



CRL OP(MD). No.17317 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 22/11/2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice V. SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD). No.17317 of 2023

K.Saravanakumar

... Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs

State Rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Colachel, Kanniyakumari District.
Crime No. 28/2023.

... Respondent/Complainant

(*)2.Rathika

... 2nd Respondent

(*)(R2 is Suo-Motu Impleaded as per the order of the
court dated 26.09.2023 in CRL OP(MD).17317/2023)

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan, Advocate.

For Respondent : Mrs.M.Aasha, Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.28 of 2023 on the file of the respondent
Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No.17317 of 2023

WEB COPY

The petitioner/sole accused, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of IPC and Section 3,6 of D.P.Act in Crime No.28 of 2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the petitioner and the defacto complainant was solemnized on 11.12.2008 and at the time of marriage the family members of the petitioner demanded 101 sovereigns of gold jewels as dowry. Subsequent to the marriage she was subjected to harassment by the petitioner demanding more dowry. hence the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and a false case has been foisted against him. Hence he seeks anticipatory to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submitted the petitioner herein demanded more dowry and harassed the defacto complainant, hence she objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. It is noticed that is a dispute between the family members.

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 and Lal Kamlendra Pratap Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others reported in



CRL OP(MD). No.17317 of 2023

(2009)4 SCC 437 and Joginder Kumar vs. State of U.P. and others reported in (1994)

WEB COPY

4 SCC 260 and taking into consideration the origine of crime, it is seen that the offence alleged as against the petitioner is not a case of heinous crime. Further the petitioner is having permanent residents at Kanniyakumari 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 petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Principal District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel, Kanyakumari District on condition that the petitioner shall execute own bond 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 dismissed and on further condition that :



CRL OP(MD). No.17317 of 2023

WEB COPY

[a] the petitioner shall affix his photograph and Left Thumb Impression in the bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of his Aadhar card or Bank Pass Book to ensure his identity.

[b] the petitioner shall report before the trial Court on receipt of summons

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

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

[e] 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].

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

sd/-
22/11/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/11/2023

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

AAV

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



CRL OP(MD). No.17317 of 2023

TO

WEB COPY

1 THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, ERANIEL,
KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT.

2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, COLACHEL,
KANNIYAKUMARI DISTRICT.

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

+1 CC to M/s.N.PRAGALATHAN, Advocate (SR-16708[I] dated 22/11/2023)

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.17317 of 2023

Date :22/11/2023

RS/JGB/SAR-(30.11.2023) 5P 6C

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