

**IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Tmt.G.Vijaya, B.A., M.L., PGDCFS**
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

Wednesday, the 12th day of October 2022

CrI.M.P.No.3351/2022
(CNR No. TNRM-01-004600-2022)

Dinesh, (aged 41/2022),
S/o.Natarajan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Kenikkarai P.S.,
in Cr.No.614/2022

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming up on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.M.Mayakannan, Learned Counsel for the petitioner and the Learned Public Prosecutor for the State and this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petition has been filed by the petitioner under section **438 of Cr.P.C** for seeking anticipatory bail.

2. The respondent police has been registered a case in **Cr.No.614/2022 for the punishable offences under section 454 and 380 of IPC against the petitioner and another..**

3. Heard, the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Public Prosecutor.

4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that a case has been registered against the petitioner and others for the offences punishable under sections

454 and 380 of IPC. According to him, he has not committed any such alleged offence and false case has been foisted against him. The petitioner is afraid that he may be harassed by the respondent police in the event of his arrest. He would further submit that most of the investigation is completed and he prays to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

5. On the hand, the learned Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioner and another have committed punishable offences U/s. 454 and 380 of Indian Penal Code are non-bailable offences. Further the learned Counsel for the State submitted that the defacto complainant is Head-Clerk of the Judicial Magistrate No.2 Court, Ramanathapuram. The petitioner is Office Assistant of Fast Track Mahila Court and A1 is Record Clerk of Judicial Magistrate Court No.II and the petitioner and A1 had stolen liquor bottles from the Court. Further he has submitted that the properties were handed over by the police officials to the Court concerned and the same were received in P.R.No.52/2022, 55/2022 and 108/2022 and the properties are kept in the office room in front of the camera and the properties are to be destroyed as per the order of the Judicial Magistrate concerned. Further he would submit that investigation is in the very beginning stage and if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, the petitioner may interfere with the investigation, hence he strongly objected to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

6. Considering both side submissions, nature of offence and considering the

facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration of the fact that the investigation is in the very beginning stage, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 12th day of October 2022.

Principal District and Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.

Copy to
The Judicial Magistrate, No.II, Ramanathapuram
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.