

**Crl.O.P.No.16727 of 2022**

WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 353, 379, 294(b) and 506(2) of IPC and Section 3 of Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damages and Loss) Act, 1992 in Crime No.321 of 2022, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant was working as Village Administrative Officer in the Vallam Panchayat. In the said Village, one Alavandhan, Son of Vellaian had sold his property to Gnanavel, Ananthavel, Sountherrajan and the said persons were given an application for issuance of patta for Government Poramboke land adjacent to the land they purchased. The defacto complainant had stated that if they give an application for issuance of patta for the Government Poramboke land adjacent to their house then he will consider. Thereafter, the petitioner had said if you are not giving patta to him and threatened him with dire consequences. Thereafter, on 07.07.2022, while the defacto complainant went to the Revenue Inspector office, at that time, the petitioner attacked the defacto complainant with JCB vehicle and caused injuries to him and damaged his bike and stolen the documents which were possessed by the Village Administrative Officer. Hence, the complaint.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that the defacto complainant is working as a Village Administrative Officer. Due to dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant for issuance of patta for poramboke land, the petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant and damaged his bike and stolen the documents, which were possessed by the defacto complainant. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, as custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

19.07.2022

Lpp



WEB COPY

3



Lpp

Crl.O.P.No.16727 of 2022

19.07.2022