

CRL.O.P.Nos.10501 and 10516 of 2016**S.VAIDYANATHAN,J.**

Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 468, 471 and 420 of IPC respectively in Crime No. 7 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police, the petitioners have come forward with these petitions seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10516 of 2016 is the first accused and the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No. 10501 of 2016 is the second accused. It is alleged that a power of attorney has been executed by the defacto complainant in favour of the first accused, after receiving a sum of Rs.25,00,000/- from the first accused. Thereafter, the property of the defacto complainant has been sold in favour of the second accused by the first accused, by creating a forged life certificate of the defacto complainant, which was given by the registered Doctor, who is the third accused.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the first accused is the Power of Attorney of the defacto complainant and the second accused is a bona fide purchaser of the property. He further would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent submits that the petitioners sold the property of the defacto complainant, which is worth about Rs.5 crores, by creating a forged life certificate of the defacto complainant and he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

S.VAIDYANATHAN,J.

ari

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also taking note of the fact that heinous crime has been committed by the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, these criminal original petitions are dismissed.

29.06.2016

CRL.O.P.Nos.10501 and 10516 of 2016

29.06.2016