



Crl. O.P. No.19498 of 2024

Crl. O.P. No.19498 of 2024

WEB CO P.DHANABAL.J.,

The petitioner / A1 apprehends arrest for the alleged offences under Sections 419, 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471 of IPC in Cr. No.176 of 2023, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that in the year 2012, the petitioner, being a land broker, introduced one Pradeep Pandurangan to the defacto complainant as the owner of the property in "Associate Avenue", Survey No.9/1, N.23, Venkatamangalam Village, Chengalpattu, Kanchipuram District and subsequently, executed sale of the said property vide Doc. No.4671 of 2012 in the office of SRO, Guduvanchery, in which the petitioner signed as witness. Thereafter, during the year 2020, a person named Pradeep Pandurangan from America, called the defacto complainant and stated that some unknown persons, using forged documents, sold his property and hence the sale deed No.4671 of 2012 is to be cancelled. Thereafter, it came to know that the petitioner along with other accused colluded with each other, impersonated the original owner Pradeep Pandurangan,executed the sale with forged documents and cheated the defacto complainant. Hence the case.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the land



Crl. O.P. No.19498 of 2024

was purchased by the defacto complainant during the year 2012 from the owner of the property Pradeep Pandurangan and the petitioner had served only as mediator and as the defacto complainant insisted the petitioner to sign as witness, he had signed as 2nd witness in the sale deed. The defacto complainant has given this false complaint against the petitioner and he is no way connected with the commission of offence as alleged in the FIR. Therefore he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that the accused had colluded with each other, impersonated the original owner Pradeep Pandurangan and executed the sale with forged documents. The petitioner has acted as mediator, for which he has collected Rs.36,000/- as broker consideration and he is the root cause for the offence. The original owner Pradeep Pandurangan has cancelled the sale deed executed by the accused and the defacto complainant has lost his money. Investigation is not yet completed. A2, who was impersonated as if the original owner of the property, is absconding. Huge money is involved in the transaction. Hence he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6.Considering the rival submissions on either side and considering



Crl. O.P. No.19498 of 2024

the gravity of offences, considering the fact that huge amount is involved in this case and investigation is also pending, I am declined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the criminal original petition is dismissed

22.08.2024

mjs

To

- 1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thiruporur.
2. The Inspector of Police, E9 Thazhambur Police Station, Thazhampur.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



CrI. O.P. No.19498 of 2024

P.DHANABAL,J

mjs

CRL O.P. No.19498 of 2024

22.08.2024