



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Thursday, the Sixteenth day of June Two Thousand Twenty Two

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.13901 of 2022

1 M.JEMINI
2 SATHISH KUMAR
3 S.REVATHI
4 J.PALANIYAMMAL

[PETITIONERS/ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
VALAPPADY POLICE STATION,
SALEM DISTRICT.
CRIME NO.330 OF 2022.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.S.SENTHILVEL, Advocate

For Respondent : MR.A.DAMODARAN, Additional Public Prosecutor,

For Intervener : M/S.R.SANKARASUBBU, Advocate

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 offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC altered into Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 307 & 506(ii) of IPC in crime No.330 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant's grandfather had a property of 2 acre and 70 cent and the same was equally divided into four shares, for which the defacto complainant's uncle quarrelled with the defacto complainant before eight months. In respect of the same, a complaint was also lodged by the said uncle. While being so, on 23.05.2022, when the defacto complainant was



proceeding to his street, at that time, the said uncle and two others i.e. Sathishkumar and Mageswaran quarrelled with the defacto complainant. On 24.05.2022 at about 6.00 p.m, the defacto complainant's another uncle and the brother of the defacto complainant took photo of the house. At that time, the defacto complainant's uncles attacked the defacto complainant and his brother. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioners are arrayed as A1, 2, 4 & 5. He would further submit that the injured was discharged from the hospital on 27.05.2022.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submitted that the accused persons had caused severe injuries, for which he also produced relevant photographs. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering that the accused persons had caused severe injuries, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
16/06/2022

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
VALAPPADY POLICE STATION,
SALEM DISTRICT.



2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.S.SENTHILVEL, Advocate on payment of necessary
charges SR.NO.9240

CRL OP.13901/2022

Date :16/06/2022

TA-22/06/2022