



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

Date : 25/08/2020

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice V.BHARATHIDASAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.8608 of 2020

1. R.Bangaru
2. B. Krishnakumar ... Petitioners/Accused No.1and2

Vs

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Kollidam Police Station,
Trichy District,
Crime No.785/2020. ... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners: Mr.M.Karunanithi,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.K. Suyambulinga Bharathi,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.785/2020 on the file of the respondent police

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as Accused Nos.1 and 2, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 379 of IPC, in Crime No.785 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and the defacto complainant are residing in the same apartments. On the date of occurrence, there was a wordy quarrel between the parties in respect of occupation of terrace, for which, the petitioners said to have attacked the defacto complainant and her son with hands and caused injuries and also snatched the chain from the defacto complainant. Hence, the present complaint.



3. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent Police.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that due to wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant by using of terrace and the defacto complainant's chain was found missing and the petitioners have not taken the chain as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he seek anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), appearing for the respondent police submitted that due to dispute with regard to the occupation of terrace, the petitioners said to have attacked the defacto complainant and his son with hands and also snatched chain from the defacto complainant. He further submitted that the chain not yet to be recovered.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the occurrence said to have taken place in a wordy quarrel and there is no overt act attributed against the petitioners, hence, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or their appearance, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Trichy, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent Police or to the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;



(e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]; and;

(f) if the accused/petitioners thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

sd/-
25/08/2020

/ 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 JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.III,
TRICHY.
2. DO THROUGH
THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
TRICHY.
3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KOLLIDAM POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DISTRICT.
4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.8608 of 2020
Date :25/08/2020

VSG

<https://hccs.es.ecm.gov.in/AdServices/> 27.08.2020/ 3P/5C