



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

Friday, the Twenty Second day of February Two Thousand Nineteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.1980 of 2019

1.RAMANATHAN
2 MURASOLI

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED
RANK NOT KNOWN

Vs

STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.4/2019)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioners : MR.S.M.SANJAY Advocate

For Respondent : MR.K.SUYAMBULINGA BHARATHI,
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.S.MAHARAJA FOR
M/S.K.R.BADURUS ZAMAAN


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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners who are apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 120(b), 468, 471 and 420 IPC in Cr.No.4 of 2019, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.It is the case of the prosecution that the defacto complainant's father namely Subban purchased land in the year 1951 and he obtained patta. After his demise, the legal heirs, inherited the property and enjoy the property without any interference. Thereafter, the first accused created forged documents and using the same registered a sale deed in favour of him and thereafter, he have power of attorney to the third accused with the help of second accused. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they are innocent persons.



4.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor would vehemently oppose to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and would submit that the petitioners and other accused illegally created bogus sale deed and interfered in a peaceful possession of the defacto complainant.

5.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that A1 was arrested and based on his confession, the other accused persons implicated in this case. He would further submit that if anticipatory bail granted, it will affect the process of investigation and accordingly, he would pray for dismissal of this petition.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the serious allegations levelled against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
22/02/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S.K.R.BADURUS ZAMAAN Advocate SR.No.3599

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.1980 of 2019
Date :22/02/2019

AE/JC/SAR-II/11.03.2019/2P/4C