

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.07.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CrI.OP.No.11387 of 2020

1. Viji @ Vijayan
2. Pugalenthil @ Manoj

Petitioners/Accused No.2 & 4

-Vs-

The state of Tamil Nadu rep.by
Inspector of Police,
Vedaranyam Police station,
Nagapattinam District.
Cr.No.990 of 2020

Respondent/Complainant

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.990 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : M/s.S.N.Subramani

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

ORDER

(This case has been heard through video conference)

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) and 307 of IPC in Cr. No.990 of 2020, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that when the defacto complainant questioning the immoral act of the petitioner and others, who were taken liquor near the Perumal koil, the petitioner and other two accused attacked the defacto complainant Rajasekar with knife and wooden log and caused injury to him. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners submitted that factually, there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the accused with respect to civil dispute and that the petitioners were not involved in any offence as alleged and that the defacto complainant attacked the petitioners and to take revenge on the petitioners, a false case has been foisted against them. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the accused were consuming liquor near the temple and when the defacto complainant questioned the same, there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant and the petitioners used aruval and caused injury on the head of the defacto complainant. He further submitted that the injured is still in the hospital and there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Taking into consideration the facts and submissions of the learned Counsel and the fact that the injured is still in the hospital, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. This Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
30/07/2020

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 INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VEDARANYAM POLICE STATION,
NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

CC to M/S.S.N.SUBRAMANI Advocate on payment of necessary charges

WEB COPY

CRL OP.11387/2020

Date :30/07/2020

cs 28/08/2020