

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.08.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Cr1.OP.No.12592 of 2020

Dineshkumar @ Chempetty Dinesh,
S/o Velayutham

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State represented by
The Inspector of police,
E-3, Teynampet Police Station,
Chennai District.
Crime No.763 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 arrest in
Crime No.763 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Ramamoorthy

For Respondent : Mr.K.Prabakar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(This case has been heard through video conference)

The petitioner who apprehend arrest at the hands of the
respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 147,
148, 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506 (ii) IPC, in Crime No.763 of 2020,
on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that two juvenile boys drove
two wheeler in a rash manner in the area of the defacto complainant
and when the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, on the
information of the two juvenile boys, the petitioner with the other
accused went to the place of the defacto complainant and attacked him
and robbed Rs.2,000/-. Hence the complaint.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner is innocent and that a false complaint has been foisted
against him and also submitted that the co-accused are enlarged on
bail by this Court. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail
to the petitioner.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed

the grant of bail and submitted that two juvenile boys drove two wheeler in a rash manner in the area of the defacto complainant and when the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, on the information of the two juvenile boys, the petitioner with the other accused went to the place of the defacto complainant and attacked and also taken away an amount of Rs.2,000/- from him and also submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and he is involved in seven previous cases registered under the Teynampet Police Station.

5. Taking into consideration the facts and submissions of the learned Counsel and the fact that there are seven previous cases pending against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

21/08/2020

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 METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE,
NO.XVIII, SAIDAPET, CHENNAI

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
E-3, TEYNAMPET POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI DISTRICT.

CC to R.RAMAMOORTHY Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.12592/2020

Date :21/08/2020

RD 10/09/2020