09.00 p.m. As per the F.I.R., a case was registered based on the complaint given by Maheswaran, son of Bhominathan. On 28.05.2018, 17 named accused and others armed with deadly weapons attacked Shanmuganathan, Arumugam, Dhanasekaran and others. The roof of the victim's residence was damaged by the mob. The said clash has resulted in the death of three persons and injuries to five others, besides damage to the properties of the SC community people. A case has been registered against 17 named persons and other unknown persons on 29.05.2018 at 05.00 hrs for offence under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 302 I.P.C. and Section 3 of Public Property Damage and Loss Act, 1992 and Section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of the Schedule Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015.

5. The appellant/Sureshkumar, aged about 20 is arrayed a accused No.26. He was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 22.06.2018. His bail petition before the trial was dismissed on 31.07.2018 on the ground that the investigation is at an early stage and gravity of the offence does not warrant release of the petitioner on bail.



6. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the State contended that the gravity of the offence and brutality applied on the oppressed community does not deserve any consideration of granting bail.

WEB COPY

7. The counsel appearing for the victim also reinforced the same statement. It is pointed out by the respondent that the peace in the village has not yet been restored. Nearly, 130 police men are employed round the clock to maintain law and order. The disharmony prevailing between the two communities have ended in brutal murder of three persons and severe injuries to few others. The house of the victim has also been damaged. The criminal law which was set into motion by the filing of the F.I.R. by Maheswaran, who has named 17 persons and their overtact has led the investigation, wherein, totally 35 persons have been arrayed as accused and except two, all others have been secured.

8. Heard the learned counsel for the appellant, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State and the learned counsel appearing for the victim and perused the records placed before this Court.

9. The prosecution has completed the investigation and has filed the final report. The allegation against this appellant is that he along with the accused Arunpandi and others, at the instigation of Suman, son of Chandrakumar had decided to wreck vengeance for the complaint initiated by the SC community members of Katchanatham village and gathered together and attacked the SC community members of Katchanatham village on 28.05.2018 at 09.00 p.m. Relying upon the confession statement of Arunpandi and Karupppiah, this accused has been arrayed as an accused for alleged offence of damaging the house roof of the victim and television sets.

10. Considering the overtact attributed to the appellant and the liberty of the accused person and larger interest of the public, this Court is of the opinion that the appellant shall set out at liberty on the following conditions:

(i) the appellant/accused 26 shall be enlarged on bail, by executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only), with two sureties, one must be a close blood relative, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Cases under SC/ST (POA) Act, 1989, Sivagangai;

(ii) he will report before the Curator, Mahatma Gandhi Museum, Madurai, on the first Tuesday of every English calendar month at 10.00 am., and stay at Gandhi Museum till 05.00 pm., to learn the teaching of Mahatma.



(iii) he shall not enter his village till the disposal of the trial on any account and he shall participate in the trial without fail.

(iv) he shall not tamper with investigation or trial; and

(v) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned trial Judge is entitled to take appropriate action, as if the conditions have been imposed and the appellant released on bail by the trial Judge himself as laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs State of Kerala in 2005 AIR SCW 5560.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(T&P)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

To

- 1.The Sessions Judge,
Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Cases
under SC/ST (POA), Act, 1989,
Sivagangai.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Manamadurai Sub-Division,
Sivagangai District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Pazhayanoor Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
- 4.The Superintendent Of Central Prison,
Madurai.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Copy to

The Curator,

Mahatma Gandhi Museum,

Madurai.

+1CC TO MR.V.KANNAN, ADVOCATE IN SR.NO.88901.

STS

TR DS SKN SAR-3 08.10.2018 4P/8C

Cr1.A(MD)No.395 of 2018