



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Wednesday, the Twenty Fourth day of November Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs Justice T.V. THAMILSELVI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.21505 of 2021

1 G.BALASUBRAMANIAN [PETITIONERS / ACCUSED]
2 A.BAHURUDEEN
3 A.ASHRAF ALI
4 N.KANNAN

Vs

STATE REP BY [RESPONDENT]
INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CCB-I, 132,
EVK SAMPATH ROAD,
VEPERY, PERIYAMET,
CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU 600 007.
CR.NO. 104 OF 2021.

For Petitioner : MR.A.R.L.SUNDARESAN SENIOR ADVOCATE for
M/S. AL.GANTHIMATHI Advocate

For Respondent : MR.N.S.SUGANTHAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 120B, 420, 408, 465, 467, 477A & 506(2) of IPC in Crime No.104 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1 & A2 approached the Defacto complainant, who is a builder of apartments to develop their lands and agreed to divide profits by a defacto complainant - A1 & A2 ratio. On 05.07.2012, the parties then entered into a Joint Venture Agreement and subsequently on 22.11.2013 and on 20.06.2016 A1 and A2 executed Power of Attorneys in favour of the defacto complainant for the purposes of developing the project. There was a dispute and the same is referred to arbitration, since arbitration proceedings is



initiated. They prayed for granting anticipatory bail.

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. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the investigation is still pending. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The Intervenor raised objection stating that by fabricating the sale deeds his property were sold to his close relatives which were worth about Rs.12,00,00,000/- which requires detailed statement and he raised strong objection.

6. Considering the allegations and the nature of the offences involved in this matter, the detailed enquiry and the investigation is in initial stage, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the petition seeking anticipatory bail is dismissed.

-sd/-

24/11/2021

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,
CCB-I, 132, EVK SAMPATH ROAD,
VEPERY,
PERIYAMET, CHENNAI,
TAMIL NADU 600 007.



2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S. AL.GANTHIMATHI Advocate on payment of necessary
charges SR.No.13473

CRL OP.21505/2021

Date :24/11/2021

APN 29/11/2021