



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

Dated: 04/02/2022

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice **G.ILANGOVAN**

Crl.OP (MD)No.19904 of 2021

R.Karthik Raja : Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Cantonment AWPS,
Trichy, Trichy District.
(In Crime No.27 of 2021)

: Respondent/Complainant

Hemalatha : Petitioner/ Intervening Petitioner
in CRL MP(MD)NO.11430 of 2021
in CRL.OP(MD)No.19904 of 2021

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Sakthivel, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.M.Vaikkam Karunanithi
Government Advocate (Criminal side)

For Intervenor : Mr.K.M.Karunakaran, Advocate

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

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.27 of 2021 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order:-

The petitioner, who is arrayed as sole accused apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under sections 498(A), 294(b) and 506(i) IPC, in Crime No.27 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The petitioner is facing the charges for the offences under sections 498(A), 294(b) and 506(i) IPC.

3.Heard both sides.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there was actually no marriage between the de-facto complainant and the petitioner and the de-facto complainant was only a friend



of this petitioner. Only for the purpose of grabbing the money, a false complaint has been given.

5.The entire CD file has been called for and perused. Perusal of the CD file shows that there was some sort of affair between the de-facto complainant and this petitioner and money transaction also. Taking advantage of the friendship, it appears that this petitioner received jewels from the de-facto complainant, but failed to return the same. Even though, it is a case of the de-facto complainant that she got divorce from her husband and later, married this petitioner, whether such contention is true or not is a matter for investigation. Since serious allegation has been made against this petitioner, this is not a fittest case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Further, it has been stated by the de-facto complainant that the petitioner alleged to have blackmailed and criminally intimidated her stating that he would share the photographs, which were taken during their closeness. It is also seen that this petitioner was also married.

6.So considering the seriousness of the offence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is **dismissed**.

sd/-
04/02/2022

/ 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 INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
CANTONMENT AWPS,
TRICHY, TRICHY DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER IN
CRL OP(MD) No.19904 of 2021
Date : 04/02/2022

er
MS/JM/SAR-2/18.02.2022/2P.3C

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