



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the Twentieth day of September Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.16645 of 2021

PATTABIRAMAN @ PALAI PATTABIRAMAN

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
EDAIYUR POLICE STATION,
TIRUVARUR DISTRICT
CR NO.360/2021

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.N.PALANIVEL Advocate

For Respondent : M/S. C.E.PRATAP, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : M/S. P.VIJENDRAN Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 294(b), 352, 506(1) of IPC and Section 24 of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007 in Cr.No.360 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the father of the petitioner and the petitioner had failed to maintain his father. Thereby, the defacto complainant made a complaint before the Revenue Divisional Officer with respect to getting maintenance from the petitioner. Further, RDO issued summons to the petitioner and immediately, thereafter the petitioner attacked the defacto complainant. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the law enforcing agency against the petitioner.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He



further submits that the petitioner had properly maintained his mother and his father used to consume alcohol. In order to grab the money from the petitioner, defacto complainant filed a false complaint before the law enforcing agency and the petitioner also filed affidavit before this Court. Furthermore, he submits that the petitioner is the president of Valarum Tamilagam political party. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the petitioner was unable to maintain his father/defacto complainant and also attacked the defacto complainant. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner attacking his father, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition seeking anticipatory bail is dismissed.

-sd/-

20/09/2021

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,
EDAIYUR POLICE STATION, TIRUVARUR
DISTRICT
CR NO.360/2021

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.N.PALANIVEL Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.No.10352

+1 CC to M/S.P.VIJENDRAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.No.10325

CRL OP.16645/2021

Date :20/09/2021

APN 06/10/2021