

Crl.O.P.No.4694 of 2023

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

The petitioner is the third accused in Crime No. 4 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 120-B, 465, 468, 471, 477 (A), 420 & 34 of the Indian Penal Code. Apprehending arrest in the said case, he has filed the present Petition seeking Anticipatory Bail.

2. This is the fourth Anticipatory Bail filed by the petitioner before this Court and the earlier petitions seeking Anticipatory Bail were dismissed by this Court.

3. The facts of the case relating to registration of the case against the petitioner-A3 has been elaborated in the earlier orders passed by this Court and it need not be dealt with in this petition. Suffice it to say that the prosecution came to be launched on 23.04.2021 on the basis of a complaint given by Tr. G. Venkatesan, then Tahsildar, Sriperumbadur, Kancheepuram District. In his complaint, he has complained that the documents relating to dry land in Survey No. 310/1 at Beemanthangal Village, Sriperumbadur Taluk was originally classified as Grazing Ground Poromboke, but the classification of the said lands have been altered without any document and



a Patta No. 3501 in Sub-division No. 310/37 has been issued to the first accused in the case. The Patta was issued as if the land was purchased by A-1 from the legal heirs of one Tr. Venugopal during the year 2014 and the said land was in his enjoyment of the said Venugopal from the year 1957. To justify the issuance of Patta, an order dated 07.10.2004 in WP No. 28923 of 2004 and Order of Settlement Officer (i/c) of Tiruvannamalai in Pa.Mu.1055/2000 dated 26.07.2000 were relied on. On investigation, based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, it came to light that the entries made in the revenue records are based on forged documents and the first accused has no title to the land in question. The investigation further revealed that A-1 has given the aforesaid land when land acquisition proceedings were initiated for Bangalore Express Highway and received Rs.33 Crores as compensation by submitting documents, which are forged. In effect, the overt act against the Petitioner/A-3 is that he has not verified the documents properly and was instrumental in causing loss to the exchequer.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has discharged his duty, as a Tahsildar, based on the



documents made available. The petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged disbursement of award amount in favour of the first accused. The petitioner was falsely implicated in this case and hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) opposed the grant of Anticipatory Bail by stating that the petitioner-A3 colluded with other accused and caused huge loss to the exchequer for pecuniary advantage. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail

6. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the State and perused the documentary evidence.

7. This Court has considered the fact that the petitioner has failed to verify the revenue records properly which led to the loss of revenue to the exchequer to the tune of Rs.33 crores and till now, no recovery had been made. Further, the earlier three anticipatory bail petitions filed by the petitioner have been dismissed. There is no change of circumstances shown



WEB COPY



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

mpa

for filing the present petition. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this petition for Anticipatory Bail is dismissed.

02.03.2023

mpa

Crl.O.P.No.4694 of 2023