



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

The petitioner who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 347, 365, 323 & 506(I) of IPC in Crime No.259 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution as per the *de-facto* complainant Amarram is that he is running a Pawn shop at Sholinganallur. On 16.09.2022 at 7.30 a.m., one Senthamizh/petitioner herein had called him on mobile phone and asked him to come to Marina beach. The *de-facto* complainant had gone there. While he was standing near the light house, 4 unknown persons taken his scooter, kicked and pushed him inside the car and switched off his mobile phone. Thereafter, tied his hands, eyes and taken him to Thiruporur Sub-Registrar Office and made him to sit inside the car outside the SRO's office and also threatened him with knife and obtained signatures in blank paper. At that time, one Krishnamoorthy and his wife Vimala of Mylapore along with 10 other persons threatened



Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

him not to disclose the same to any body and threatened him that they will do away his family and hence, the *de-facto* complainant did not inform it to any body. Further, on the same day at 7.00 p.m., the said Krishnamoorthy had taken the *de-facto* complainant in his own car and pushed him before his shop. The *de-facto* complainant had informed to his wife. The further averment is that the *de-facto* complainant had entered into an sale agreement with said Krishnamoorthy in respect of property in Survey No.20/2A1, Navalur village measuring 58 cents and the *de-facto* complainant had paid Rs.60,00,000/-. Subsequently on 24.08.2018, the said Krishnamoorthy received the balance consideration and had executed a sale deed in respect of the property. While so, one Manogaran had filed a suit before the Madras High Court and also an another suit before the District Court, Chengalpattu against the *de-facto* complainant and the said Krishnamoorthy and the case is pending and settlement talks were going on. The further allegation is that only on the instigation of the said Krishnamoorthy, the *de-facto* complainant was taken to the Thiruporur Sub-Registrar Office and the sale deed was illegally cancelled. Thereafter, the property belonging to the *de-facto*



Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

complainant had been transferred to the name of one Boomi Builders, Chennai. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner, other than being known to the defacto complainant as an Advocate, has not committed any offence alleged by the prosecution. He would submit that the defacto complainant had called the petitioner and thereafter, given a false complaint as if the petitioner had called the defacto complainant asking him to come to the light house. He would submit that the co-accused against whom allegations are grave in nature had been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.Nos.25774 and 25778 of 2022 on 03.11.2022. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent would submit that in the complaint, *de-facto* complainant has alleged that he was taken under threat and coercion by 4 unknown persons in a car and as per the complaint of the *de-facto* complainant, he



CrI.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

has stated that he was kept in a car out side the office of the Sub-Registrar, Thiruporur and that certain signatures were obtained in blank paper from him. Whereas, during the course of the investigation, the respondent police has enquired the Sub-Registrar, Thiruporur and statement has been obtained from him on 21.09.2022, wherein he has stated that the *de-facto* complainant had willingly come into the office and he has signed all the documents in his presence. In the statement recorded, the Sub-Registrar, Thiruporur had also spoken about the manner in which the *de-facto* complainant has executed the documents and it has appeared that there was no threat or force to the *de-facto* complainant. However, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.Heard the learned counsel. Perused the materials available on record including the C.D. File. The statement recorded from the Sub-Registrar, Thiruporur, shows that the *de-facto* complainant had voluntarily participated in the registration. As per the statement from the Sub-Registrar, Thiruporur, it is stated that the *de-facto* complainant came



Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

to the Sub-Registrar Office, Thiruporur and the document has been registered and he has also stated that the *de-facto* complainant was found not to be under any threat or coercion and that the documents were registered only after due enquiry of facts and perusal of the records.

6.Further it is also submitted that litigations are pending between parties and a Civil Suit in O.S.No.13 of 2018 is filed before District and Sessions Court, Chengalpattu and it is pending. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

7.Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **learned Metropolitan Magistrate-2, Egmore**, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the



Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m. for a period of four weeks and thereafter on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]**.



CrI.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

WEB COPY

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

03.11.2022

vk



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

vktr

Crl.O.P.No.26097 of 2022

03.11.2022