

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL THOMAS

TUESDAY, THE 14TH DAY OF JULY 2015/23RD ASHADHA, 1937

Bail Appl..No. 6664 of 2014 ()

**CRIME NO. 1385/2014 OF VADANAPPALLY POLICE STATION,
TRISSUR DISTRICT**

PETITIONERS/ACCUSED :

**RAVI, AGED 59 YEARS,S/O RAMAN,
THURUTH VEEDU, KANNAMALIPURAM
CHEDRAPPINNI**

BY ADV. SRI.RAJIT

RESPONDENT :

**STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT. MADHUBEN M.

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 14-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:**

bp

SUNIL THOMAS, J.

=====

B.A.No.6664 of 2014

=====

Dated this the 14th day of July, 2015

ORDER

This application for pre-arrest bail is filed by the second accused in Crime No.1385 of 2014 of the Vatanappilly Police Station for offences punishable under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471 and 420 r/w Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. The crux of the allegation against the accused is that the accused had forged certain documents in relation to an item of property and availed a loan of Rs.9,00,000/- from a bank in 2004. Subsequently, it was found that all title deeds were forged by accused Nos.1 to 3 and hence, complaint was laid. Apprehending arrest in the case, the second accused has approached this Court seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. Heard both sides and examined the records.

3. The allegation of the bank is that the first accused had deposited the title deeds in relation to the disputed property and availed a loan. The above property was purchased by the first accused from the second accused who in turn had purchased it from the third accused. Thereafter, another person approached this Court, in a writ proceeding contending that he is the true owner of

the property and accused Nos.1 to 3 have no right over the property. It appears that the property which the second defendant claimed to have purchased from the third defendant is the property which originally belonged to another person. The person from whom the petitioner herein claims to have purchased the property had no property at all. The complexity of the second accused with the remaining accused in creating certain documents is apparent. This is a matter which requires detailed investigation. Whether all the three accused have conspired and created documents with a criminal intent, is a matter which requires deeper investigation. It is possible that granting of pre-arrest bail may hamper the proper investigation into the manner in which forgery was done and whether other persons are also involved. Hence, I am not inclined to grant bail.

The application is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-

SUNIL THOMAS
Judge

Sbna