

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL THOMAS

FRIDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF JULY 2016/7TH SRAVANA, 1938

Cr1.MC.No. 4811 of 2016 ()

CRIME NO. 784/2016 OF PERAMANGALAM POLICE STATION , TRISSUR

PETITIONER(S) :

LINEESH A.D.
AGED 32 YEARS, S/O.DANIEL, ARANGASSERY HOUSE,
KORATTY KARA, KUNNAMKULAM, THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.SRI.JAISHANKAR V.NAIR
SRI.ALBERT V.JOHN
SMT.ROSHNI MANUEL

RESPONDENT(S) :

STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR:SMT M T SHEEBA

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
29-07-2016, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE A1. COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 19.7.16 IN BA 5196/2016.

ANNEXURE A2. COPY OF THE TAX RECEIPTS.

ANNEXURE A3. COPIES OF THE TAX RECEIPTS.

ANNEXURE A4. COPY OF DEED BEARING NO.1283 OF 2003.

ANNEXURE A5. COPY OF DEED BEARING NO.2014 OF 2010.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS:NIL

True Copy /

P A to Judge

SUNIL THOMAS, J.

Crl.M.C..No. 4811 of 2016

Dated this the 29th day of July, 2016

O R D E R

The petitioner herein is accused in Crime No.784/2016 of Peramangalam Police Station for offences punishable under Section 376 IPC read with section 3 (1) (xi) of SC and ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by Annexure A1 order of this Court subject to few conditions, interalia ,on execution of a bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties. The grievance of the petitioner herein is that two sureties by name Derbi and one Leena had offered themselves as sureties along with the title deeds Annexures A4 and A5. Two tax receipts now produced are Annexure A2 and A3. According to the petitioner herein, the court below did not permit the petitioner to execute a bond on a premise that entries in the tax receipts were not correspondingly entered in the respective column. It appears from the tax receipt, the survey numbers, the extent, period of tax amount paid and the person who has remitted the tax are seen. Apparently though they are not in the appropriate column directly against the

heading, I do not find anything doubtful in that. Merely because certain entries have spilled over to the next column, if that is only objection, to my mind, it is highly technical. In the light of the above, if the tax receipt produced as Annexures 2 and 3 are otherwise in order, the court below might not be stand on this technical objection alone.

Hence, Crl, M.C. is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
SUNIL THOMAS
Judge

dpk

True Copy

P S to Judge

