



CRL OP(MD). No.21425 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 28/11/2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD). No.21425 of 2023

1. Palpandian,

2. Theepan Sakaravathi,

... Petitioners/ Accused 1 & 2

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
Kodaikkanal Police Station,
Dindigul District.
Crime No.331/2023.

... Respondent/ Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.M.KANNAN,
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.331/2023 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners / accused, who apprehend at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 506(i) and 379(N/P) of IPC in Crime No.331 of 2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.



CRL OP(MD). No.21425 of 2023

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to property dispute, there was a wordy quarrel arose between the parties. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and their names have been falsely implicated in this case and hence he seeks anticipatory to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that it is a case of civil dispute and the investigation of the case is pending.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it is noticed that the petitioners are not tenants. As stated in the FIR the defacto complainant purchased the property from own co-owner and these petitioners are also co-owner in the same property and in order to support his case he shows the property tax receipt stand in their names.

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 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 is having permanent residents at Dindigul District. Hence the principles



CRL OP(MD). No.21425 of 2023

stated in Hussainara Khatoon & Ors vs. Home Secretary, State Of Bihar reported in

WEB COPY

AIR 1979 SC 1360 is taken into consideration. In that case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has cautioned that pre-trial detention is not to 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 is made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Kodaikanal, Dindigul District 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 dismissed and on further condition that :

[a] the petitioners shall appear before the trial Court on receipt of summons as directed by the trial Court.

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



CRL OP(MD). No.21425 of 2023

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

WEB COPY

[d] 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].

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

sd/-
28/11/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TRP
TO
1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
KODAIKANAL, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

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

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

MADURAI

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



CRL OP(MD). No.21425 of 2023

+1 CC to M/s.M.KANNAN, Advocate (SR-16979[I] dated 28/11/2023)

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21425 of 2023
Date :28/11/2023

SA/SKN/SAR. /06.12.2023/5P/6C

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