



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.14440 of 2021

1 JAYALAKSHMI
2 SELVARAJ

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOEMN POLICE STATION,
GINGEE,
VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.
CRIME NO. 24 OF 2021.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S. C.PRABAKARAN Advocate

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

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 294(b), 323, 506(i), 417, 376, 313 and 109 of I.P.C. in Cr.No.24 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that A1 is the son of the petitioners. There was a love affair and physical intimacy between the defacto-complainant and A1. Due to which she got pregnant and further the A1 compelled her to abort the child. It is alleged by the defacto complainant that both got married on 12.01.2016, without the consent of her parents. Thereafter, A1 had refused to live along with the defacto complainant, inspite of several requests made by her. It is the further case of prosecution that A1 has borrowed Rs.80,000/-



and 3 sovereigns of gold from the defacto complainant on various occasions. Hence the case was lodged by the defacto-complainant against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the investigation is pending in this case and the main culprits are the petitioners who restricts A1 from living with the defacto complainant. Hence he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case that on perusal of Section 164 Statement, a serious allegation was made against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition seeking anticipatory bail 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 PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
GINGEE, VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

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

CRL OP.14440/2021

Date : 31/08/2021

RW 14/09/2021