



CRL.O.P.No.26114 of 2022

CRL.O.P.No.26114 of 2022

WEB C **T.V.THAMILSELVI,J.**

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 465, 467, 468 and 420 of IPC in Cr.No.1271 of 2020, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant purchased a property from one Murugan (A1) and Saravanan (A2) to an extent of 1400 Sq.Ft of Varatharajapuram and the same has been registered as a Document no.2711/2020 dated 27.05.2020 in presence of the petitioner/A3. After purchasing the above said property, the Defacto complainant enquired about the property before Village Administrative Officer regarding the property, pursuant to that defacto complainant came to know that the above said property is not in the name of the Defacto complainant and the same was questioned by the defacto complainant to the A1 and A2. The said Murugan (A1) and Saravanan (A2) did not give the proper reply and asked the defacto complainant to talk with the petitioner/A3. Hence, the Law Enforcing Agency registered a case against the petitioner.



CRL.O.P.No.26114 of 2022

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the co-accused/A1 and A2 had been granted Anticipatory bail by this Court. Hence he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that there are totally three accused in this case in which petitioner is arrayed as A3. He further submitted that the petitioner/A3 and other accused/A1 and A2 misrepresented as owners of the said property which belongs to the State Highways Department and executed a sale deed in favour of the defacto complainant and cheated him. Therefore, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the submissions on either side, it is seen that the petitioner had sold the property which belongs to the State Highways Department to the defacto complainant. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.26114 of 2022

6. Accordingly, the petition seeking anticipatory bail is dismissed.

12.01.2023

dk



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.26114 of 2022

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

dk

CRL.O.P.No.26114 of 2022

12.01.2023