



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 21/10/2021
PRESENT

WEB COPY

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice B.PUGALENDHI

CRL OP(MD). No.15328 of 2021

Sathishkumar

... Petitioner/Accused No.6

Vs

The State rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
Palani Taluk Station,
Dindigul District.
Crime No.378 of 2021.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.S.SELVAKUMAR,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.T.SENTHIL KUMAR,
Additional Public Prosecutor

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory bail in Crime.No.378 of 2021 on the file of the Respondent Police

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 8(C) r/w.20(b)(ii)B of NDPS Act in Crime No.378 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 12.05.2021, on secret information, the respondent Police conducted a raid along with police party at Balasamuthiram Ellai Karuppasamy Kovil. At that time, they found the accused persons in possession of 1.500 kgs of Ganja. On seeing the respondent police, the accused persons tried to run away from the occurrence place, however, the accused No.1 has been arrested. On the basis of the confession statement of the first accused, the present case has been registered.

3. It appears that considering the nature of offence and that the petitioner has been implicated on the basis of the confession statement, this Court granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner and directed the respondent police to file a report as to the manner in which the petitioner has been arrayed as accused.



4. However, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor claims that the petitioner who has availed the benefit of the interim anticipatory bail on 07.10.2021, did not appear before the respondent Police even for a single day for interrogation.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the order copy has not been uploaded, he has not advised his client to appear before the respondent Police.

6. However, this Court passed the order in the presence of the learned counsel for the petitioner with a specific direction to appear before the respondent Police for a period of two weeks and co-operate for the investigation. But, the petitioner, taking advantage of the interim order, has failed to appear before the respondent Police.

7. Considering the conduct of the petitioner and the nature of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
21/10/2021

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2021
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

Note :In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate / litigant concerned.

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PALANI TALUK STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

**ORDER
IN**

CRL OP(MD) No.15328 of 2021
Date :21/10/2021

SA/SKN/SAR.4/26.10.2021/2P/3C