



CRL OP(MD). No.13346 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 13/10/2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice V. SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD). No.13346 of 2023

1. Linges
2. Masanamuthu
3. Krishnagowri
4. Satheesh

... Petitioners/ Accused 1 to 4

Vs

1. State Rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Valliyoor, Tirunelveli District.
Crime No.16 of 2023.

... Respondent/Complainant

(*)2. Dhanalakshmi

... 2nd Respondent

(*)(R2 is Suo-Motu Impleaded as Per Order of the Court
Dated 21/07/2023 in CRL OP(MD).13346/2023)

For Petitioners	:	M/s.Antony Arulraj T, Advocate.
For Respondent-1	:	Mrs.M.Aasha, Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For Respondent-2	:	Ms.G.Saranya, Advocate

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.16 of 2023 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No.13346 of 2023

WEB COPY

The petitioners/A1 to A4, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 323 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.16 of 2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant was solemnized on 07.11.2022 and there was some misunderstanding between the defacto complainant and the first petitioner. Under such circumstances there was an oral agreement between the defacto complainant and the first petitioner on 12.07.2023 and then the first petitioner has beaten the defacto complainant, due to which she sustained injuries. Further all the petitioners demanded more dowry and harassed the defacto complainant. hence the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and a false case has been foisted against them, hence he seeks anticipatory to the petitioners.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent submitted that all the accused persons demanded more dowry and harassed the defacto complainant, hence he objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. It is seen that it is a matrimonial dispute between the parties.

6.Taking into consideration the principles stated by the Honourable Supreme Court in Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia Etc., vs. State of Punjab reported in 1980 AIR 1632



CRL OP(MD). No.13346 of 2023

and Lal Kamendra Pratap Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others reported in (2009)4 SCC 437 and Joginder Kumar vs. State of U.P. and others reported in (1994) 4 SCC 260 and taking into consideration the origine of crime, it is seen that the offence alleged as against the petitioners is not a case of henious crime. Further the petitioners are having permanent residents at Kanyakumari District. Hence the principles stated in Hussainara Khatoon & Ors vs. Home Secretary, State Of Bihar reported in AIR 1979 SC 1360 is taken into consideration. In that case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has cautioned that pre-trial detention is not be encouraged nor is to be encourageable pre-trial release on sureties; that if the Court is satisfied after taking into consideration that the accused has his roots in the community and is not likely to abscond, he can safely be released on his personal bond.

7.In view of the above, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Valliyoor on condition that the petitioners shall execute own bonds for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand



CRL OP(MD). No.13346 of 2023

dismissed and on further condition that :

WEB COPY

[a] the petitioner shall report before the trial Court as and when required for the purpose of interrogation.

[b] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[d] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[e] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

sd/-
13/10/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/10/2023
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

AAV



CRL OP(MD). No.13346 of 2023

TO

WEB COPY

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.II, VALLIYOOR.

2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
VALLIYOOR, TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

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

+1 CC to M/s.T.ANTONY ARULRAJ, Advocate (SR-15277[I] dated 17/10/2023)

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.13346 of 2023

Date :13/10/2023

RS/DD/SAR-(17.10.2023) 5P 6C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing
certified copies in this format from 17/07/2023