



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 20/01/2022

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mrs.Justice R.THARANI

CRL OP(MD). No.935 of 2022

1. VIJI @ VIJAYALAKSHMI
2. LAKSHMI

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.1&2

VS

THE STATE REP. BY,
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ARIYAMANGALAM POLICE STATION,
TRICHY CITY.
(CRIME NO/686/2021).

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Vakeeswaran,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.S.Manikandan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

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

PRAYER :-


For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.686 of 2021 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/Accused No.1 & 2, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 294(b), 354 and 324 of IPC in Crime No.686 of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case against the petitioner is that the first petitioner threatened the defacto complainant to release a obscene video clipping of the defacto complainant through the internet. The second petitioner pulled her down and draw her dress. Hence, the case was registered.

3.On the side of the petitioners it is stated that the alleged allegation is said to have taken place on 14.11.2021. But the complaint was lodged only on 10.12.2021 i.e., after 25 days. The second petitioner was attacked by the defacto complainant and



others. The second petitioner was taking treatment as in patient for five days and she lodged a complaint in Crime No.617 of 2021. The brother of the defacto complainant was arrested in the case. Only as a counter blast, this false case was foisted against the petitioners. As the concerned police refused to register the false complaint, the defacto complainant approached the Commissioner, who forwarded the complainant to the respondent police. Both the petitioners are ladies. The second petitioner is 60 year old. She was brutally attacked by the brother of the defacto complainant and prayed the petitioners to be released on anticipatory bail.

4. On the side of the prosecution, it is stated that the allegation against the petitioner is serious in nature. The first petitioner threatened the defacto complainant as if she took videographs of the defacto complainant having bath and threatened to publish the same through internet and the allegation against the second petitioner is also serious in nature and prayed the petition to be dismissed.

5. It is seen that the complaint was filed only after 25 days from the date of occurrence. The injured might have been discharged from the hospital by this time. The FIR was registered on 10.12.2021. Major portion of the investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the age of the second petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.


6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, before the learned Judge, Additional Mahila Court, Trichy (Judicial Magistrate Level), on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and the petitioners shall appear before the concerned Court daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

7. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

sd/-
20/01/2022

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2022
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 JUDGE,
ADDITIONAL MAHILA COURT (JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE LEVEL),
TRICHY.
 2. DO-THROUGH : THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
TRICHY DISTRICT.
 3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ARIYAMANGALAM POLICE STATION,
TRICHY CITY.
 4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.
- +1 CC to M/s.C.VAKEESWARAN, Advocate (SR-332[I] dated 21/01/2022)

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.935 of 2022
Date :20/01/2022

USK/JM/SAR-II/25.01.2022/3P/6C