



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the First day of November Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.19361 of 2021

1 KUMAR

[PETITIONERS / ACCUSED]

2 JANAKIRAMAN

Vs

STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH, VELLORE,
VELLORE DISTRICT.
CRIME NO.7 OF 2021.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioners : M/S.G.VINODHKUMAR, Advocate

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

For Intervenor : M/S.E.KANNADASAN, Advocate

PETITION 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 Sections 120, 341, 420, 465, 468, 294(b), 506(1) of I.P.C. in Cr.No.7 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 disputed property. A1 is alleged to have created forged document and executed a general power of attorney in favour of A4, who inturn executed sale agreement in favour of A5. The petitioners are arrayed as A1 and A4.



3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The learned counsel further submitted that the petitioners and defacto complainant are close relatives and they have right over the property and that they are entitled for the property and hence A1 executed a general power of attorney in favour of A4, who inturn executed sale agreement in favour of A5, which is valid one.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.The learned Government Advocate submitted that without any authority over the defacto complainant's property, A1 executed general power of attorney in favour of A4, who inturn executed sale agreement in favour of A5.

6.Considering the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7.This criminal original petition is accordingly dismissed.

-sd/-
01/11/2021

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,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
VELLORE, VELLORE DISTRICT.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S. E.KANNADASAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.NO.12304

CRL OP.19361/2021

Date :01/11/2021

JPA 12/11/2021