



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

Tuesday, the Twenty Third day of April Two Thousand Nineteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.5067 of 2019

1 DINESH,
2 SARAVANAN,
3 JEYAKUMAR,

... PETITIONERS / ACCUSED

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
KENIKARAI POLICE STATION,
RAMNAD DT.
(CRIME.NO.81 OF 2019)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioners : Mr.R.MURUGAN Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.K.SUYAMBULINGA BHARAH, Govt. Advocate
(Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.M.S.JEYAKARTHIK, Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who is arrayed as accused, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC @ 147, 148 r/w. 120 (b) of IPC in Crime No.81 of 2019, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 20.03.2019, there was a Panguni Uthiram festival celebrated in the village and due to the above festival, the accused persons joined together and attacked the defacto complainant, thereby the defacto complainant sustained injuries and admitted in the hospital. Therefore he filed a complaint before the respondent police.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the anticipatory bail application and he has also made an endorsement to that effect.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the petitioner is the main accused and he has brutally attacked the defacto complainant and narrowly he escaped from the scene of



occurrence. He would also submit that the defacto complainant sustained injuries in his right hand and leg and taking treatment and he has spent more than Rs.3,00,000/- for treatment and he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that already arrested accused persons were granted bail, however main accused is yet to be apprehended. He would also submit that five previous cases are pending against the petitioners. Hence he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Though the learned counsel for the petitioners made an endorsement to withdraw the case, taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the main accused is yet to be apprehended, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Hence the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

sd/-

23/04/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
KENIKARAI POLICE STATION,
RAMNAD DT.

2 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to Mr.R.MURUGAN, Advocate SR.No.7035

+1. CC to Mr.M.S.JEYAKARTHIK, Advocate SR.No.7168

PS/VR/SAR-2/27.04.2019/2P/5C

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.5067 of 2019

Date :23/04/2019