

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17..02..2021

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.BHARATHIDASAN

CrI.O.P.No.3002 of 2021

Raja

... Petitioner

-Versus-

The State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
J-3, Guindy Police Station,
Chennai 600 032.
[Crime No.862 of 2020]

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 of Criminal Procedure Code praying to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.862 of 2020 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Abrar Ahmed

For Respondent : Mr.S.Karthikeyan,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police in connection with a case registered in Crime No.862 of 2020 for the alleged offence under Sections 341, 294(b), 323 and 506(i) of IPC, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. There are totally three accused in this case and the petitioner has been arrayed as A3. The allegation is that when the de facto complainant, who has been working as Additional Secretary to Government, Tourism Culture and Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department was about to initiate an action against a friend of A1, the petitioner informed A1 to threaten the de facto complainant. Accordingly, A1 along with the petitioner/A3 and two others said to have watched over the movement of the de facto complainant for two days prior to the occurrence and on the date of occurrence, they attacked the de facto complainant and

assaulted him with hands and also criminally intimidated him with dire consequences. Hence, a case was registered on a complaint from the de facto complainant.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offence and he has been falsely implicated. A simple road rage brawl has been given the colour of criminal offence. According to the learned counsel, the co-accused who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody, had been released on bail.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the granting of anticipatory bail. According to him, some other accused persons are still absconding.

5. Considering the seriousness of the offence and the gravity of the allegations made against the petitioner, this court is of the considered view that it is not a fit case for the grant of anticipatory bail. Thus, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed accordingly.

-sd/-

17/02/2021

This order, on being produced, be punctually observed and carried into execution by all concerned

TRUE COPY

Sub-Assistant Registrar (Statistics/C.S.)
High Court, Madras - 600 104.

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
J-3 GUINDY POLICE STATION, सत्यमेव जयते
CHENNAI-600 032.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.A.ABRAR AHMED Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.No.1802

CRL OP.3002/2021

Date :17/02/2021

cs 01/03/2021