

Memorandum of Criminal Original Petition

Under Section 438 of Cr.P.C.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

CRL.O.P.No. OF 2010

IN

Crime No. Not known of 2010

(On the file of Police Station)

1) Mr. R. Divakar,  
S/o. Mr. R. Ravindran  
Aged about 30 years

2) Mr. R. Ravindran  
S/o. Mr.  
Aged about 57 years

3) Mr. R. Soundharya  
W/o. Mr. R. Ravindran  
Aged about 52 years

All the above residing at  
No.10/A, Nagappan Street,  
Nemlichery, Chrompet,  
Chennai – 600 044

...Petitioners/Accuseds

-Vs-

The Inspector of Police,  
Police Station,  
Chennai

...Respondent/Complainant

Mrs. D. Ranjini,  
W/o. Mr. R. Divakar,  
Aged about \_\_ years,  
No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Chennai

... De-facto Complainant

**PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL**

The Petitioners are Mr. R. Divakar, son of Mr. R. Ravindran, aged about 30 years,  
Mr. R. Ravindran, son of \_\_\_\_\_, aged about 57 years and Mr. R.

Soundharya, wife of Mr. Ravindran, aged about 52 years and all of the them residing together at No.10/A, Nagappan Street, Nemlichery, Chrompet, Chennai – 600 044

The address for service on the Petitioner is the same as that of his counsel M/s. I. Stalin Selvamani & S. Padma Priya at No. 39, Pammal Main Road, Pammal, Chennai – 600 043

1. The Petitioner submits that they apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offence under section under Sec. 498 (A) read with 506 (II) of I.P.C.

2. The Petitioner submits that the allegation of the prosecution is that the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner was married to the De-facto Complainant Mrs. Ranjini, 03.02.2008 at \_\_\_\_\_. The marriage was solemnized at the instance of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Petitioners who are none other than the in laws of the De-facto Complainant and parents of the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner. Thereafter a grand reception was conducted at \_\_\_\_\_. The Petitioner submits that out of their lawful wedlock a child was born and \_\_\_ name is \_\_\_\_\_, who is now \_\_\_ years old.

3. The Petitioners submit that for the past several years from the date of their marriage between 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner and De-facto Complainant, they have been leading a happy and contended married life and were living in a joint family along with the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners and brother of the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner. The allegations that a dowry was demanded collectively by the Petitioners herein and other allegation alleged against the petitioners are all false. The petitioner hails from a rich family with a good reputation in the society.

4. The Petitioners submit that recently nowadays, the De-facto Complainant used to quarrel now and then hearing the advise and on the instigation of her parents. On 24.05.2010, there were certain exchange of words between her and the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner and angry behaviour on her part due to which the De-facto Complainant left the matrimonial home and went to her parental home. When the Petitioners went to convince her, and inspite of various requests she has not returned back home instead she gave a list of orders to be carried out by the

Petitioners failing which the De-facto Complainant threatened the Petitioners with false criminal complaint and dyer consequences. Since till date the Defacto Complainant was residing with the Petitioners family happily, there was no cause for any criminal complaint at this stage. The Defacto Complainant on the wrong advice of her parents alone will prefer a complaint to harass the Petitioners.

5. The Petitioners submit that the compromise initiative taken by them failed and the defacto complainant was repeatedly harping upon the Petitioners to obey the orders stated by her. The petitioner thereafter left the place and thereafter all of a sudden the parents of the De-facto Complainant and other relatives called the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner and threatened him that they are moving to respondent police station to launch a police complaint against the Petitioners herein.

6. The Petitioner submits that they are innocent and they have not committed any offence and the have been falsely implicated in the above case.

7. The Petitioners are a Law abiding citizen and has no bad antecedents. They hail from a respectable family. Their brother and relatives are all residing in Chennai. The Petitioners herein has no previous criminal history whatsoever of any case having been registered against them.

8. The Petitioners further submit that there is no necessity for any custodial interrogation and they are very much available in Chennai for any further investigation. The Petitioners are ready and willing to offer solvent sureties and abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble High Court. The Petitioners are having strong roots in Chennai and has a permanent residence in Chennai.

9. The Petitioners submit that this is the first Anticipatory Bail Petition moved before this Hon'ble High Court and no other petition is pending before any other Court including the Hon'ble High Court.

It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to grant Anticipatory Bail to the Petitioners herein in Crime No. Not known of 2010 on the file of the Respondent Police, pending investigation, on such conditions, as this

Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

Dated at Chennai on this the \_\_\_\_ day of May, 2010

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

**Note:-**

1. Bail to the satisfaction of the Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. No Similar Petition is Pending in any other Court.

Memorandum of Criminal  
Original Petition

Under Section 438 of Cr.P.C.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF  
JUDICATURE  
AT MADRAS**

CRL.O.P.No. OF 2010

IN

Crime No. Not Known of 2010

- 1) Mr. R. Divakar,
  - 2) Mr. R. Ravindran
  - 3) Mr. R. Soundharya
- ... Petitioners/Accused

-Vs-

The Inspector of Police,  
Police Station,  
Chennai  
...Respondent/Complainant

Mrs. D. Ranjini  
... De-facto Complainant

**PETITION FOR  
ANTICIPATORY BAIL**

**M/s. I. STALIN SIMION SELVAMANI  
S. PADMA PRIYA  
COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER**