



CRL OP NO. 29983 of 2024



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-12-2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP NO. 29983 of 2024

AND

CRL OP NO. 29987 OF 2024

Crl.O.P.No.29983 of 2024

1.Sadhham Hussain

2.Samsudeen

3.Anu @ Anshath

4.Jaabaer Ali

Petitioners(s)

Vs

The State Rep By Its,
The Inspector of Police, Race course Police Station, Coimbatore.

Respondent(s)

CRL OP NO. 29987 of 2024

1.Akram Sindhaa

2.Abdul Munaf

3.Suhbhani

Petitioners

Vs

The State Represented by

The Inspector of Police,
Race Course Police Station, Coimbatore.

Respondent(s)



For petitioners(s):

Akshaya K

For Respondent(s):

S.Santhosh

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

CRL OP NO. 29987 of 2024



WEB COPY

For Appellant(s):

K.Akshaya

For Respondent(s):

S.Santhosh

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

COMMON ORDER

Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.558 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 189(2), 232, 351(3) of BNS 2023, the present petition has been filed seeking anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that as per defacto complainant viz., Nehrudass, on 19.11.2024, he had gone to the learned Principal District Sessions Court in relation to the case in S.C.No.195 of 2017, while he was waiting outside in the corridor, the accused who were coming out of the Court have seen the defacto complainant and threatened him that if he gives complaint against him, he would be killed like Farook, who was killed by them earlier. The accused Akram Sindhaa, Sadham Hussain, Samsudeen, Anu @ Hansad, Jaffer Ali, Abdul Munab, who had also come out of the Court, surrounded him and threatened him. They also stated that all other witnesses



were threatened by them. One Akram Sindhaa, S/o. Subakani attempted to assault

and threatened him stating that if the defacto complainant gives evidence against him, then he would be killed. Hence, the case.

WEB COPY

3. Pleading innocence on the part of the petitioners, false implication in the case, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks indulgence of this court. He further submits that the witnesses in this case turned hostile and did not support the prosecution case. The entire case of the prosecution is foisted for the purpose of cancelling the bail granted to the petitioners in the earlier case. He would further submit that petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court.

4. The case of the prosecution as put forth by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police, opposing for grant of anticipatory bail, is that the petitioners are accused in S.C.No.195 of 2017, while coming out of the Court they threatened the defacto complainant/witness to be examined in this case. There are ample materials including the CCTV footages to show that the accused had threatened the defacto complainant in the Court premise. He would further submit that there are also statement of the others who have witnessed the occurrence. He would further submit that threatening the witness inside the Court is a serious offence and it



would be amount to interfering the administration of Justice. Except A7 all the :
were involved in several previous cases and they got several antecedents.

WEB COPY

5.The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that it is the case where the accused had threatened the defacto complainant, who is the witness in this case. He would submit that the accused had not only threatened the defacto complainant and also interfered in the administration of the Court.

6.Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, intervenor and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent Police and perused the materials available on record.

7.It is a case, where the accused had threatened the witness inside the Court premises and thereby, this Court is of the opinion that threatening of the witness would amount to interfering with the administration of Justice. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case and the submission made by the learned Government Advocate, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.



11-12-2024

To
WEB COPY

1.The Judicial Magistrate – III, Coimbatore.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Race course Police Station,
Coimbatore.

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

ah



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.29983 & 29987 of 2024

11.12.2024

1/2