

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4740 of 2017

ORDER:

This petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings against the petitioner/accused No.8 in Crime No.61 of 2015 on the file of the Station House Officer, I Town Police Station, Tenali, Guntur District, registered under Sections 468, 471, 420 and 447 read with 34 IPC.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner strenuously submitted that the second respondent has no right whatsoever in the property in question. He further submitted that the second respondent herein created a will dated 20.09.2008 to deprive the legal rights of accused Nos.1, 3 and 4. He further submitted that the petitioner purchased the property under sale deed dated 22.02.2014, therefore he is a bonafide purchaser for valuable consideration. He further submitted that the allegations made in the complaint do not constitute any offence much less the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor for the State of Andhra Pradesh submitted that originally the property belongs to one Chandrasekhar Lingam, who is father of second respondent. He further submitted that Accused Nos.1, 3 and 4 have obtained a possession certificate in connivance with revenue officials and created a gift deed dated 23.04.2012. He further submitted that the allegations made in the complaint *prima facie*

constitute the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner.

3. A perusal of the record reveals that the petitioner herein is A8 and the second respondent is the *de facto* complainant. A perusal of the record reveals that Accused Nos.1, 3 and 4 are children of Bharathi Devi, who died on 20.03.2009. The father of the second respondent died on 30.09.2008. It is alleged that there was some relation between the father of the second respondent and Bharathi Devi. As per the allegations made in the complaint, accused Nos.1, 3 and 4 have created a gift deed dated 23.04.2012 basing on the possession certificate obtained by them. It is further alleged that A8 purchased the property in connivance with accused Nos.1, 3 and 4. The gist of the allegations made in the complaint is that the petitioner along with other accused cheated the second respondent.

4. While exercising the inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the Court has to take into consideration the allegations made in the complaint only. The Court is not justified in embarking upon an enquiry as to probability, reliability or genuineness of the allegations made in the complaint at the initial stage of investigation. Whether the petitioner/A8 is a *bona fide* purchaser or not will come to light during the course of investigation. The material placed before the Court is *prima facie* sufficient to investigate into

the matter in order to ascertain the truthfulness or otherwise of the allegations made in the complaint.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in **R.P.Kapoor v. State of Punjab**¹, **State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal**², **V.Y.Jose v. State of Gujarat**³ and **Teeja Devi v. State of Rajasthan**⁴, I am of the considered view that it is not a fit case to quash the criminal proceedings at the threshold.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated by the Supreme Court in **Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar**⁵, the Station House Officer, I Town Police Station, Tenali, Guntur District, is hereby directed to follow the procedure as contemplated under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. in Crime No.61 of 2015 so far as the petitioner/accused No.8 is concerned.

7. With the above direction, the Criminal Petition is disposed of. Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Criminal Petition shall stand closed.

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

Date:29.06.2017

Rns

¹ AIR 1960 SC 866

² AIR 1992 SC 604

³ (2009) 3 SCC 78

⁴ 2015 (1) ACR 564 (SC)

⁵ 2014 (8) SCALE 250

