



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 29.04.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

and

Crl.MP(MD)No.4999 of 2024

P.Balamurugan @ Vaigai Balan

... Petitioner/ Accused 1

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch (CCB),
Madurai City.
Crime No.5 of 2024

... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER: Petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C seeking bail in connection with the case in Crime No.5 of 2024 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioner : Mr.ANANTHA NARAYANAN,
Senior Counsel
for Mr.S.RAMASAMY, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.E.ANTONY SAHAYA PRABAHAR
Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervenor : Mr.V.KATHIRVELU,
Senior Counsel
for Mr.S.P.PRABAKARAN, Advocate

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on

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



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

28.03.2024, in connection with the case in Crime No.5 of 2024 for the alleged offence u/s.379(NP), 387, 506(ii) IPC and Section 24 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007 @ 379(NP), 387, 406, 420, 506(ii) IPC and Section 24 of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007, by the respondent police, has filed this petition seeking bail.

2.The case of the prosecution, in brief, is as under:-

2.1.One Mrs.Ramuthai, who is the second wife of the petitioner's father, is the defacto complainant herein. Her elder son, namely, Natarajan, is working as Mechanical Marine Engineer. He joined the job in the year 1992 and since then he transferred a total sum of Rs.15,62,35,236/- to the bank account of the petitioner, for the purpose of purchasing properties in and around Madurai and Chennai in the name of Natarajan. The petitioner promised to act as care taker of the properties. But, in contra, the petitioner purchased the properties in his name and all the property documents are in the custody of the petitioner.

2.2.That apart, the defacto complainant's son purchased some gold jewelry worth about 1000 Sovereigns, which is in her custody. The petitioner and his wife / second accused threatened and obtained the defacto complainant's signature in blank



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

papers and forcibly took away the above said gold jewels on 25.07.2023. Thereafter, the defacto complainant shifted to her son's house at Madurai. However, on 08.01.2024, the accused persons came to that house and assaulted her and took away the documents and snatched her chain at gun point.

2.3. Therefore, the defacto complainant has lodged a complaint on 10.01.2024. The Inspector of Police, D1 Thallakulam Police Station, Madurai, registered the same in Crime No.69 of 2024. Thereafter, the said case was forwarded to the respondent / Central Crime Branch and re-assigned as Crime No.5 of 2024.

Case of the petitioner:-

3. The petitioner's father, Paulraj, is a retired Additional Deputy Superintendent of Police. The defacto complainant is the second wife of the petitioner's father and also the younger sister of the petitioner's mother, namely Nallamal. With the consent of the first wife, the second marriage took place with the sister. They are having six children (sons), ie., three children from each wedlock. The petitioner is the elder son in the family. He is having two brothers. One is a practising Advocate and also a former Additional Public Prosecutor of the Madras High Court. The petitioner is also a practising Advocate. He is also the Village Panchayat Board President of Kullichettipatti and a District Secretary of a political party. Similarly, the defacto



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

complainant is having three sons and her elder son, Natarajan, is working as a Marine Engineer. Her second son, Ramesh, is a practising Advocate.

4. According to the petitioner, they are living as a joint family and his father, Paulraj, is the Kartha of the family. The earnings of all the members of the family were handled by this petitioner and his father, Paulraj. The properties were purchased in the names of the parents and brothers. They have also formed a firm in the name of PNR Bio-Firms Private Limited (PNR - Paulraj Nallamal Ramuthai). The petitioner's brothers and all other family members are share holders in this firm and they are having several properties. Apart from this, they have also established an Oil Company in the name of Tough Off Shore Private Limited, which is maintained by Natarajan and Ramesh. There is some dispute in the family in sharing of properties and in order to coerce the petitioner to give the entire share to the complainant and her sons, this complaint has been foisted.

5. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, by relying upon the complaint, submitted that the first occurrence is said to have taken place on 25.07.2023 at Kullichettipatti Village, Dindigul District, however, the complainant preferred to lodge the complaint before the Tallakulam Police Station, Madurai, by choosing the



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

police, on 10.01.2024. The case in Crime No.69 of 2024, which was registered by the Tallakulam Police based on the complaint lodged on 10.01.2024, was transferred to the Central Crime Branch, Madurai and the case was reassigned as Crime No.5 of 2024.

6.The petitioner was arrested on 28.03.2024. He is in jail for the past 32 days. The respondent police have searched the petitioner's premises on search warrant and apart from that, they have also taken him for police custody for two days. However, they have not collected any incriminating materials as against the petitioner. Therefore, the learned Senior Counsel seeks grant of bail.

7.When this bail application came up for hearing, Mr.V.Kathirvelu, learned Senior Counsel representing the defacto complainant, submitted that the defacto complainant has filed an intervening application, however, the same is yet to be numbered. He insisted that the defacto complainant has to be heard before deciding this bail application and requested for adjourning this application.

8.Though the State is defended by the learned Public Prosecutor, it has become the order of the day before this Bench that in almost all the bail applications, the



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

defacto complainants are insisting to hear them by filing an application to intervene.

WEB COPY

In this case also, even before the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner makes his arguments, an objection has been made on behalf of the defacto complainant that her intervening application has to be heard before deciding this bail application. Since this request has been made from a designated Senior Counsel, this Court has permitted the Registry to number the intervening application and took up the matter at 03.00 pm.

9.Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the defacto complainant made his submissions as follows:-

9.1.The first accused along with his wife / second accused barged into the defacto complainant's house on 08.01.2024 around 08.00 pm and threatened her at gun point and took away 3 sets of diamond necklaces and property documents worth several Crores of rupees.

9.2.The defacto complainant preferred this complaint before the Commissioner of Police, Madurai City, on 10.01.2024 and the same was forwarded to the Tallakulam Police Station, Madurai. The Tallakulam Police investigated the same and thereafter, registered the case in Crime No.69 of 2024 for the offence u/s.379, 387, 506(ii) IPC. As



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

the amount involved is running in more than Crores, the same has been transferred to Central Crime Branch, Madurai / respondent police and the crime number was reassigned as Crime No.5 of 2024 for the alleged offence u/s.379, 387, 506(ii) IPC and Section 24 of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizen Act, 2007 @ 379 (NP), 387, 406, 420, 506(ii) IPC and Section 24 of Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 and the investigation is in the initial stage.

9.3.Before registering the case, the defacto complainant as well as the accused persons were mediated by Hon'ble Mr.Justice T.Sudanthiram, a Retired Judge of this Court. The petitioner's brother, one Govindharajan, is the Junior of the Hon'ble Judge and therefore, the mediation went in a biased manner and it failed. Thereafter, on 08.01.2024, the incident happened and only thereafter, the present case has been registered. After registering the case, the accused moved an application for anticipatory bail before this Court in Crl.OP(MD)No.3133 of 2024 and this Court has also conducted mediation in the Chamber. However, the same ended in vain and thereafter, the petition for anticipatory bail was dismissed on 21.03.2024.

9.4.He has also referred some paragraphs from the orders of this Court in the anticipatory bail application filed by this petitioner in Crl.OP(MD)No.3133 of 2024



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

and submitted that considering the nature of offence, this Court has dismissed the anticipatory bail application and only thereafter, the respondent Police has arrested this petitioner. He also referred about the quash petition filed by the accused in Crl.OP(MD)No.4847 of 2024, wherein, this Court has passed an order referring the matter for mediation before Hon'ble Mr. Justice T.Sudanthiram.

9.5.In this regard, the defacto complainant, in the intervening application, has made an allegation as against this Court as under:-

“In the meantime, the accused persons have filed quash petition in Crl.OP(MD)No.4847 of 2024 and this Court, by order dated 10.04.2024, passed an interim order not to harass the second accused and not to file the final report and further this Court appointed Hon'ble Retired Judge Mr.T.Sudanthiram as Mediator to find out the solution between the parties, but the petitioner / 2nd respondent not accepted the mediator. But, this Hon'ble Court forced to accept the same.”

9.6.As against the order passed in Crl.OP(MD)No.4847 of 2024 appointing the Mediator, as against her wish, the defacto complainant has preferred a special leave petition before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in EC.SCINO.1-13289-2024 and that it is



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

likely to be listed shortly.

WEB COPY

10.Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, sailing with the arguments put forth by the learned Senior Counsel for the defacto complainant, submitted that it is a case involving 15 Crore worth property and jewels. The investigation is in the initial stage and therefore, this is not a fit case for grant of bail.

11.The petitioner's father, Paulraj, has appeared before this Court and submitted that the entire allegations in the complaint are false. According to him, they are living as a joint family. The petitioner and his brothers, who are the sons from the first wife, treat the defacto complainant as their mother and in fact, without any differentiation as to for whom they were born, all of them are living together. This is how they are jointly living happily. However, for sharing of the property, some dispute arose which resulted in this complaint.

12.After hearing the petitioner's father, this Court suggested him to put his submissions in the form of an affidavit and he has accordingly filed an affidavit, as under:-



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

"I, V.PAULRAJ, Father of the Petitioner, aged about 82 years, residing at North Street, Kulichettipatti Village, DIndigul District, do hereby solemnly affirm and sincerely state as follows:-

I'm married to Mrs.Nallamal as 1st wife and Mrs.Ramuthai as 2nd wife and I have begotten six children, 3 sons from each wife. To bring up all my 6 children, I had spent my own earnings and savings. I'm the head of the family and the family was running as a Joint Hindu family and the entire family was under my control and supervision. Among my 6 children, 3 of them are advocates and 3 of them are engineers and they're working in abroad.

The son of the defacto complainant, Natrajan, was earning well as a marine engineer and he used to send the money to his brothers under my instructions. My eldest son, Balamurugan has taken care of all the investments and purchased properties in the name of family members. I was always under the impression that my son, NATRAJAN was liberal enough. My elder son Balamurugan acting under my instructions had taken care of all the properties purchased jointly. In fact, the earnings of the other sons, though not to a large extent, but were in the common pool of money utilised for purchasing properties. Earnings of my son GOVINDARAJAN as



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

a lawyer and Addl. Public Prosecutor were also contributed towards the properties purchased.

To my surprise, my son NATRAJAN decided to be away from all of us and claimed properties to be returned to him. And I advised him to wait for some time and to settle the dispute among the brothers.

In order to pressurize, a false complaint has been filed against my other sons for which he had pressurized his mother and my wife.

Mrs.Ramuthai, the defacto complainant, to having taken the jewels and documents from my custody in my house Kulichettipatti, DIndigul District and the false complaint was given in the name of my wife, Mrs.Ramuthai.

The allegations made in the complaint are totally contradictory to the real facts.

My wife Mrs.RAMUTHAI while leaving home at Kullichettipatti at Dindigul District, took away all the belongings including property documents and jewellery. There is no fault on the part of my eldest son, Balamurugan who is now languishing in prison. And even if at all anything is to be settled, it can be done only by me. My son Balamurugan has never disobeyed my words and always followed my guidance and advise.



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

Further, the investigating officer did not make any attempt to find the truth so far, and not at all enquired me at any point of time till date. In fact, I was also served as an Additional Deputy Superintendent of Police, Madurai CCB at Madurai at the time of Retirement.”

13.During the course of arguments, since the learned Counsel on either side has pointed out the application filed in Crl.OP(MD)No.3133 of 2024 [petition for anticipatory bail], which was dismissed by this Court by order dated 21.03.2024 on the ground that the defacto complainant is aged about 75 years, I directed the Registry to place those materials also before this Court.

14.This Court considered the rival submissions made on either side and also perused the materials placed on record, including the CD files.

15.The defacto complainant, Ramuthai, is the second wife of the petitioner's father. The petitioner's father is a retired Additional Deputy Superintendent of Police. The petitioner is the elder son and also a practising Advocate. The petitioner's mother is the elder sister. She has allowed her husband to marry her sister, the defacto complainant herein. All of them appears to have been living as a joint family. The



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

petitioner's father is having three sons from each wife. Out of them, three are practising as Advocates and three others are Engineers working in Abroad. The petitioner's brother, one Govindarajan, is a former Additional Public Prosecutor of the Madras High Court. All of them appears to have pooled their salary into the joint family and it appears they are also having two firms, in the name of PNR Bio-Firms Private Limited [PNR – Paulraj Nalammal Ramuthai] and another Oil Company in the name of Tough Off Shore Private Limited.

16.From the complaint, it appears that the defacto complainant has made the following allegations as against the petitioner:-

(i) The defacto complainant's elder son Natarajan, a Marine Engineer, is said to have sent more than Rs.15 Crore to the account of this petitioner for the purpose of purchasing properties in and around Madurai and Chennai. The petitioner, who was supposed to purchase the properties as a care taker of the said Natarajan, dishonestly, purchased the properties in his name and also took all the documents into his possession.

(ii) On 25.07.2023, the petitioner threatened the defacto complainant to sign in certain blank papers. When she refused to sign, they have forcibly took away some gold jewels around 1000 Sovereigns from her residence in Kullichettipatti Village,



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

Dindigul District.

WEB COPY

(iii) The defacto complainant moved all the property documents to her elder son's house at Aathikulam, Madurai and on knowing that, on 08.01.2024, the petitioner along with his wife, Jeyalakshmi, came to her residence, assaulted her and took away the property documents and also snatched away a chain. They also said to have intimidated her.

17.For this nature of complaint and for the incidents said to have taken place on 25.07.2023 and on 08.01.2024, a complaint was lodged before the Commissioner of Police, Madurai City, on 10.01.2024. It was forwarded by the Commissioner of Police to the Tallakulam Police Station on 12.01.2024. Accordingly, the Inspector of Police has registered the case in D1 Tallakulam Police Station in Crime No.69 of 2024 for the offence u/s.379(NP), 387, 506(ii) IPC on 18.01.2024 at about 10.00 pm. Thereafter, on the request of the Inspector of Police, D1 Tallakulam Police Station, the case was transferred to the Central Crime Branch, Madurai City, on 29.01.2024. It has been recommended by the Assistant Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner on the same day and the Commissioner of Police, by proceedings dated 06.02.2024, has transferred this case to the Central Crime Branch. Accordingly, the Central Crime Branch has registered this case on 10.02.2024 for the offence u/s.379, 387, 506(ii) IPC



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

and also for the offence u/s.24 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007. Thereafter, on 05.04.2024, the offences have been altered into Sections 379(NP), 387, 406, 420, 506(ii) IPC and Section 24 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007. The respondent Police has also issued summons u/s.41A Cr.P.C calling upon this petitioner for enquiry.

18.Apprehending arrest, this petitioner has approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail in Crl.OP(MD)No.3133 of 2024. Considering the status of the parties, it appears that the Hon'ble Judge himself has conducted mediation thrice. However, no consensus was arrived. Thereafter, the anticipatory bail application was dismissed and the relevant paragraphs are extracted as under:-

“13.The defacto complainant is a lady aged about 75 years and is a cancer patient. Her specific allegation is theft, causing grievous hurt and instilling fear in the mind of a person and criminal intimidation, that too by a member of the legal profession. Further, it is the specific claim of the defacto complainant that the 1st petitioner is holding the post of Panchayat President in the locality and has a huge clout with a political party, which cannot also be lost sight of by this Court. Coupled with the fact that the 1st petitioner is a practicing Advocate and also holding the post of Panchayat



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

President and having affiliation to a political party, the apprehension of the defacto complainant with regard to her fear for life on the intimidation alleged to have been caused by the petitioners cannot be ruled out.

14. When even according to the petitioners, summons, if issued by the law enforcing agency for an enquiry would create an apprehension that they might be taken into custody, the fear of the senior citizen, an old lady aged about 75 years, apprehending threat to her life at the hands of the petitioners cannot be brushed aside lightly considering the various factors, as noted above, more particularly weighing the apprehension put forth by both the parties to the lis, in which the apprehension of the defacto complainant outweighs the apprehension expressed by the petitioners in that backdrop.

15. In such a backdrop, looking at the various allegations levelled against the petitioners by the defacto complainant, this Court is of the considered view that it would not be in the interest of the defacto complainant and also in the interest of justice, on the facts and circumstances of this case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners as the possibility of further criminal intimidation and tampering with the evidence by the petitioners cannot be ruled out and in such view of the matter,



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

granting anticipatory bail would not be proper.”

WEB COPY

19.Learned Senior Counsel for the defacto complainant has mainly relied on the orders of this Court in Crl.OP(MD)No.3133 of 2024 and has pointed out the grounds raised by the Court in rejecting the anticipatory bail. It was projected before the Hon’ble Judge that the victim has suffered a grievous hurt. This Court has, therefore, verified with the entire CD file. The defacto complainant has not even sustained a simple injury. The respondent Police has also not registered any sections for the offence of hurt.

20.The defacto complainant’s second son is also a practising Advocate. The original complaint dated 10.01.2024 lodged before the Commissioner of Police, Madurai City, stated that this petitioner dishonestly purchased the properties in his name and all the important documents of her elder son, Natarajan, are in the custody of this petitioner and his wife. This allegation stated in paragraph no.3 is contradictory to the averment in paragraph no.5, wherein, she has stated that due to fear, she had moved to her son’s house at Aathikulam along with the property documents and on 08.01.2024, the accused came to her house and threatened her at gun point in order to take away the property documents and jewel.



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

21.The first allegation, which is the main allegation, is that the petitioner dishonestly purchased the properties in his name, using the funds provided by the defacto complainant's son for the purpose of purchasing properties in his name. This issue appears to be of a civil dispute. This issue can be decided only by the competent civil Court. Though this allegation concerns about the amount sent by the defacto complainant's elder son, Natarajan, the said Natarajan has not lodged the complaint and he is not before this Court. Nor, it appears that he has authorized his mother to lodge the complaint. When this Court verified as to when this amount was transferred from the account of the defacto complainant's son, Natarajan, to this petitioner, neither the Public Prosecutor nor the Senior Counsel representing the defacto complainant is in a position to respond. According to them, there was some transaction from the year 2004 to 2020 between the parties. If that being so, it is not known as to why this complaint was lodged in the year 2024.

22.The second allegation is said to have taken place on 25.07.2023, for which, the complaint is lodged after five months on 10.01.2024. Moreover, this occurrence took place at Kalichettipatti Village, Dindigul District, for which, a cognizance has been taken by the Tallakulam Police, Madurai. It is not known as to why the defacto



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

complainant has not chosen to file a complaint immediately before the jurisdictional police.

WEB COPY

23.Insofar as the third allegation, ie., threatening at gun point and snatching a gold chain and property documents, is concerned, it appears that the respondent Police has searched the house of this petitioner on search warrant and also took him on police custody from the judicial custody. However, they have not collected any incriminating materials so far. They have not even find out as to whether this petitioner is having any Gun or not. Moreover, a threat has to be felt by the defacto complainant, then only it would attract the offence u/s.506 IPC. In the event if there is any delay in reporting the incident, it would not attract an offence u/s.506 IPC. However, for an incident took place on 08.01.2024, a case was registered on 18.01.2024.

24.Perusal of the entire records revel that a partition dispute has been given with a criminal color and the police is acting like a puppet at the directions of some of the higher officials in order to give coercion to the petitioner and his brothers.

25.It appears that the Commissioner of Police has initially referred the matter to the Central Crime Branch, but, thereafter, modified and referred it to Tallakulam



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

Police Station. The very same Commissioner, who referred the matter to Tallakulam, after one month, has referred the matter to Central Crime Branch. Thereafter, the Central Crime Branch has acted swiftly, as expected, arrested the accused; obtained search warrant; conducted search; took police custody of the accused; but, has not achieved anything in the investigation and has not collected any material, as on date, attracting an offence. However, they have created a further document of confession, when the petitioner was in judicial custody, on 10.04.2024, as if the petitioner has handed over all the documents to his brother, one Govindarajan, an Advocate and a former Additional Public Prosecutor.

26.This Court has come across several cases, where two things were noted. In cases where a proper investigation is required, there would not be any such investigation and on the other hand, cases which should not be taken up by the police are getting much attention. Likewise, in this case, in a pure partition dispute case, search warrants have been obtained, search has been conducted and police custody has been taken. If this interest in conducting the investigation is shown in all the cases, de hors the amount involved and without any cherry-picking, the Department would stand tall in the weighing scale.



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

27.The Police is not having power to deal with civil matters. There is a forum for dealing with the civil matters. Here, a partition dispute has been given with a criminal color. The Police Standing Order PSO.562 specifically prohibits the police from interfering in cases of civil in nature. Even then, complaints of similar in nature are entertained by the Police and they are doing some Kangaroo Court. The Additional Director General of Police has, recently, issued a Circular in No.18/ADGP/L&O/Camp/2024, dated 09.01.2024, that the police are strictly refrained from enquiring or entertaining in civil matters like money dispute, land dispute, property dispute, pathway dispute, intellectual property dispute, etc. It appears, even the Commissioner of Police is not having any regard to this Circular. Therefore, this Court expects the Director General of Police, Chennai, to look into this issue and to preserve the dignity and image of the Department.

28.It appears that this alleged confession statement dated 10.04.2024 has not been forwarded to the Court so far. It is not known when this document has been created. But, the fact remains that the accused have moved an application for quashing the FIR registered as against them in Crl.OP(MD)No.4847 of 2024 before this Court. In that petition also, the petitioner and the defacto complainant appeared through the very same Senior Counsel. Considering the nature of allegations and the



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

status of the parties, this Court suggested as to why not they solve their issues amicably among themselves. By then, it was reported that Justice T.Sudanthiram, a retired Judge of this Court, has already conducted mediation on this issue. Considering the stature of Justice T.Sudanthiram and since the Hon'ble Judge has already dealt with this issue, I have made a suggestion as to why not this matter be referred for mediation before the very same Hon'ble Judge himself. At that juncture, learned Senior Counsel submitted that the petitioner's brother, Advocate Govindarajan, was a Junior to the Hon'ble Judge. The defacto complainant's son, Ramesh, who is also practising as an Advocate, was present before this Court. I verified with the said Ramesh as to whether he is not having any confidence with the Hon'ble Judge. He said that he is having confidence. Therefore, by order dated 10.04.2024, I have referred the issue [in the quash petition] for mediation before the Hon'ble Judge, after recording the concurrence of the parties and also directed the respondent Police not to harass the parties.

29.However, the defacto complainant and her son are now taking a stand attributing motive as against the Hon'ble Judge and this Court, as if I have compelled them to appear before him. He is retracting his own statement which he has made before the High Court, a Court of Record. This conduct of the defacto complainant



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

and her son is not appreciable.

WEB COPY

30.Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, the nature of allegations, the period of incarceration and in view of the discussions supra, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

31.Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail

i) on the petitioner executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai;

ii) the petitioner and the sureties shall submit a copy of their Aadhar Card or any other identity card issued by the Government in proof of their residential address;

iii) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent Police as and when required and shall co-operate for the investigation;

iv) the petitioner shall not misuse the liberty granted to him by indulging in any further offence and shall not tamper with the prosecution witnesses and he shall be available for the trial as well;



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY

v) on violation of any of the above conditions by the petitioner, the respondent Police shall move an application for cancellation of bail.

sd/-
29/04/2024

/ TRUE COPY /

29/04/2024
Sub-Assistant Registrar
(C.S. II)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

GK
TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I,
MADURAI.

2 DO THROUGH THE CHIEF JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE, MADURAI DISTRICT.

3 THE SUPERINTENDENT,
CENTRAL PRISON, MADURAI.

4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CENTRAL CRIME BRANCH (CCB),
MADURAI CITY.

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

COPY TO:
THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE (HOPF),
CHENNAI.



Crl.OP(MD)No.6458 of 2024

WEB COPY
+1 cc to Mr.S.RAMASAMY, Advocate, SR.No.5082 (I) DT.30/04/2024

+1 cc to Mr.S.P.PRABAKARAN, Advocate, SR.No.5181 (I) DT.30/04/2024

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.6458 of 2024
Date :29/04/2024

SA/SAR. /29.04.2024/25P/8C

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