



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Twenty Eighth day of September Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.18023 of 2021

SURIYAN

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP BY

[RESPONDENT]

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CHENNAI CCB, POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI DISTRICT
(CRIME NO.132/2018)

For Petitioner : M/S P.CHANDRASEKAR Advocate

For Respondent : MR. C.E.PRATAP, Govt. Advocate (CrI. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471, 447, 120(B) of IPC in Cr.No.132 of 2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant has purchased a land and the name of the de-facto complainant was impersonated by one Chinamma and created a fake Sale deed as if she is the legal heir of Vinayagam, and Chinamma/Accused A7 created a fake Power of Attorney in 576/2015 in favour of A2. Whereas, the accused A2 in turn executed a sale deed in favour of A3. A3 created a Family settlement and executed in favour of one Kalpana. The above petitioner arrayed as A7 stood as witness of above document. Hence the Law Enforcing Agency, on the complainant of the de-facto complainant, registered a case against the petitioner and other accused persons.



3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that owing to his friendship with the prime accused, he only stood as witness for above said document. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl side) submits that the petitioner stood as a witness for the above said document. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, though the petitioner pleads that he stood only as witness to the said document, However, it is to be pointed out that these types of offences occurs frequently and are on the increase due to increase in value of the property and therefore, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner as otherwise it will give a leeway for persons to commit such offence.

6. Accordingly, this petition seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed

-sd/-

28/09/2021

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 PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CHENNAI CCB, POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI DISTRICT.

CC to M/S P.CHANDRASEKAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges

CRL OP.18023/2021

Date :28/09/2021

RW 12/10/2021