



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 07.12.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Cr1.O.P.No.18998 of 2020

1. Ramalingam
2. Annamalai
3. Saminathan
4. Govindaraj

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State Represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Jamunamarathur Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District.
(Cr.No.527 of 2020)

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Connection with the Crime No.527 of 2020 pending on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners: Mr.G.Vinodh Kumar

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 alleged offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 448, 294 (b), 506 (ii), 379 of IPC r/w. Section 3 of TNPP (D&R) Act, in Crime No.527 of 2020, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Rajendran was murdered and in retaliation, the petitioners along with other accused had entered into the house of the de-facto complainant and ransacked the entire house. Hence, the complaint.



3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that this the second anticipatory bail application. He would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioners are relatives. Due to property dispute, one Rajendran was murdered by one Annamalai and hence, the petitioners and other accused trespassed into the house of the de-facto complainant's father and ransacked the entire house. He would further submit that A2 to A6 and A10 are in custody and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is very much required. He would further submit that this is the second anticipatory bail application and this Court had very recently dismissed the earlier application and there are no change in circumstances in this case. However, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and that this Court had very recently dismissed the anticipatory bail petition filed by these petitioners and there are no change in circumstances in this case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
07/12/2020

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 JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
VANIYAMPADI.

2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
TIRUVANNAMALAI [FOR INFORMATION].



3 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
JAMUNAMARATHUR POLICE STATION,
THIRUVANNAMALAI DISTRICT.

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

CRL OP.18998/2020

Date :07/12/2020

MN-15/12/2020