



Crl.O.P.No.28127 of 2022

Crl.O.P.No.28127 of 2022

T.V.THAMILSELVI,J.

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 406, 418, 420, 120(B) and 34 of IPC in Crime No.272 of 2022, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners are the husband and wife. He would also submit that the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant was childhood friends and they worked in Singapore. He would also further submit that the 1st petitioner helped the defacto complainant to buy three plots in Kovilpattu at Karaikal, which valued Rs.21,00,000/- in the year 2015. Thereafter, in the year 2021, the 1st petitioner informed that a plot at Karaikal, Puduthurai came for sale and the owner needed money for some urgency, hence, the plot would be registered in the name of 2nd petitioner and the same would be transferred to the defacto complainant after he come down to Karaikal. Hence, the defacto complainant gave a sum of Rs.7,32,000/- by way of cheque and Rs.75,000/- for getting patta and other expenses. Thereafter, the defacto complainant



Crl.O.P.No.28127 of 2022

came to know that the petitioners have fraudulently registered three plots in Kovilpatu, Karaikal in the name of 2nd petitioner by misrepresenting that the 2nd petitioner will transfer the land at Pududurai, Karaikal, which is in her name to the defacto complainant and thereby, defraud a sum of Rs.29,00,000/- of the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the petitioners are the husband and wife. He would also submit that the defacto complainant is a citizen of Singapore and the 1st petitioner is the friend of the defacto complainant. He would further submit that the petitioners have cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.29,00,000/- under the guise of purchasing properties in the name of defacto complainant. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COURT

5.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor would submit that the intervenor is a Singapore citizen and he knows the 1st petitioner is a family friend. He used to send amount to his bank account in order to purchase properties and he has also sent a sum of Rs.21,00,000/- to buy three plots in the year 2015. Thereafter, on 28.06.2021, he has sent a ICICI Bank cheque for a sum of Rs.7,32,000/- to purchase another property. In the guise of purchasing another property, the petitioners by knowing that the defacto complainant is not aware of Tamil language had executed documents and thereby, transferred three plots in the name of the 2nd petitioner and also executed receipts as if the petitioners have repaid the amount to the defacto complainant, which was said to be received through bank account. Therefore, the defacto complainant has given a complaint.

6.Taking into consideration of the fact that the defacto complainant is a Singapore citizen and he happened to come to India to purchase property and in this case there was some money transaction between the parties, which requires a detailed investigation, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.28127 of 2022

T.V.THAMILSELVI,J.

sp

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

08.12.2022

sp

Crl.O.P.No.28127 of 2022