



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

Friday, the Nineteenth day of November Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.20816 of 2021

and CrI.M.P.No.11916 of 2021

A.JAYASHANKAR

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
KILPAUK,
CHENNAI DISTRICT.
CR.NO.14 OF 2021.

[RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT]

For Petitioner : M/S S.N.ARUNKUMAR ADVOCATE


For Respondent : MR.S.SUGENDRAN, Govt. Advocate (CrI. Side)

For Intervenor : M/S.G.MOHANA KRISHNAN Advocate

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 498(A), 294(b) and 506(i) of IPC in Cr.No.14 of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the marriage was performed between the defacto complainant and the petitioner in the year 2019 and the other accused persons are in-laws of the defacto complainant. There was no compatibility between the petitioner and the defacto complainant due to which the petitioner along with other accused persons demanded additional dowry from the defacto complainant and threatened her with dire consequences. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against the petitioner. Thereby, the law enforcing agency registered a case 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. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that petitioner along with other accused persons demanded additional dowry from the defacto complainant and threatened her with dire consequences. He further submits that earlier, this Court has dismissed the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.18315 of 2021 dated 01.10.2021 and this is the second petition filed by him. Hence, he vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner and that earlier anticipatory bail petition was dismissed by this Court and there is no change of circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore, this criminal original petition is dismissed. Though intervening application is filed in Crl.M.P.No.11916 of 2021, no orders is yet to be passed in this intervening petition. Accordingly, the MP.No.11916 of 2021 is also dismissed.

-sd/-

19/11/2021

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,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI DISTRICT.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.S.N.ARUNKUMAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.No.13109

CRL OP.20816/2021

and

Crl.M.P.No.11916/2021

Date :19/11/2021

APN 30/11/2021