



Crl.O.P.No.27503 of 2022

Crl.O.P.No.27503 of 2022

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 419, 465, 467, 468, 471, 109, 120(b) of IPC in Crime No.19 of 2022.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant one Hemant Kumar lodged a complaint stating that he was running a chemical company at Redhills and as he was in need of place to store his goods, one of the accused Sundar Inayan contacted the defacto complainant and informed that one Kamala is the owner of the place in S.No.195/1 of Villangadupakkam, Ponneri Taluk measuring 67.5 cents for which the said Kamala agreed to sell the property for Rs.1,01,00,000/- and so far the defacto complainant paid the entire sale consideration, but subsequently, after the registration, the documents were not handed over to the defacto complainant and later found that the said Kamala has impersonated as a real owner and thus swindled the said



Crl.O.P.No.27503 of 2022

WEB COPY

amount. Based on the complaint, FIR was registered. Further allegation is that the petitioner, who is a policeman, had helped the other accused to get the forged patta. He is a habitual offender and having a previous case in Crime No.122 of 2021 of Kuttralam Police Station for the offence under Sections 420, 423, 465, 468, 471 of IPC and 84 of Registration Act and the departmental enquiry is also pending against him.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that the petitioner is working as a Head Constable and he is an habitual offender. He would further submit that he is the person, who have arranged other accused and cheated the defacto complainant. He would also submit that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Therefore, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.No.27503 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. Taking into consideration the facts of the case and the submissions made by the learned counsel, and also taking note of the fact that there is one previous case is pending against the petitioner as similar in nature, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

14.11.2022

nr

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

Page 3 of 4



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.27503 of 2022

nr

Crl.O.P.No.27503 of 2022

14.11.2022