

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.06.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Cr1.O.P.No.9521 of 2020

1. Rasappan
2. Vimal Raj
3. Jaisankar

... Petitioners

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Nanila Police Station,
Tirvarur District.
Cr. No.1159 of 2020

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.,
praying to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their
arrest in Crime No.1159 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr. T. Muruganantham

For Respondent : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz,
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

The petitioners who apprehends apprehend arrest at the hands of
the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections
294(b), 352 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.1159 of 2020 seek
anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and the
defacto complainant are neighbours and there was a wordy quarrel
between them and it is alleged that the petitioners abused the defacto
complainant with unparliamentary words. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the
petitioners are innocent persons and there was only a wordy quarrel
between the defacto complainant and the petitioners. The petitioners
did not assault the defacto complainant or any other person and there
was no previous case pending against the petitioners. Therefore, he
prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that there was a wordy quarrel between the defacto complainant and the petitioners. Further the petitioners abused the defacto complainant with unparliamentary words and threatened him. Hence he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the above fact and circumstances of the case and the fact that there was only a wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant and there was no previous case pending against the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Nanillam on condition that each of the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

-sd/-
29/06/2020

This order, on being produced, be punctually observed and carried into execution by all concerned

TRUE COPY

Sub-Assistant Registrar (Statistics/C.S.)
High Court, Madras - 600 104.

TO

1 THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, NANILLAM.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
NANILA POLICE STATION,
TIRUVARUR DISTRICT

CC to M/S.T.MURUGANANTHAM Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.9521/2020

Date :29/06/2020

cs 24/07/2020

WEB COPY