



5. It is seen that there are totally 5 accused in which the petitioner is arrayed as A3. When the petitioner was working as a registering authority in a Sub-Registration Office, Thiruporur, the petitioner registered a settlement deed in favour of A2 which was executed by A1, on the strength of the fabricated documents in favour of A1 vide Document No.1512 of 1971. It is also seen that A4 and A5 are employees of the Registration Office and they fabricated the sale deed in favour of the first accused in respect of the subject property to an extent of 5.88 acres as if it was purchased by the first accused. Thereafter, the first accused executed a settlement deed in favour of A2 without producing any parent documents as if the parent documents are missing. Therefore, the petitioner colluded with the other accused and registered a settlement deed in favour of A2 in respect of the property owned by the defacto complainant which was purchased by him in the year 1981 vide Document No.2441 of 1980. That apart, the petitioner is also facing other vigilance cases.

6. Taking into consideration of the above facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

-sd/-

27/06/2022

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 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CCB III, POLICE STATION,
CHENNAI

2 THE SUPERINTENDENT,
CENTRAL PRISON, PUZHAI, CHENNAI

3 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

+2 CC to M/S.P.SARANATH Advocate on payment of necessary charges
SR.NO.10033

CRL OP.14632/2022

Date :27/06/2022

JPA 04/07/2022