



CRL OP(MD)No.21511 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.21511 of 2023

Karthik

... Petitioner / Sole Accused

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
Shanarpatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.368 of 2023)

... Respondent / Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Arunraj, 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.368 of 2023 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No.368 of 2023 on the file of



CRL OP(MD)No.21511 of 2023

the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution is that L angle shape iron rod stolen by the petitioner, which were belongs to the petitioner's temple. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that there was temple dispute between the parties and therefore, the defacto complainant lodged the present false case. In fact, the petitioner did not take anything from the temple and the petitioner is ready to deposit the value of the stolen property. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail.

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

5.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 petitioner is not a case of heinous crime. Further the petitioner is having permanent residence at Dindigul District. Hence the principles stated in Hussainara Khatoon & Ors vs. Home Secretary, State Of Bihar



CRL OP(MD)No.21511 of 2023

WEB COPY

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.

6.In view of the above, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition that the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- to the credit of Cr.No.368 of 2023 before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The trial Court is directed to decide the case on merits as to whether the petitioner has committed theft as stated in FIR.

7.On such deposit, 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 Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul on condition that the petitioner 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 :



CRL OP(MD)No.21511 of 2023

WEB COPY

[a] the petitioner shall affix his photograph and Left Thumb Impression in the surety 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 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/-
29/11/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

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

GNS



CRL OP(MD)No.21511 of 2023

To
WEB COPY

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.III,
Dindigul.

2.Do through the Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Dindigul District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Shanarpatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.

4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.K.ARUNRAJ, Advocate (SR-17041[I] dated 29/11/2023)

ORDER
IN

CRL OP(MD) No.21511 of 2023
Date :29/11/2023

ED/JGB /SAR- (11/12/2023) 5P / 6C

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