



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 22/09/2020

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice V.BHARATHIDASAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.10111 of 2020

1. Dhandapani @ Thaendapani
2. Kavitha

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 2

Vs

State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Keeranur Police Station,
Dindigul District.
In Crime No. 800 of 2020.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Sasikumar,
Advocate.

For Respondent : M/s.S.E. Veronica Vincent,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

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

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No.800 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners who are arrayed as A-1 & A-2 apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 294(b), 323, 427 and 506(i) of IPC, in Crime No.800 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that earlier the petitioners and the defacto complainant are running Ohm Muruga Brick Chamber. Due to dispute regarding partnership, the petitioners left the firm run by the defacto complainant. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners said to have trespassed into the brick chamber and abused the defacto complainant by using filthy language and assaulted him and also caused damage to the machines. Hence, the complaint.



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

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and partnership dispute is pending between the parties and due to the same, the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that they have not caused any damage to the machines. Hence, he seek anticipatory bail.

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police.

6. Considering the fact and circumstances of the case and considering the fact that partnership dispute is pending between the parties, due to the same, occurrence taken place in a wordy quarrel, this Court is 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 Court, Palani, 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/-
22/09/2020

WEB COPY

/ 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, PALANI.
- 2.DO THRO'THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 3.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KEERANUR POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 4.THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to Mr.R.SASI KUMAR, Advocate (SR-6586[I] dated 23/09/2020)

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10111 of 2020
Date :22/09/2020

ksa
AE/JC/SAR-I (28.09.2020) 3P 6C