



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

Tuesday, the Thirtieth day of April Two Thousand Nineteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP (MD) No.6569 of 2019

PONRAJ,

... PETITIONER / SOLE ACCUSED

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
TUTICORIN DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.5 OF 2019)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : MR.S.GOKUL RAJ Advocate

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

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences under Sections 506(i) I.P.C and Section 9 (f), 11(1) r/w 12 of POSCO Act, in Crime No.5 of 2019, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is a English Teacher, working in SEE.Na.Va.Na. Government Higher Secondary School. While taking class, he had misbehaved with girl students. For which, 13 girl students made a complaint before the Headmaster. Since, the Headmaster failed to take action against the petitioner, they filed a complaint before the Superintendent of Police, in which, F.I.R has been registered.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He also submitted that the Headmaster, namely Sengurkani, had misappropriated the school funds and indulged in other illegal activities. When the petitioner made a representation under the Right Information Act, the said representation was rejected, against which, the petitioner had filed



an appeal before the DEO, Tuticorin. Since the proper reply has not been given by the appellate authority, the petitioner had filed second appeal under the RTI Act before the Commissioner. The second appeal is also pending. Further the petitioner requested the DEO, in respect of the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant and other girl students and also the petitioner had sought for information including the CCTV Footage regarding the conversation between the headmaster and the students before lodging the complaint against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed for anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that out of 13 girls, 8 victims' statement were recorded and all the 8 victims categorically made an allegation against the petitioner in respect of his misbehaviour with the students. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of this case and considering the nature of allegation levelled against the petitioner, the petitioner is school teacher, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
30/04/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
TUTICORIN DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to MR.S.GOKUL RAJ Advocate SR.No.7082

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.6569 of 2019
Date :30/04/2019

AE/PN/SAR-II/ (08.05.2019) 2P 4C