WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.23631 of 2023
and
Crl.MP.No.17647 of 2023

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w Section 465 IPC in Crime No.92 of 2014, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The de facto complainant is the State Bank of India. It is stated that the petitioner had availed a Car loan from the de facto complainant to purchase a Hyundai Verna Car for Rs.10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakhs Only) and had availed a loan for Rs.8,70,000/- (Rupees Eight Lakhs and Seventy Thousand Only). This was in the year 2011. It had also been stated that the petitioner had repaid some amount but also not repaid some of the amounts.

3. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the then Manager had seized the Vehicle. But it is case of the prosecution and also the case of the intervenor, that the petitioner had created documents and had sold the Car to a third party, who now claims valid title. It is under those circumstances, a complaint had been lodged and an FIR had been registered.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

mkn2/kp

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that notice under Section 41A of Code of Criminal Procedure had been issued. The Investigation then will have to be conducted about the creation of the documents for effecting sale of the Car which had been actually hypothecated to the de facto complainant.

5. In view of that particular fact, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, the petition stands dismissed. Crl.MP.MNo.17647 of 2023 intervening petition is closed.

07.11.2023

mkn2/kp

Crl.O.P.No.23631 of 2023
and
Crl.MP.No.17647 of 2023

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis