



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Thirty First day of August Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.15618 of 2021

VIKRAMA

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP. BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
W-24, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
TEYNAMPET,
CHENNAI.
CRIME NO.02 OF 2019

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.R.PRATHAP KUMAR Advocate

For Respondent : MR.C.E.PRATAP, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : M/S.SASI KUMAR Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner who was arrested by the respondent police for an offence under Sections 498-A & 417 IPC in Crime No.2 of 2019, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the defacto complainant is a victim girl who developed a love affair with the petitioner and had a sexual relationship before marriage and was 7 months pregnant. The petitioner and the defacato complainant got married on 17.03.2019. However the petitioner did not take care of his wife and he does not want to live along with the defacto complainant. Hence the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the case has been wrongly foisted against the petitioner. He further submitted that on earlier occasion, the anticipatory bail was



moved before this court in Crl.O.P.No.13426 of 2019, the same was referred to mediation on 22.05.2019. However, the petitioner alone had appeared before the High court Mediation and Conciliation Centre and the defacto complainant has not even appeared. The aforesaid anticipatory bail was withdrawn as dismissed by this Court on 09.08.2019.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) submitted that the defacto complainant was pregnant at the time of marriage, now the child is 2 years old and the petitioner is not willing to live along with the defacto complainant. He further submitted that on earlier occasions 3 anticipatory bail petitions were moved by the petitioner and the same were dismissed. Hence, the learned Government Advocate vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. In view of the submission made by the learned Government Advocate that on earlier occasions 3 anticipatory bails were moved by the petitioner and the same were dismissed, no change of circumstances arises for consideration in the present anticipatory bail petition. Hence, this Criminal Original petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
31/08/2021

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-24, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
TEYNAMPET, CHENNAI.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.R.PRATHAP KUMAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.NO. 9401

CRL OP.15618/2021

Date :31/08/2021

JPA 14/09/2021