

CRL.O.P.No.25113 of 2015**S.VAIDYANATHAN, J.**

Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 420 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.21 of 2012 on the file of the respondent police, the petitioner has come forward with this petition seeking anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is alleged to have created forged documents and sold the property to the defacto complainant. Hence, a case had been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A6 submitted that the petitioner stood only as a broker in respect of the property sold to the defacto complainant. He further submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that the totally there are eleven accused and this petitioner is arrayed as A6. The allegation is that one Ramakrishnan executed a sale deed in favour of Panduranga Rao in the year 1974 - 1975. Panduranga Rao died on 17.05.1987. Thereafter, his legal representatives is in possession and enjoyment of the said property. Now, the complainant is the son of the Panduranga Rao. Now the allegation is that the vendor of the property, viz., Ramakrishnan whose LR executed power of attorney viz., three persons in respect of the same property in favour of A5. Thereafter,

S.VAIDYANATHAN, J.

gv

A5 executed sale deed in the name of A9 and A10 . Later A9 and A10 executed power of attorney in favour of A15 and A16. This petitioner stood as a broker in respect of subsequent transactions and liable for the double sale of the property.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and taking note of the fact that the petitioner created forged documents in respect of the property which originally belongs to one Panduranga Rao and one Ramakrishnan executed power of attorney on the very same property and sold to A5 and A5 created the sale deed in favour of A9 and A10. Thereafter A9 and A10 executed power of attorney and acted in the entire episode. Petitioner/A6 stood as a broker and moved the same for sale consideration by creating forged documents and that this court is of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this matter and hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

31.08.2016

gv

CRL.O.P.No.25113 of 2015