



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Wednesday, the Twenty Seventh day of October Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.18615 of 2021

1 NARAYANASWAMY [PETITIONERS / ACCUSED]
2 VIGNESH @ GOPI @ GOPINATH
3 PRABAHAKARAN
4 PRAVEEN KUMAR

Vs

STATE REP BY [RESPONDENT]
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
D2, CHENGALPATTU TALUK POLICE STATION,
CHENGALPATTU,
KANCHEEPURAM DISTRICT
(CRIME NO.709 of 2021)

For Petitioners : M/S.M.MOHANASUNDARAM 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 petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 447, 294(b), 323 & 506(i) of I.P.C & Section 4 of Prohibition of Women Harassment Act in Crime No.709 of 2021, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the De-facto Complainant leaving his wife at home, took his mother to the temple to perform some pooja and when the same was questioned by the petitioners who are the in-laws of the De-facto Complainant, a wordy quarrel arose between the petitioners and the De-facto Complainant due to which the petitioners kicked the De-facto Complainant's mother and threatened him with dire consequences. Hence the complaint.



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. He further submitted that at the time of marriage and even after the marriage, the De-facto Complainant and his mother demanded dowry from 1st petitioner's daughter and did not take care of her and further he submits that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. Hence he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned counsel for the intervener submitted that the De-facto Complainant's mother was attacked by the petitioners due to which she was admitted in the hospital. Hence he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate submitted that though the injured has been discharged from the hospital, for the injuries suffered, continuous treatment is being given to the injured and, therefore, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, though it is claimed that it is a family dispute between the parties, however, considering the fact that the injured is still taking treatment continuously in the hospital, though she has been discharged from the hospital, in view of the gravity of the offence committed by the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the petition seeking anticipatory bail is dismissed.

-sd/-
27/10/2021

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,
D2, CHENGALPATTU TALUK POLICE STATION,
CHENGALPATTU,
KANCHEEPURAM DISTRICT



2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.M.MOHANASUNDARAM
charges SR.NO.12192

Advocate on payment of necessary

CRL OP.18615/2021

Date :27/10/2021

JPA 16/11/2021