



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Wednesday, the Twenty Seventh day of April Two Thousand Twenty Two

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Dr Justice G. JAYACHANDRAN

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.9567 of 2022

SUGIRTHA WISELET

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

THE STATE REP BY ITS,
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
MADHAVARAM POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI DISTRICT
CRIME NO.NOT KNOWN OF 2022.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.G.PUNNIAKOTI Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.S.SANTHOSH, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)


For Intervener : M/S.P.VELUMANIYAN, Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner herein, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 294 (b), 323 and 506(ii) of IPC, in Crime No.not known of 2022, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The petitioner herein earlier approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail and on representation of the learned Government Advocate (crl.side) that the C.S.R.No.970 of 2021 is pending, this Court vide order dated 23.03.2022 disposed of the petition with a direction to the respondent police to complete the enquiry, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order and not to arrest the petitioner till then, provided she cooperate for enquiry. This order came to be passed on the



undertaking given by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner will cooperate for the enquiry. However, it appears that the petitioner has not attended the enquiry inspite of summons. Suppressing the said fact, the second anticipatory bail petition is filed for the very same reason.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the de facto complainant has produced the earlier order and submitted that the petitioner herein, having cheated the de facto complainant, has now suppressing the earlier order and come before this Court.

4. This Court verified the records and on hearing the submissions of the learned Government Advocate (crl.side), who states that inspite of summons, the petitioner did not appear for enquiry. Therefore, earlier undertaking given to this Court by him that the respondent police will complete the enquiry in C.S.R.No.970 of 2021 within three weeks could not be completed.

5. Taking note of the above fact, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

27/04/2022

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,
MADHAVARAM POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI DISTRICT

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

CC to M/S.G.PUNNIAKOTI Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.9567/2022

Date :27/04/2022

RW 12/05/2022