



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

Monday, the Tenth day of September Two Thousand Eighteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL OP(MD) No.15681 of 2018

1.V.VENNILA,

2.B.VIJAYALAKSHMI,

... PETITIONERS / ACCUSED Nos.2 and 5

Vs

STATE THRO'

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
EAST POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR, THANJAVUR DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.283/2018)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioners : Mr.J.PRICILLA PANDIAN Advocate

For Respondent : Mrs.M.ANANTHA DEVI
Government Advocate (Criminal 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 offences punishable under Sections 147, 294(b), 386, 364(A), 506(i) I.P.C, in Crime No.283 of 2018, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with three accused demanded a sum of Rs. 35,00,000/-, which should be handed over in the defacto complainant's marriage hall. Further, alleged that the defacto complainant's daughter had love affair with one Safique. In this regard, the defacto complainant had approached the first accused for separation of the above said persons, for that, the first and third accused demanded a sum of Rs.6,00,000/-. As agreed by them, the first accused rescued the daughter of the defacto complainant from Safique and handed over to the defacto complainant's family. But, the defacto complainant did not pay the assured amount to the first accused. For which, there was a wordy quarrel with the defacto complainant. Due to that, the first accused threatened the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.



3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that these petitioners have no role on the part of the first accused. The first petitioner/A2 is the wife of the first accused and the second petitioner/A5 is the mother of the first accused and the fourth accused is the wife of A3. These petitioners have no way connected in the alleged occurrence and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that investigation is pending in this case.

5.Taking note of the facts and circumstances, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thanjavur and on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. The petitioners shall comply with the conditions stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

6.The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed.

sd/-
10/09/2018

/ TRUE COPY /

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


TO

1.THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I,
THANJAVUR.

2.DO THRO'THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
THANJAVUR AT KUMBAKONAM

3.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
EAST POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR,

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



4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to MR.R.SURESH KUMAR Advocate SR.No.17383

WEB COPY

ORDER

IN

CRL OP (MD) No.15681 of 2018

Date :10/09/2018

MSA

AE/RR/SAR1/19.09.2018/3P/6C