

(2010) 10 MAD CK 0193**Madras High Court****Case No:** H.C.P. No. 1678 of 2010

D. Priya

APPELLANT

Vs

The Sub Inspector of Police and
Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Oct. 7, 2010**Acts Referred:**

- Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) - Section 376, 417
- Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 - Section 3(1)

Hon'ble Judges: M. Chockalingam, J; C.S. Karnan, J**Bench:** Division Bench**Advocate:** T. Arulraj, for the Appellant; Babu Muthumeeran, Additional Public Prosecutor, for the Respondent**Final Decision:** Dismissed**Judgement**

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

M. Chockalingam, J.

The grievance ventilated by the Petitioner is that she developed love with the detenu Selvadurai and pursuant to the love between herself and the detenu Selvadurai, they became intimated to each other and due to the relationship developed, she became pregnant seven or eight months. When it came to the knowledge of the detenu, he was not coming out of the house. Hence a complaint was given to the first Respondent and a case in Crime No. 255 of 2010 was registered. But the detenu was not actually secured. Under such circumstances, the present habeas corpus petition is brought forth by the Petitioner.

2. When the matter is taken up for enquiry, it is represented by the learned Counsel appearing for the State that a case has been registered against the detenu in Crime No. 255 of 2010 for the offences under Sections 417, 376 of the Indian Penal Code

417, 376 of the Indian Penal Code, 3(1)(xii) of the Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes Act and the detenu has actually been arrested on 9.9.2010 and produced before the Judicial Magistrate No. I, Krishnagiri and he was judicially remanded on the same day.

3. In view of the statement made by the learned Counsel appearing for the State and recorded above, I am of the considered opinion that the request of the Petitioner at this stage does not require any consideration and the habeas corpus petition is disposed of accordingly.