



CRL OP(MD)No.22131 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date: 08.12.2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble MR JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL OP(MD)No.22131 of 2023

Senthilkumar

... Petitioner/ Accused No.2

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
Pasupathipalayam Police Station,
Karur District.
(Crime No. 377 OF 2023)

... Respondent/complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Manojkumar,Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.RMS.Sethuraman
Additional Public Prosecutor

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.377 of 2023 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/A2, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent

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



CRL OP(MD)No.22131 of 2023

police for the offences punishable under Section 304(2) of IPC in Crime No.377 of 2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner/A2 is the owner of an auto rikshaw and he permitted the second accused to drive the said vehicle. However, the second accused made an accident, due to which, one person died. 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. He would further submit that the petitioner is only the owner of the vehicle and hence, he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent submitted that the petitioner/A2 is the owner of an auto rikshaw and he permitted the second accused to drive the said vehicle. However, the second accused made an accident, due to which, one person died. Hence, he objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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 Kamlendra 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

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



CRL OP(MD)No.22131 of 2023

offence alleged as against the petitioner is not a case of heinous crime. Further the petitioner is having permanent residents at Trichy 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 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.

6. There is no allegation as against the petitioner with regard to the offence committed by the second accused.

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 is made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Karur 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:

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



CRL OP(MD)No.22131 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/-
08/12/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

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



CRL OP(MD)No.22131 of 2023

CMR

WEB COPY

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I
KARUR.
- 2 DO THROUGH:
THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
KARUR DISTRICT.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PASUPATHIPALAYAM POLICE STATION,
DISTRICT.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to M/s.S.GOKULRAJ, Advocate (SR-17554[I] dated 11/12/2023)

ORDER
IN

CRL OP(MD) No.22131 of 2023

Date :08/12/2023

PKP/JGB/SAR- /15.12.2023/ 5P/6C

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