



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS  
( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Monday, the Twentieth day of September Two Thousand Twenty One

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.17053 of 2021

1 EDMON  
2 KAMESH

[ PETITIONER / ACCUSED ]

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY  
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
T14-MANGADU POLICE STATION.  
CRIME NO.854 OF 2021.

[ RESPONDENT ]

For Petitioner : M/S. R.THIRUMOORTHY Advocate

For Respondent : MR. A.GOPINATH, Govt. Advocate ( Crl. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, apprehends arrest at the hands of respondent police for the offences under Sections 294(b), 324, 506(ii) of I.P.C in Crime.No.854 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner herein is working as a cable operator under the first petitioner, who influenced him to reside in the house of the second petitioner as a tenant. Subsequently the defacto complainant vacated his own house and shifted to the second petitioner's house as a tenant. After some time, as the defacto complainant is not able to give rent, he had decided to vacate his house and to shift to his own house and the same was prevented by the petitioners herein, due to which, the petitioners abused and attacked the defacto complainant with Aruval and caused injuries to him. Hence the law enforcing agency registered a case against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Therefore, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted there was some tenancy dispute between the petitioners and the defacto complainant and when the defacto complainant started to vacate the house, the petitioners prevented him to vacate the house and attacked the defacto complainant with Aruval and caused injuries to him. Hence he vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts of the case and the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly this Criminal Original petition 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,  
T14-MANGADU POLICE STATION.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,  
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

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

CRL OP.17053/2021

Date :20/09/2021

INBA-07/10/2021