



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

Wednesday, the Tenth day of April Two Thousand Nineteen

PRESENT

WEB COPY

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL MP(MD) No.3354 of 2019

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.2396 of 2019

SHANMUGAM

... PETITIONER/DEFACTO COMPLAINANT

Vs

1.G.SUGANTHI,

2 A.MARIYAYEE

3 A.DHARMARAJ

... 1 TO 3 RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS

4.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
LALGUDI POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DISTRICT.

IN CRIME NO.77 OF 2019

... 4TH RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Petition praying that in the circumstances stated therein and in the petition filed therewith the High Court will be pleased to CANCEL the Bail granted to the Respondents 1 to 3/Accused in Crl.OP.(MD).No.2396 of 2019 dated 25.02.2019 on the file of this Honourable Court.

Order : This petition coming on for orders upon perusing the petition filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of M/S.S.GOPALAMANIKANDAN, Advocate for the petitioner and of MR.K.SUYAMBULINGA BHARATHI, Government Advocate(Crl. Side) on behalf of the fourth Respondent, the court made the following order:-

The petitioner/defacto complainant has filed this cancellation of anticipatory bail petition to cancel the anticipatory bail granted by this Court in Crl.O.P.(MD)No.2396 of 2019 on 25.02.2019.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is a retired Assistant Elementary Officer. After retirement, he had a relationship with the first petitioner school teacher. During the period, the first petitioner received huge amount from the defacto complainant and not returned the same and also refused to live with him. Hence the complaint.

3. While granting bail, this Court imposed a condition, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to co-operate for the investigation, since the respondents 1 to 3 did not co-operate for



investigation, the defacto complainant filed a petition for cancellation of anticipatory bail application before this Court.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the State would submit that he did not receive any information from the respondent police, as if the respondents 1 to 3 in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.2396 of 2019, is not co-operate the with investigating agency.

5.In view of the above, I am not inclined to allow this petition. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
10/04/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
LALGUDI, TRICHY DISTRICT.
- 2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
TRICHY DISTRICT.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
LALGUDI POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DISTRICT.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL MP (MD) No.3354 of 2019
IN
CRL OP (MD) No.2396 of 2019
Date :10/04/2019

sj i
AE/PN/SAR-II/23.04.2019/4P/5C