



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Seventeenth day of August Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.14460 of 2021

1 SEKAR
2 SHAKILA
3 S.BALAJI
4 S.MARUDHU PANDI

[PETITIONERS / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
W-16, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
PULIANTHOPE,
CHENNAI.
CRIME NO. 3 OF 2021.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S. S.ARUMUGAM Advocate

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

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 366-A, 506(ii) IPC 5(1) r/w 6,7 of POCSO Act in Crime No.3 of 2021 seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that A1 one Thirumalai has made a call to one Kavya which ended a wrong call to the defacto complainant viz., Sabitha after which repeated calls and torture from A1 made her to fall in love. Thereafter, they had performed marriage. The petitioners herein had threatened the defacto complainant to bring dowry, the same was questioned by her , due to which, A1 and the petitioners joined together and attacked the victim girl. It is further alleged the defacto complainant came to know that A1 had love



affair with several girls and performed marriage with one Nithya and they had lived together. The petitioners have not informed the same to her. Based on the complaint made by the defacto complainant, the law enforcing agency registered the case against the petitioners.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are in-laws and they are in no way connected with any such offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submits that the statement under Section 164 has been recorded from the victim girl in which, the defacto complainant stated that A1 had love affair with several girls and performed marriage with one Nithya and they are lived together and the same was not informed by the petitioners and they also supported their son/A1.

5. Considering the allegations made against the petitioners and a perusal of 164 statement, and also considering the gravity of offences committed by the petitioners, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

17/08/2021

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 PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
W-16, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
PULIANTHOPE, CHENNAI.

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

CRL OP.14460/2021

Date :17/08/2021

RW 22/09/2021