



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

Tuesday, the Twenty Sixth day of February Two Thousand Nineteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP (MD) No.2937 of 2019

RAVIKUMAR.S. @ 'SAMI RAVI'

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED

Vs

THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU,
REP. BY INSPECTOR OF POLICE
K.K.NAGAR POLICE STATION,
TRICHY-620001,
IN CRIME NO.81/2019

... RESPONDENT /
INVESTIGATING OFFICER

For Petitioner : MR.M.SHREEDHAR Advocate

For Respondent : K.SUYAMBULINGA BHARATHI,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

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 offence under Sections 342, 364 (A), 392 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.81 of 2019, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail

2. Totally there are eight accused in this case. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with others kidnapped the defacto complainant and robbed a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- and some gold jewels. Hence the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He would also submit that there was a money dispute between A1 and the defacto complainant for which settlement talk is going on in the office of the political party since the settlement was not carried out, the defacto complainant himself preferred a false complaint and demanded money from the accused persons.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioner had kidnapped the defacto complainant. He would also submit that jewels were not



recovered. He would also submit that A5 to A7 were arrested in this case and investigation is pending and hence he objected for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the fact that the jewels was not recovered and that some of the accused are yet to be arrested, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

sd/-
26/02/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
K.K.NAGAR POLICE STATION,
TRICHY-620001
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.2937 of 2019
Date :26/02/2019

MSI/JC/SAR 4/01.03.2019/2P-3C