

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.11.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.OP.No.17220 of 2020

S.Chandran

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep. By its
The Inspector of Police,
Nannilam Police Station,
Thiruvavarur District.
(Cr. No.1332 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.1332 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Malaviya

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

ORDER

(This case has been heard through video conference)

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 352, 323, 506(i) IPC and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Women Harassment Act, later the same was altered to the offence under Section 294(b), 352, 323, 506(i), 417, 376 IPC and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Women Harassment Act IPC in Crime No.1332 of 2020, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had love affair with the defacto complainant, who is the neighbour to him. Due to which the petitioner had sexual relationship with the defacto complainant and later he failed to marry her. Hence the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that this is the third anticipatory bail petition. Hence, he prays for grant of

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He further submitted that this is the third anticipatory bail petition and the earlier petitions were withdrawn by the respective counsels. He would also submit that it is a case where the victim girl had sexual intercourse with the petitioner herein and during the Covid-19 period, the petitioner had married another lady secretly. Further allegations against the petitioner is that he along with his parents assaulted the defacto complainant and prevented her from giving complaint as against the petitioner. He further stated that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required and that he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent and also perused the materials available on record.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

10/11/2020

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,
NANNILAM POLICE STATION,
THIRUVARUR DISTRICT.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

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

CRL OP.17220/2020

Date :10/11/2020