



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

2. The case of the prosecution as per the *de-facto* complainant is that the petitioners along with other accused waylaid and molested the victim women and assaulted her husband and also snatched their mobile phones while they were standing in a beach. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He would submit that as per the case of the prosecution the petitioners were alleged to have snatched 2 mobile phones from the *de-facto* complainant. However, even as per the police, the complaint has been made by the *de-facto* complainant by calling police through her mobile phone and a false case has been foisted against them. Hence, he prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.



Crl.OP.No.26136 of 2022

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
mpl

4. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor (Puducherry) appearing

for the respondent would submit that the petitioners are habitual offenders having previous cases of similar nature. He would further submit that when the *de-facto* complainant and her husband were near the beach, the petitioners have misbehaved with the *de-facto* complainant, outraged her modesty and molested her. Later, they snatched the mobile phones from the *de-facto* complainant and her husband. The mobile phones have been snatched only after the victim has made a phone call to the police and he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. Taking into consideration the nature of the offence and also the fact that the petitioners have got previous cases of similar in nature, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner for the present.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

27.10.2022

mpl

Crl.O.P.No.26136 of 2022