



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 04/08/2022
PRESENT

WEB COPY

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice G.ILANGO VAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.13915 of 2022

Ramesh

... Petitioner/Accused No.2

Vs

The State rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
Keeranur All Women Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
Crime.No.19 of 2022.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s.BANUMATHY.A,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.R.M.ANBUNITHI,
Additional Public Prosecutor (Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.439 of Cr.P.C.

PRAYER :- For Bail in Crime No. 19 of 2022 on the file of the Respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/Accused herein, who was arrested on 27.06.2022 for the alleged offence under Sections 5(1), 6(i) and 17 of POCSO Act, 447, 294(b) and 506(i) IPC in Crime No.19 of 2022, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that her 3rd daughter by name Kavya studying 12th Std., in Government Higher Secondary School, Iluppur. The first accused viz., Karthi developed intimacy with her daughter and also subjected to intercourse by continued the same for some time. For the above said illegal activity, A2 viz., Ramesh helped him. On 22.05.2022 again she was subjected to sexual intercourse. When the defacto complainant came to know about the above said occurrence she scolded the victim girl. On 23.06.2022, A1 and A2 trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and criminally intimidated her. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that A1 is absconding and A2 is in judicial custody from 27.06.2022.



4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted the petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant along with the first accused and also criminally intimidated her. He would further submit that there is no previous case against the petitioner.

WEB COPY

5. It is the contention of the petitioner counsel that the mobile phone purchased by him was used by the first accused he contacted over phone to the said Girl; that the petitioner has scolded him and hence, his name has been falsely implicated in this case.

6.Considering the period of incarceration and the fact that limited role has been stated against the petitioner and that there is no previous case against the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with stringent conditions.

7.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Pudukkottai and on further condition that the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

sd/-

04/08/2022

/ TRUE COPY /

04/08/2022

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

TO

1 THE SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHILA COURT, PUDUKKOTTAI.

2 THE OFFICER INCHARGE, DISTRICT JAIL, PUDUKKOTTAI.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KEERANUR ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
PUDUKKOTTAI DISTRICT.

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

ORDER IN

CRL OP(MD) No.13915 of 2022
Date :04/08/2022

SA/VR/SAR.4/04.08.2022/2P/5C

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>