



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 20569 of 2025

1. N.Devaraj

S/o.Late Narasimhan, 53/2, Jawaharlal
Nehru Salai, Ekkattuthangal, Chennai -
600 032.

2. N.Radhakrishnan

S/o.Late Narasimhan, No. 4, Pillaiyar
Koil 1st Street, Ekkattuthangal,
Chennai - 600 032.

3. J.Ramesh

S/o. James, No. 31A, Main Road,
Sekkadu, Avadi - 600 073 Tiruvallur
District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep. by, The Inspector of
Police,
CCB- Avadi City, Tiruvallur District.
Cr.No. 60 of 2025,



Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners in the event of their arrest or in connection with the case in Cr. No. 60 of 2025 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Darshan R

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120B of IPC in Crime No.60 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2.The The allegation against these petitioners is that petitioners A1, A2, and A3 fabricated a sale deed with the view to grab the property belonging to the de facto complainant, claiming that they had a patta in their favour. Thereby, they attempted to take possession of the property from the de facto complainant. When the de facto complainant raised objections, they stated that they are having right over the properties based on patta in their favour. Hence, the complaint was registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Tahsildar and



RDO, conducted an investigation and reported that the patta was issued in favour of the petitioners, but it was given wrongly based on the sale deed entered between the parties. He further submitted that the petitioners are aged persons, and custodial interrogation is not necessary. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that these petitioners, knowing fully well about the nature of the land and ownership of the de facto complainant, created a sale deed as if they had a patta. However, at the time of executing the sale deed, there was no patta available with them. Based on the sale deed, they were able to obtain a subsequent patta in their favour and grab the property of the de facto complainant. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) reported that totally three accused in this case and the petitioners have no previous cases against them. He further submitted that the investigation is also pending. However, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY

6.This Court has noted the fact that the sale deed was executed between A1 to A3 with intention of grabbing the property of the de facto complainant without any right over the property, and it is further noted that the de facto complainant has filed a civil suit claiming title to the property, in which the first and second petitioners are parties to the proceedings. Based on this fabricated sale deed, they approached the revenue authorities to obtain a patta, and after obtaining it, they attempting to take possession of the property. Therefore, I am of the view that the execution of the sale deed in the year 2022 is a clear case of land grabbing. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the criminal petition is dismissed.

04-11-2025

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order Internet:Yes Neutral Citation:Yes/No

mpa

To

1.The State rep. by, The Inspector of
Police,
CCB- Avadi City, Tiruvallur District.
Cr.No. 60 of 2025,

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 20569 of 20



K.RAJASEKAR J.

mpa

**CRL OP No. 20569 of
2025**

04-11-2025