



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Wednesday, the Twenty First day of January Two Thousand Fifteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice P.N.PRAKASH

CRL OP (MD) No.16796 of 2014

WEB COPY

1 SUNDARAMMAL
2 GOMATHIAMMAL
3 PARVATHI
4 RAJAMMAL
5 MUTHULAKSHMI
6 MUTHURAJ

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NOS.3,5,6,7,9 & 10

Vs

STATE.REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ILATHUR POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
CR. NO. 134 OF 2013.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : No appearance

For Respondent : MR.C.RAMESH, Additional Public Prosecutor

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.
ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Crime No.134 of 2013, on the file of the respondent police for offences under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471 and 420 IPC, the petitioners are now before this Court seeking Anticipatory Bail.

2.This matter was heard extensively on 20.01.2015 and posted 'for orders' today. Today, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners.

3.It is seen from the Case Diary that the de-facto complainant is the owner of the land measuring 2 acres and 34 cents in S.No.273/2. He had divided it into plots and sold to various persons and has retained for himself 25 cents of land. In this regard, there was a suit in O.S.No.469 of 2003 filed by one Arumaikani Nadar against the de-facto complainant and the suit was dismissed in favour of the de-facto complainant on 06.12.2005. While so, it is seen that the accused in this case have deliberately created encumbrance over the property of the de-facto complainant by registering sale deeds amongst their own family members, as if the properties belong to them. The allegations against



Sundarammal (A3) is that she has registered a sale deed on 26.07.2012 Document No.2810/12 in favour of her daughter Parvathi, the third petitioner herein. It is seen that the other petitioners are witnesses to the documents, knowing full well that the executors of the documents have no right or title over the same, they put signature in the documents. Taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations against these petitioners, this Court is of the view that it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

sd/-
21/01/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ILATHUR POLICE STATION, TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.16796 of 2014
Date :21/01/2015

PA/28.01.15/1P/3C