



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 20/01/2020

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice G.R.SWAMINATHAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.18761 of 2019

Senthil Kumar, ... Petitioner/Accused Rank No.1

Vs.

State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Valliyoor, Tirunelveli District.
In Crime No.13 of 2019.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s. S. Mohammed Kasim,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.A.Robinson,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.V.Meenakshi Sundaram

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.13 of 2019 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for the defacto complainant and the learned Government Advocate(Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent.

2. The petitioner apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 294(b), 406, 498(A) and 506(i) of I.P.C., and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, in Crime No.13 of 2019 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

3.The petitioner and his parents as well as sister and her husband filed Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17472 of 2019 before this Court. By a detailed order dated 27.11.2019, I granted bail to the petitioners 2 to 5 therein, while denying the relief to the petitioner herein. Thereafter, the petitioner has renewed his petition for anticipatory



bail by filing this criminal original petition. By order dated 16.12.2019, I suggested that the petitioner can go to the house of the defacto complainant (his wife) and take his child as well as wife back to the matrimonial home. In fact, interim protection was also given to the petitioner herein.

WEB COPY

4.Today, when the matter was taken up, the petitioner's counsel stated that the petitioner received a phone call from the Deputy Superintendent of Police stating that a fresh complaint has been received against the petitioner. That is why, the petitioner did not go to the house of the defacto complainant.

5.The defacto complainant's counsel Thiru.V.Meenakshi Sundaram categorically asserted that no fresh complaint has been given to the police.

6.I fail to understand the conduct of the petitioner. This Court had specifically given interim protection to the petitioner, so that, the petitioner can reunite with his wife and child. But it appears that the petitioner is not interested. The reasons which impelled me to dismiss the petition for anticipatory bail earlier, still hold good. I am not inclined to grant relief. Hence, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

sd/-
20/01/2020

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2020

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
VALLIYIOOR, TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

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

+1 CC to M/s.S.MOHAMMAD KASIM, Advocate (SR-944[I] dated 20/01/2020)

+1 CC to M/s.V.MEENAKSHI SUNDRAM, Advocate (SR-963[I] dated 20/01/2020)

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.18761 of 2019
Date :20/01/2020

rmi

<https://hcs9001.scribd.com/document/5244012020> 2P 5C