



CRL OP(MD)No.19966 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 29.11.2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble MR JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD)No.19966 of 2023

1.Lathip @ Shiek Abdul Latheef

2.Riyash @ Shiek Mohammed Riyas Deen

3.Sybudeen @ Shiek Sarpudeen

4.Raquman @ Abdul Rahuman

5.Rafick@ Mohamed Rabik

... PetitionersAccused Nos.1 to 3,
5 & 7

(Petitioners' name & Sections amended as per
order of this Court dated 29.11.2023, in
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16722 of 2023 in Crl.O.P.(MD)
No.19966 of 2023)

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
Natham Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.582 of 2023)

... Respondent/Complainant



CRL OP(MD)No.19966 of 2023

WEB COPY For Petitioners : Mr.K.R.Badurus Zaman, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.R.Suresh Kumar,
Government Advocate(Crl.side)

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.582 of 2023 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 341, 324, 427, 506(ii) and 379 IPC in Crime No.582 of 2023, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to some dispute, the petitioners abused in filthy language and also attacked by using wooden log. Hence the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail.



CRL OP(MD)No.19966 of 2023

WEB COPY

4.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that the investigation is still pending.

5.Considering the nature of allegations levelled as against the petitioners and 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 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 origin of crime, it is seen that the offence alleged as against the petitioners is not a case of heinous crime. Further the petitioners are having permanent residence at Dindigul 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.



CRL OP(MD)No.19966 of 2023

WEB COPY

6. 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 District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Natham, Dindigul District on condition that the petitioners shall execute a 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 :

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

[b] the petitioners shall report before the trial Court on summons.

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



CRL OP(MD)No.19966 of 2023

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

WEB COPY

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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/-
29/11/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/12/2023
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

gns

TO

1.THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
NATHAM, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
DINDIGUL.

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



CRL OP(MD)No.19966 of 2023

3.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
NATHAM POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

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

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.19966 of 2023
Date :29/11/2023

RK/DD (19/12/2023) 6P / 5C

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