



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 12/10/2020

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL OP(MD).No.11171 of 2020

1.Julbahar
2.Benasir

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.3&4

Vs

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Keeranur,
Pudukkottai District.
(Crime No.11 of 2020)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners: Mr.P.Ganapathi Subramanian,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Ms.M.Ananthadevi,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.G.Mathavan
Advocate

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No.11 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as A3 & A4, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 406, 498(A) and 506(i) IPC., and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and Section 4 of the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Act, 2019, in Crime No.11 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to matrimonial dispute between the defacto complainant and the first accused, A1 sent the Talak letter to the defacto complainant through his father, the second accused. Hence, the complaint.



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

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 and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he seek anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), appearing for the respondent police submitted that there is matrimonial dispute between the defacto complainant and the first accused.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that there is a matrimonial dispute between the defacto complainant and A1, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or their appearance, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Keeranur, Pudukkottai District, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten 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



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/-
12/10/2020

/ 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,
KEERANUR, PUDUKKOTTAI DISTRICT.
2. -DO- THROUGH: THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
PUDUKKOTTAI DISTRICT.
3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
KEERANUR,
PUDUKKOTTAI DISTRICT.
4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.11171 of 2020
Date :12/10/2020

VSD
SRS/ SMA/SAR-III/ 16.10.2020/ 3P/5C