



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Fourteenth day of December Two Thousand Twenty One

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs Justice T.V. THAMILSELVI

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.23980 of 2021

1 G.RAJALAKSHMI

[PETITIONERS / ACCUSED]

2 G.KARTHICK

Vs

THE STATE REPRESENTED BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
TEAM-I, EDF-I,
CENTRAL CRIME BRANCH,
CHENNAI.
(CRIME NO.160 OF 2021)

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.S.SHANMUGA VELAYUTHAM, Senior Advocate for
M/S.A.M.PACKIANATHAN EASTER Advocate

For Respondent : MR. A.GOKULAKRISHNAN, Additional Public Prosecutor

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 offences under sections 409 and 420 IPC, in Crime No.160 of 2021 seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant viz., Mrs.Sucharitha Madanagopal is having four plots. She has entered into a Sale Agreement with the accused viz., Ramakrishnan, for selling the four plots for a sale consideration of Rs.3 Crore. After making initial payment of nearly Rs.52 lakh, the said accused had agreed to finish off the sale within a short span of time. On such pretext, he obtained the original documents of the properties by giving some of the title deed as security. Thereafter, he had neither completed the sale nor made any payment. When it was checked



with Registering Authorities, it appears that the accused had sold the property for Rs.1.25 Crore, though there was an agreement of Rs.3 Crore. In order to cheat the defacto complainant, the sale deed was executed by the petitioner for lesser consideration in favour of other accused. As per sale agreement, the accused Ramakrishnan has to pay Rs.2.48 Crore to the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that they are under the apprehension of arrest in Crime NO.160 of 2021. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that the petitioners herein have not arrayed as accused and they have only cited as witnesses in this case, since there is no case against the petitioners. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners .

5.Recording the submission of the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, as there is no case against these petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners .

6.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

14/12/2021

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,
TEAM-I, EDF-I,
CENTRAL CRIME BRANCH, CHENNAI.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+4 CC to M/S.A.M.PACKIANATHAN EASTER Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.NO.14725

CRL OP.23980/2021

Date :14/12/2021

RW 23/12/2021