

**In the Court of the Principal District Judge, Madurai.**

Present : **Thiru.M. Balakumar, B.A., M.L.,**

**(V Additional District Judge, Madurai)**

Principal District Judge, Madurai. (i/c)

Thursday, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of September -2020.

**CrI.M.P.No.4072/2020**

Sathishkumar,S/o.Periyasamy

... Petitioner/Accused.

**Vs**

State through the Inspector of Police,

Samayanallur,P.S. Cr.No.1565/2020

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition taken up today for hearing at request through e.mail/ e.petition and after hearing the arguments of Thiru.Varadharajan, Advocate for the petitioner and of Thiru.M. Tamil Chelvan, the Public Prosecutor for the state over conference call, this court passed the following

**Order**

1. Bail application u/s. 439 of Cr.p.c.
2. The offences alleged are U/s. 294(b), 306, 447 and 506(i) of IPC.
3. Heard.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner is working in the IDFC bank as a representative, engaging in the work of collecting the loan dues from the customers. Likewise, he went to the victim house for collection of money and on the fateful day, the victim's father stated that he will make payment on 31.8.2020 and in the house of the victim the accused not involved any of the activities inducing the victim to commit suicide. The petitioner is aged about 20 years only and he is a college student. In addition to that he employed in this job, only for his livelihood. There is no inducement on the part of the accused to make the victim for committing suicide.

5. In reply, the learned public prosecutor has stated that only on the inducement and force made by the petitioner with motive to collect the loan amount, the victim was forced to take the bad decision of putting his life to an end. The stress made by the petitioner/accused is the root cause for this incident. Hence, strongly objected to release the petitioner on bail.

6. On considering the rival submissions, it reveals that there was a loan amount is pending to the bank, where the accused was employed and their presence could not been denied at the time of occurrence. Though the petitioner's counsel argued that already there was a family dispute, their presence at the time of occurrence cannot be simply ignored. Considering the objection raised by the prosecution, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the Petitioner at this stage and the petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. In the result, the bail petition is dismissed accordingly.

Pronounced by me in Open Court on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of September -2020.

Sd/- M. Balakumar  
**V Additional District Judge, Madurai**  
Principal District Judge, Madurai.(i/c)

**Copy to**

1. The Judicial Magistrate concerned