

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, SALEM

Present : Thiru.S.Jeganathan, B.A.,B.L., D.C.A., C.J.,
Principal Sessions Judge (i/c),
I Additional Sessions Judge,
Salem.

Thursday, the 13th day of October, 2022

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION No.3431 / 2022

(CNR.No.TNSA010055002022)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) Jayaprakash (29), S/o.Gunasekaran | |
| 2) Gunasekaran @ Cable Bala (55),
S/o.Ponnusamy | |
| 3) Sagunthala (49), W/o.Gunasekaran | |
| 4) Deepika (33), W/o.Srinivasan | ... Petitioners / Accused
No.1, 3 to 5 |

/Versus/

State by : The Sub Inspector of Police,
Ammamet AWPS.
Cr.No.45 / 2022

... Respondent / Complainant

This Petition filed on 11.10.2022 under section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Tr.R.Cholan, Advocate for the petitioners and of the Public Prosecutor contra, this Court passed the following :

ORDER

Heard both sides and perused the records.

This petition is filed by counsel for petitioners/accused u/s.438 of Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail. Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent/police for the alleged offence punishable u/s.498(A), 494, 354 (D) (1)(i), 294(b), 506(i) IPC, section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and section 66(E) of Information Technology Act, the petitioners have come forward with this petition seeking anticipatory bail.

The learned counsel for petitioners would submit that the first information report registered against the petitioners on 22.09.2022. The 1st petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant, 2nd and 3rd petitioners are parents of the 1st petitioner and 4th petitioner is the sister of the 1st petitioner. They have been falsely charged for the offence u/s.498(A), 494, 354 (D)(1)(i), 294(b), 506(i) IPC, section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and section 66(E) of Information Technology Act. Hence he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on any condition.

Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor would submit that the defacto complainant and the 1st petitioner were studied together and they loved each other and they got married on 04.06.2017. As per the available information there was demand of dowry and the 1st petitioner is got married with one Soundarya. Hence he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Considering the above facts and circumstances and taking into account the charge against 1st petitioner under section 494 IPC., this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and as such this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court, this 13th day of October, 2022.

Sd /- S.Jeganathan,
Principal Sessions Judge (i/c),
I Additional Sessions Judge,
Salem