



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Twentieth day of July Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION Nos.12530 & 12533 of 2021

THIRUPATHI E. [PETITIONER / ACCUSED
IN CRL.OP.NO.12530/2021]

VIGNESH R. [PETITIONER / ACCUSED
IN CRL.OP.NO.12533/2021]

Vs

THE STATE REP BY [RESPONDENT
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]
T-6, AVADI POLICE STATION,
AVADI, CHENNAI.
CRIME NO. 794 OF 2021

For Petitioner : M/S.NATHAN AND ASSOCIATES Advocate
[IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

For Respondent : M/S. C.E.PRATAP, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)
[IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

For Intervenor : M/S. S. THANKIRA, Advocate [IN BOTH THE PETITIONS]

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Section 341, 294(B), 365, 406, 420, 471, 468 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.794 of 2021, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the owner of the property to the extent of 16 cents. One Ramanan approached the defacto complainant to buy lands in Madhuravoyal Main Road by selling his own property, stating that the power to sale of the said land has been vested with him and it has high value and would give more gain. Believing the words of the accused persons, the petitioner executed Power of Attorney in favour of one Sathish Kumar, in the office of the Sub Registrar, Poonamalle. Later when the defacto complainant questioned about the property, the accused persons did not give any proper response. The defacto complainant suspecting the act of the accused, went to the Sub Registrar Office to cancel the Power of Attorney executed, whereby he was threatened by the accused persons and thereafter, they came to the house of the



defacto complainant and abducted him along with his family for registration of the property in their favour. The defacto complainant apprehended over the same and acted as to their needs. Thereafter, lodged a police complaint before the respondent to take appropriate action.

WEB COPY

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners along with other accused person have illegally abducted the defacto complainant and his family, threatened and got registration of his property in their favour and hence he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Since the offence is very heinous in nature, it requires proper investigation and therefore, granting anticipatory bail at this stage would affect the progress of investigation and hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, these criminal original petitions are dismissed.

-sd/-

20/07/2021

This order, on being produced, be punctually observed and carried into execution by all concerned

TRUE COPY

Sub-Assistant Registrar (Statistics/C.S.)
High Court, Madras - 600 104.

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
T-6, AVADI POLICE STATION,
AVADI, CHENNAI.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+2 CC to M/S.NATHAN AND ASSOCIATES Advocate on payment of
necessary charges SR.NOs.7592 & 7591

+4 CC to M/S. S. THANKIRA, Advocate on payment of necessary
charges SR.NOs.7585 & 7584

CRL OPs.12530 & 12533/2021

Date :20/07/2021

INBA 02/08/2021

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>