



Crl.O.P.No.889 of 2024

Crl.O.P.No.889 of 2024

WEB COPY

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

The petitioners/A2 and A3 in Crime No.29 of 2023 registered by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 of IPC seeks anticipatory bail.

2. It is the case of the prosecution is that the property at Plot No.18 measuring to an extent of 2400 sq.ft situated at Jaihind Nagar , Layout No.85/1981, comprised in Punja Survey Nos.604/3CA, 614/1CC, 614/1CB and 614/1C at Old Gummidipoondi Village, Gummidipoondi Taluk, Tiruvallur District , was originally owned by one Ramakrishnan who is the defacto complainant.

3. It is stated that A1 who is still absconding had impersonated the said Ramakrishnan and had executed a power of attorney with right to deal with the said lands in favour of A2. In that particular power of



CrI.O.P.No.889 of 2024

attorney A3 had signed as a witness. A witness to a document identifies the parties and also identifies the signatures of the parties. If A3 had signed as a witness, then he had only identified the impersonator as Ramakrishnan. Using that particular power of attorney A2 had sold the property to A3 who had signed as a witness in the power of attorney document.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner points that originally, complaint had been in this regard and the respondent had thought it fit to close the same and in this regard also pointed out the order of the Sub Inspector of Police, Land Grabbing Cell, Thiruvallur , dated 05.04.2023 which was an result of enquiry conducted in C.No.131/DSP-ALGSC/TVLR/2023 dated 13.03.2023.

5. It is stated that thereafter the petitioners were harassed and therefore, they had given a complaint against the investigating officer to the Superintendent of Police, Thiruvallur dated 08.06.2023. It is stated that thereafter the present complaint had been lodged. These are all



Crl.O.P.No.889 of 2024

issues which are ancillary, but, the main issue is about impersonation of Ramakrishnan and without his signatures and without his consent, his property was sold away through power of attorney to A3. Investigation will have to be done. A1 will have to be identified A3 alone knows the identity of A1 since he has signed as witness to the power of attorney document and since A2 is the agent of A1, he would also know A1.

6. In view of the fact that interrogation is required in that regard, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition seeking anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

Vv

23.01.2024



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.889 of 2024

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN,J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.889 of 2024

23.01.2024