



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

Friday, the Fifteenth day of July Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Ms.Justice V.M.VELUMANI

CRL OP(MD) No.11197 of 2016

A.MURUGAN,

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED No.3

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
C.C.B., TIRUNELVELI,
(CRIME NO.16 OF2016)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S P.PETHU RAJESH, 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 petitioner, who is arrayed as A3 apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for an alleged offence punishable under Sections 419,465,467,468,471,473,120B and 420 of IPC in Crime No.16 of 2016, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Anburose, land broker along with three other accused persons approached the defacto complainant and informed him that 8 cents of lands in Meenakshipuram village belongs to one Nisha, W/o. Dr. Venkatachalam which is available for sale of Rs.60,00,000/-. The defacto complainant after seeing the land agreed to purchase on 28.06.2016. The petitioner and other accused persons came along with original documents. The defacto complainant gave documents to one Gomathi Nayagam, Document writer for preparing the documents. The document writer informed the defacto complainant that the document is a forged one. Immediately, the petitioner and two others ran away from the place of occurrence. The defacto complainant and other persons who accompanied him hold on A1 and A2. On enquiry, A1 informed to defacto complainant that she is Santhanamary @ Chandra and she is not Nisha, W/o. Dr. Venkatachalam. The petitioner and others created identity card



fixing her photo and signature of her to represent as Nisha, W/o. Dr. Venkatachalam. The defacto complainant handed over A1 and A2 to the Commissioner of Police and on complaint, a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that neither the petitioner involved in the alleged occurrence nor his name has been found in the FIR.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that the petitioner and other accused persons impersonated the real owner Nisha and created forged documents and tried to sell the property and the investigation of the case is pending.

5. Considering the serious nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-

15/07/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
C.C.B., TIRUNELVELI, (CRIME NO.16 OF2016)

2 THE ADDL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S K.SATHISH KUMAR Advocate SR.No.36901.

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.11197 of 2016

Date :15/07/2016

AM/AAL.MPA/SAR-II/25.07.2016/2P/4C