



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 02/06/2020

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Dr.Justice G.JAYACHANDRAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.5602 of 2020

1. Manickam

2. Saravanan

3. Pandian ... Petitioners/Accused Rank not known

Vs

The State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
Valanadu Police Station,
Trichy District.
(Crime No.Not Known/2020)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s A.Joel Paul Antony,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.A.P.G.Ohm Chairma Prabhu,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.438 of Cr.P.C

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime.No.Not Known of 2020 on the file of the Respondent Police.


ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent.

2.The petitioners apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of I.P.C., in Crime No.Not Known of 2020, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

3.Due to property dispute, these petitioners have gone to the house of the de-facto complainant and demanded the title document. At that time, the petitioners have attacked the de-facto complainant, his wife and son. The de-facto complainant had sustained head injury and he was admitted in the hospital as

<https://hcmjstc.courtsofmadras.gov.in/home> 07.05.2020 to 31.05.2020.



4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in support of the petition for anticipatory bail would submit that purely for a civil dispute a criminal color has been given to the issue by the de-facto complainant.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) appearing for the State would submit that the de-facto complainant was attacked by these petitioners indiscriminately with wooden rod. The wife of the de-facto complainant and son have also sustained injury, while they prevented the petitioners from attacking the de-facto complainant. If the petitioners were granted anticipatory bail, they will again attack the de-facto complainant and threatened him. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.Taking note of the fact that the petitioners have gone to the house of the de-facto complainant and attacked him after picking quarrel with him. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners is not conducive for the proper investigation.

6.Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

sd/-
02/06/2020

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2020
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

Note:

In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the Advocate/litigant concerned.

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
VALANADU POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DISTRICT

2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S A.JOEL PAUL ANTONY Advocate SR.No.5728

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.5602 of 2020
Date :02/06/2020

PD/VR/SAR 3/04.06.2020/2P/4C

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