



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Thursday, the Sixteenth day of June Two Thousand Twenty Two

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION No.13415 of 2022

RAMESHKUMAR

[PETITIONER / ACCUSED]

Vs

STATE REP BY
INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KOYAMBEDU POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI.
CRIME NO.98 OF 2022.

[RESPONDENT]

For Petitioner : M/S.A.SINAGARVELU Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.A.DAMODARAN, Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervener : M/S.K.PREMKUMAR, Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner/A1 who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 448, 454, 406, 420, 465, 468, 471, 506(1) & 34 of IPC in Crime No.98 of 2022, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant purchased a house at No.29/30 F1, Varalakshmi nagar, 2nd Main Street, Maduravoyal from Mrs.J.Gnanavadiyu who is the mother of petitioner/A1, on 27.03.2019. This being so, in the year 2021, after the lock down the de facto complainant visited his above stated property and came to know that someone have entered inside his house. While enquiring the same, the de facto complainant came to know that petitioner herein, broke open his house and gave the same for lease to A2 for a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- (Rupees Eight Lakhs only) on 09.12.2019. When the de



facto complainant asked the same, the petitioner herein, along with A2 and her husband threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint.

3. The de facto complainant purchased the subject property Viz., the house site situated at No.29/30 F1, Varalakshmi nagar, 2nd Main Street, Maduravoyal from the mother of the petitioner/A1 by registered sale deed dated 27.03.2019 in Doc.No.1956/2019. Thereafter, it was kept under lock and key, since the de facto complainant was having residence in another house. Utilizing the said circumstances, A1 broke open the lock and leased out the said property in favour of the A2.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the de facto complainant/intervenor submitted that he lodged a complaint in the year 2021 immediately after broke open of the lock and A2 appeared before the concerned police station and assured that she will vacate the subject premises within a short period of time. However, A2 failed to vacate the premises and as such, the respondent Police registered the case.

5. It is also seen that, the de facto complainant purchased the property over a valid sale consideration concerned from the mother of the A1. Since, it is kept under lock and key, under the possession of de facto complainant, A1 broke up the key and handed over the possession to A2, on receipt of Rs.8,00,000/- as lease amount.

6. Considering the above submissions, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-
16/06/2022

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 INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KOYAMBEDU POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI.

2 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+1 CC to M/S.K.PREMKUMAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges
SR.NO. 9274

CRL OP.13415/2022

Date :16/06/2022

RW-21/06/2022