

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.08.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

CrI.O.P.No. 11189 of 2020

C.Rajesh @ Puratchi Rajesh
S/o. Chandran
No.155/53, Amman Koil Street,
Lakshmipuram, Kolathur, Chennai – 99 ... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
M-3, Puzhal Police Station,
Chennai.
Cr. No. 28 of 2020 ... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.,
praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime
No.28 of 2020 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Agni
For Respondent : Mr.S.Karthikeyan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 307 of IPC in Crime No.28 of 2020, seeks anticipatory bail..

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that he is a Legal Advisor of RB Enterprises. Based on the information received from the company Supervisor viz., Balakumaran, the defacto complainant rushed to the occurrence place and at that time, the petitioner and 3 others were objecting their construction. They were joined together and attacked the defacto complainant on his head and caused injuries.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is a social worker and he never involved such activities and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays for grant of Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that there are six previous cases against the petitioner and another case in Crime No.27 of 2020 on the file of the same respondent police. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submitted that earlier this Court had dismissed the Anticipatory Bail petition in Crl.O.P.No.10967 of 2020 dated 24.07.2020. He further submitted that there is no change in circumstances. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that there is no change in circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

WEB COPY 03.08.2020

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-Speaking order
dh

To

1. The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Madhavaram.
2. The Inspector of Police (Law & Order),
M-3, Puzhal Police Station,
Chennai.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J

dh



CrI.O.P.No.11189 of 2020

WEB COPY 03.08.2020