

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the Twenty Second day of March Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice V. BHARATHIDASAN

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.5534 of 2021

S.ANANDARAJ @ ANAND SIDDHARTH [PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP BY [RESPONDENT]
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
W-20, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
SAIDAPET,
CHENNAI-600 015.
(CR.NO.1/2021)

For Petitioner : M/S.M.PREMKUMAR Advocate

For Respondent : MR.S.KARTHIKEYAN, ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

ORDER

(The case has been heard through video conference)

The petitioner/A1, who apprehends arrest in connection with the case in Crime No.1 of 2021 on the file of the respondent police for the alleged offence u/s 376, 417, 420, 294(b), 506(2) and 509 of IPC, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The de facto complainant is stated to be a practising lawyer. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant and the petitioner said to have developed friendship through social media platform which later on turned into love. The petitioner, after giving false promise that he would marry her, had physical relationship with her on multiple occasions. But, later on, he had refused to marry her. When she questioned the same, the petitioner and his friends, who have been arrayed as A2 to A7, have abused her in filthy language, insulted her modesty, criminally intimidated her and also spread false information about her modesty on social media platforms.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner and the de facto complainant were only friends and the petitioner had never promised to marry her and had physical relations at any point of time. The de facto complainant expressed her love to the petitioner and wanted to marry her. When the petitioner has not accept the love proposal, a false complaint has been given against him.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would stoutly oppose the petition for anticipatory bail. He would submit that serious allegation of rape is made and the investigation is pending.

5. Considering the gravity of the offence and seriousness of the allegations made against the 1st petitioner for which custodial interrogation may be required, this court is of the view that it is not a fit case for granting anticipatory bail and the petition deserves only to be dismissed.

In the result, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

22/03/2021

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,
W-20, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
SAIDAPET,
CHENNAI.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

CC to M/S.M.PREMKUMAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.5534/2021

Date :22/03/2021

TA-21/04/2021