

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.12.2020

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN

CrI.O.P.No.19606 of 2020

1.Varghees
2.Jesintha Mary

... Petitioners

Vs.

State by
The Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station,
Gingee Taluk,
Villupuram District.
(Crime No.10/2020)

.... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.10 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.V.Ashok Kumar

For Respondent : Mrs.T.P.Savitha
Government Advocate.

ORDER

(The case has been heard through video conferencing)

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 417, 420, 406, 376, 506(i), 109 of IPC r/w 66 (E) of I.T.Act, in Crime No.10 of 2020, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the defacto complainant is that she is a staff in Panchayat Union Office, Cuddalore District. At the assurance of these petitioners, she has married one Joseph Stalin, after coming to know about him through Bharath Matrimony. The allegation found in the complaint is that the said Joseph Stalin is already married person having 14 years old son. Suppressing the fact, he married the defacto complainant. These two petitioners who are the relatives of the said Joseph Stalin, has mislead the defacto complainant assuring about the character of the Joseph Stalin and allowed the defacto complainant and the first accused stay in their house.

3. In this petition, it is contended that these petitioners have never suppressed any fact from the defacto complainant and they came to know about the marriage between the defacto complainant and the said Joseph Stalin, only after they got married.

4. The learned Government Advocate would submit that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant/Nirmala, enquiry was conducted and found that the first accused/Joseph Stalin suppressing the first marriage, with the help of these petitioners, has married the defacto complainant and also extracted money. Some of the obscene photos of the defacto complainant was taken at the petitioners' house and these petitioners have provided shelter for A1 to do the illegal act. The learned Government Advocate would further submit that the 1st accused was granted bail and he has not furnished the surety and not complied the bail condition. Whereas these petitioners are absconding. Therefore it is difficult to progress with the investigation.

5. On considering the gravity of the offence and the submission made by the learned Government Advocate, this Court finds that there is no change in circumstances to reconsider the anticipatory bail. Hence, this petition for Anticipatory Bail is dismissed.

-sd/-

16/12/2020

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,
GINGEE.

2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
VILLUPURAM. [FOR INFORMATION]

3 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
GINGEE TALUK,
VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

CC to M/S V.ASHOK KUMAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.19606/2020

Date :16/12/2020