

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 11.02.2021

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. BHARATHIDASAN

Crl.O.P.No.2408 of 2021

1. G.R.Apparaj ... Petitioners
2. M.Mohamed Ali

Vs.

The State Rep. by ... Respondent
The Inspector of Police,
F-1 Chintadripet Police Station
Chennai.
(Crime No.183 of 2018)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 438 of Criminal Procedure Code to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.183 of 2018 pending investigation on the file of the Respondent.

For Petitioners: Mr.V.Manohar

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

ORDER

(The case has been heard through video conference)

The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 294(b) and 506(1) of I.P.C., in Crime No. 183 of 2018, on the file of the respondent police, and now, they have filed this petition seeking to grant anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the occurrence was taken place in the year 2018. Due to a dispute between two rival groups in a fish market, there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant, as a result of which, they said to have abused and attacked the defacto complainant. In the said circumstances, the criminal case has been registered against them and now, they are seeking anticipatory bail.

3. The learned counsel appearing for petitioners would submit that on the date of occurrence, due to a dispute between two rival groups in a fish market, there was a wordy quarrel between the parties. He would submit that they are innocent persons, they are no way connected with the offence as alleged in the complaint and they

have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that due to a dispute between two rival groups in a fish market, there was a wordy quarrel, and they have attacked the defacto complainant, thereby caused injury. He would submit that the injured was discharged from the hospital and there is no previous case pending against the petitioners. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Taking into consideration the fact that the occurrence took place in the year 2018, due to a dispute between two rival groups in a fish market, in which, there was a wordy quarrel between them, the injured was discharged from the hospital and there is no previous case pending against the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

a) Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

[b] 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;

[c] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation;

[d] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

[e] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[f] 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];

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

6. With the above directions, this Criminal Original Petition is ordered.

-sd/-
11/02/2021

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 XIV METRTOPOLITAN MAGISTRATE,
EGMORE.

2 THE CHEIF METRTOPOLITAN MAGISTRATE,
EGMORE[FOR INFORMATION].

3 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
F-1 CHINTADRI PET POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI DISTRICT.

+1 CC to M/S.V.MANO HAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges
SR NO. 1459

सत्यमेव जयते

CRL OP.2408/2021

Date :11/02/2021

WEB COPY

MN-19/02/2021