



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

Friday, the Thirtieth day of June Two Thousand Seventeen  
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs.Justice J.NISHA BANU

CRL OP(MD) Nos.22780,22796 and 23549 of 2016

WEB COPY

RAVI

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.I  
IN CRL OP(MD)NO.22780 OF 2016

1 MURUGANANTHAM

2 VANCHILINGAM

(AMENDED AS PER ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE  
COURT ORDER DATED 22.12.2016 AND MADE  
IN CRL MP(MD)NO.12599 OF 2017 IN  
CRL OP(MD)NO.22796 OF 2017)

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO. 2 & 3  
IN CRL OP(MD)NO.22796 OF 2016

S.E.VASUDEVAN

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.5  
IN CRL OP(MD)NO.23549 OF 2016

Vs

STATE REP.BY,  
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
ANTI LAND GRABBING CELL,  
THANJAVUR DISTRICT.  
CRIME NO.30 OF 2016

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT  
IN ALL THE PETITIONS

C.AMMU

... PETITIONER/INTERVENER  
IN CRL OP(MD)NOS.22780 & 22796/2017

For Petitioner : M/S.S.VENKATESAN Advocate  
IN CRL OP(MD)NOS.22780 & 22796 OF 2017

For Petitioner : M/S.K.MUTHU GANESAPANDIAN, Advocate  
IN CRL OP(MD)No.23549 OF 2017


For Respondent : MR.A.RAMAR, Additional Public Prosecutor  
IN ALL THE PETITIONS

For Intervenor : MR.R.VENKATESHWAR, Advocate  
IN ALL THE PETITIONS

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>  
The petitioners, who are arrayed as A1, A2, A3 and A5 in Crime  
No.30 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police, apprehends  
arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged



offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 423, 465, 468, 471, 120 (b) and 506(ii) IPC and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the intervener/defacto complainant and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent/State.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners colluding with the other accused, including the Government officials, are alleged to have grabbed the property of the defacto complainant by creating forged documents and also forging the signature of the defacto complainant, after affixing her photo.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that due to previous enmity, the present false complaint has been lodged by the defacto complainant and that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the intervener/defacto complainant submitted that the petitioners colluding with the other accused illegally grabbed her property and that though the case has been registered in the year 2016, the respondent Police did not take any steps to arrest the accused. There is also life threat against the defacto complainant.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the nature of the allegations raised against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, these petitions are dismissed. However, the respondent Police is directed to complete the investigation and file a final report within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

sd/-

30/06/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
ANTI LAND GRABBING CELL, THANJAVUR DISTRICT.

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

ORDER

IN

CRL OP (MD) Nos. 22780, 22796  
and 23549 of 2016

Date : 30/06/2017