



Crl.O.P.No.19798 of 2022

WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.19798 of 2022

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC, 1860 in Crime No.6 of 2022 seeks anticipatory bail.

2. There are totally 11 accused involved in this case, in which, the petitioner is arrayed as A10. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant purchased a land comprised in Survey No.314/31 and S.No.314/2, Vasantham Avenue, Alamathi, Tiruvallur District admeasuring to an extent of 2400 sq.ft has been purchased by the defacto complainant from one T.S.Mani on 18.10.1994 and since then they are in possession of the said land and during recent years when the defacto complainant wanted to settle the properties in the name of his sons, he had applied encumbrance and he found that his property has been fraudulently sold to some third parties by impersonation and creating a forged General Power of Attorney in such a way showing that the defacto complainant has executed the GPA in favour of A1. Hence, the complaint.



Crl.O.P.No.19798 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution. Therefore, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the petitioner has arranged A1 to impersonate the defacto complainant and execute the power of attorney. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. It is seen that the petitioner herein has arranged A1 to impersonate the defacto complainant as if he is the owner of the property comprised in S.No.314/31 and 314(2) situated at Vasantham Avenue, Alamathi, Tiruvallur District admeasuring to an extent of 2400 sq.ft and execute power of attorney in favour of A2. In turn, A2 executed sale deed in favour of A3 and A4. As far as the petitioner is concerned, he only arranged A1 to impersonate the defacto complainant and execute the power of attorney.



Crl.O.P.No.19798 of 2022

WEB COPY

6. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the submissions made by both counsel and also the fact that the petitioner has arranged A1 to impersonate the defacto complainant and execute the power of attorney, therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required and hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Vv

23.08.2022



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.19798 of 2022

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.19798 of 2022

23.08.2022