



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 12/08/2022
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice G.ILANGO VAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.9426 of 2022

1. Varathalakshmi
2. Singaraj

... Petitioners/Accused No.2 & 3

Vs

The State rep.by,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thirumangalam, Madurai District.
Crime.No.11 of 2022.

... Respondent/Complainant

Vaishnavi

... Intervening Petitioner / Respondent /
Defacto Complainant
IN CRL MP(MD)No.6453 of 2022

For Petitioner : MR.C.Senthil Murugan, Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi,
Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervenor : MR.P.MURUGAPANDI, Advocate.

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

PRAYER :-For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.11 of 2022 on the file of the Respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 417, 376, 294(b) and 506(i) of IPC, in Crime No.11 of 2022, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the first accused fell in love with each other. On 10.03.2022, at about 12.00 p.m, the first accused went to the defacto complainant's house and on the false promise of marriage, he had a physical relationship with the defacto complainant and that was also continued for some time. Thereafter, she came to know that an arrangement was made by the petitioners for the first accused marriage. The defacto complainant went to the house of the first accused and enquired his parents, at that time, the first petitioner demanded 25 sovereigns of gold and Rs.10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakhs only) and also refused to arrange the marriage between the first accused and the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.



3. During the course of investigation, the statement was recorded from the defacto complainant, wherein the defacto complainant repeated the allegation that has been made in the complaint.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that only the petitioners prevented the first accused to marry the defacto complainant.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that based on the submission of the intervenor, this Court directed the petitioners to file an undertaking affidavit that they are not prevented the first accused from marrying the defacto complainant. Therefore, the petitioners filed an undertaking affidavit before this Court. Hence, he prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the undertaking affidavit filed by the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or their appearance, before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thirumangalam, and on their executing 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 respondent police on every Saturday at 10.30 am until further orders. The petitioners shall comply with the conditions stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. scrupulously.

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

9. If any violation is noticed or any new case is registered against the petitioners for the very same issue, anticipatory bail granted by this Court, shall stand automatically cancelled. The petitioners must file a copy of the above said affidavit before the concerned Magistrate Court and send another copy to the concerned Police Station.

sd/-

12/08/2022

/ TRUE COPY /

/08/2022

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 JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
THIRUMANGALAM.
- 2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
MADURAI DISTRICT.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, THIRUMANGALAM,
MADURAI DISTRICT.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to M/s.C.SENTHIL MURUGAN, Advocate (SR-8551[I] dated 16/08/2022)

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.9426 of 2022

Date :12/08/2022

TTA

MK/VR/SAR.IV/25.08.2022/3P/6C