



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

Monday, the Twenty Fifth day of February Two Thousand Nineteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP (MD) No.2888 of 2019

MAHENDRAN

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED No.14

Vs

STATE REP.BY,
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PATTUKOTTAI TALUK POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT
IN CRIME NO.246/2018

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : MR.K.S.DURAIPANDIAN Advocate

For Respondent : MR.S.CHANDRASEKAR, Additional Public Prosecutor

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences under Section 147, 148, 341, 324, 307, 302 of IPC r/w Section IES Act, in Cr.No.246 of 2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.It is the case of the prosecution that the petitioner and other accused person are said to have made assault on the defacto complainant and deceased Prakashkumar by throwing a Country bomb at a vehicle, with an intention to murder one Thamba Karthi, in which the Prakashkumar died.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner is arrayed as A14 and his name was not found in the FIR. On the basis of the confession made by other accused persons only, this petitioner was implicated in this case.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would submit that the investigation is still pending and that initially the petitioner's name was not included in the complaint made by the defacto complainant. The confession made by the co-



accused, reveals that the petitioner himself purchased three country made bombs only with an intention to commit murder the deceased and thrown the same in Vehicle. Hence, his name was implicated in this case.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case and considering the heinous nature of offence, this Court is of the opinion that if this type of accused was granted anticipatory bail, it will affect the investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

sd/-
25/02/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PATTUKOTTAI TALUK POLICE STATION,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to MR.K.S.DURAIPANDIAN Advocate SR.No.49706

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.2888 of 2019
Date :25/02/2019

TM
PK/PN/SAR-1/01.03.2019 : 2P/4C