

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.ABRAHAM MATHEW

WEDNESDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF MAY 2015/6TH JYAISHTA, 1937

Bail Appl..No. 2149 of 2015 ()

**CRIME NO. 291/2015 OF FORT POLICE STATION ,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT**

PETITIONER(S)/1ST AND 2N ACCUSED:

- 1. SHAHUL HAMEED, AGED 59 YEARS,
S/O.ABDUL RASAQ, RESIDING AT T.C.12/1698,
NEAR KAIRALI T.V.PALAYAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT.**
- 2. SANTHOSH KUMAR, AGED 43 YEARS,
S/O.AYYAPPAN PILLAI, RESIDING AT T.C.39/464,
VINAYAKA BUILDING, PULIMOODU.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.J.R.PREM NAVAZ
SRI.P.T.SHEEJISH**

RESPONDENT/STATE:

**STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
FORT POLICE STATION,
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM-682 032.**

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT. R.REMA

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 27-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:**

sts

K. ABRAHAM MATHEW, J.

.....
B.A.No. 2149 of 2015 (C)
.....

Dated this the 27th day of May, 2015

ORDER

Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.

2. Petitioners are the accused 1 and 2 in Crime No. 291 of 2015 of Fort Police Station registered for the offences under sections 120B, 420, 465, 468, 471 and 34 of IPC.

3. He is the tenant of a shop room, the landlord of which is the sister of the first informant. The eclectic supply to the shop room was disconnected a few years ago. It is alleged that the petitioners forged a document as if it is a rent deed executed by the landlord in favour of the second petitioner and on the strength of it power supply was restored to the shop room.

4. Heard.

5. It is not in dispute now that the rent deed produced before the Electricity Board contains the forged signature of the landlord. Forged ID card and consent letter also were produced before the Electricity Board. It is not in dispute it was the second petitioner who produced them. The facts and circumstances of the case indicate that the offences were committed, *prima facie* by the petitioners together. They are not entitled to get anticipatory bail.

In the result, this application is dismissed. Learned counsel submits

B.A.No. 2149 of 2015 (C)

::2::

that the petitioners will surrender before the Investigating Officer, they may do so if they are so advised.

Sd/-
K. ABRAHAM MATHEW
JUDGE

DST

//True Copy//

P.A. To Judge