



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 25/05/2022
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice P.VELMURUGAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.9654 of 2022

1.Moovendrapandian
2.Panjavarnam
3.Lakshmi

... Petitioners/Accused No.2-4

Vs

1.The Inspector of Police,
Tallakulam All Women Police Station,
Madurai City.
Crime.No. 29/2022.

2.Rathidevi

... Respondents/Complainants

For Petitioner : M/s.Dhana Law Associates,
Advocate.

For Respondent : MR.SS.Madhavan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.29 of 2022 on the file of the Respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/Accused No.2-4, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 498 A, 406 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.29 of 2022, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that there is a matrimonial dispute between the defacto complainant and her husband, who is the son of the first and second petitioners and the brother of the third petitioner. The petitioners have kept the jewels of the second respondent and also gave a life threat to her. Hence the complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners 1 and 2 are senior citizens and the petitioners are not involved in the occurrence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that one of the petitioners has been admitted in the hospital and therefore, they may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.



4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) would submit that A1 is the husband of the de-facto complainant and the petitioners are her in-laws. He would further submit that the offence under Section 498-A IPC is serious in nature, hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.The main allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners have taken the jewels of the de-facto complainant and harassed her. In this regard, the case has been registered only on 23.05.2022 and the investigation is in preliminary stage. At this stage, if the petitioners are enlarged on anticipatory bail, there is a possibility of tampering the witnesses and hampering the investigation and also it would protract the investigation. Since the de-facto complainant being a lady, she would not get justice as well as her jewels. Therefore, under these circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

6.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-

25/05/2022

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2022

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

SJI/LM

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 INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TALLAKULAM ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, MADURAI CITY.

2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.DHANA LAW ASSOCIATES Advocate SR.No.5022

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.9654 of 2022

Date :25/05/2022

SA/PN/SAR:IV/26.05.2022 : 2P/4C

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>