



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

Wednesday, the Twenty Fourth day of June Two Thousand Fifteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.17677 of 2014

WEB COPY

1 ANANTHAYEE
2 SASIKALA
3 N.MUTHUKANNAN

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.1,3 &4

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
APPANTHIRUPATHI POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT.
(CR.NO.969 OF 2014)

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.P.SUBBIAH Advocate

For Respondent : MR.P.KANNITHEVAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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

The petitioners who are arrayed as A1, 3 and 4 apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of I.P.C in Crime No.969 of 2014 and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the accused have forged the signature of the de-facto complainant and sold the ancestral property.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the first petitioner is the mother and the petitioners 2 and 3 are sister and brother of the de-facto complainant. The family owned ancestral property to an extent of 78½ cents and based on the power of attorney executed by the petitioners and the de-facto complainant, 50 cents were already sold in the year 2010 and in respect of the balance of 28½ cents the de-facto complainant has executed a consent deed and on that basis, the petitioners have executed a power of attorney in favour of the accused 5 and 6. It is further submitted that in the year 2010 the marriage of the de-facto complainant was performed after selling the property and subsequently, the younger sister of the de-facto complainant got married for which the balance land was sold with the consent of the de-facto complainant. However, subsequently she had lodged the present complaint alleging that her signature was forged in the consent deed. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the accused 5 and 6 were already granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.16838 of 2014.

4.Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for



5. Considering the nature of allegations made against the petitioners in FIR, I am inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.2, Madurai, and on each of them executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the third petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required and the petitioners 1 and 2 shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. The petitioners shall comply with the condition stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. Scrupulously.

6. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

sd/-

24/06/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.II,
MADURAI.
- 2 DO-THRO' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
MADURAI.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
APPANTHIRUPATHI POLICE STATION, MADURAI DISTRICT.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S.P.SUBBIAH Advocate SR.No.33415

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.17677 of 2014

Date :24/06/2015

PA/PPS/30.06.2015/2P/6C