



2024:KER:71204

B.A Nos.1215 and 1216 of 2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.S.DIAS

TUESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2024 / 2ND ASWINA, 1946

BAIL APPL. NO. 1215 OF 2024

CRIME NO.ECIR/KCZO/42/2023 OF ENFORCEMENT DIRECTORATE KOCHI,

Ernakulam

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED 29.01.2024 IN CRMP
NO.4 OF 2024 SPECIAL C OF SPE/CBI-I&3 ADDITIONAL DISTRICT
COURT / I ADDITIONAL MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL,
ERNAKULAM

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

N. BHASURANGAN,
AGED 70 YEARS
BHASURA, MARANALLOOR, KUVALASSERY P.O., TRIVANDRUM,
PIN - 695512

BY ADVS.
P.T.JOSE
P.V.BABY

RESPONDENT/APPLICANT:

THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT,
KOCHI ZONAL OFFICE, KANOOR CASTLE, A.K. SHESHADRI
ROAD, KOCHI, PIN - 682011

BY ADV JAISHANKAR V.NAIR, SC, ENFORCEMENT
DIRECTORATE

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
24.09.2024 ALONG WITH B.A. NO.1216/2024, THE COURT ON THE
SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:71204

B.A Nos.1215 and 1216 of 2024

2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.S.DIAS

TUESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2024 / 2ND ASWINA, 1946

BAIL APPL. NO. 1216 OF 2024

CRIME NO.ECIR/KCZO/42/2023 OF ENFORCEMENT DIRECTORATE KOCHI,
Ernakulam

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED 29.01.2024 IN CRMP
NO.5 OF 2024 SPECIAL C SPE/CBI-I&3 ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT/
I ADDITIONAL MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

AKHILJITH J.B,
AGED 28 YEARS
BHASURA, MARANALLOOR, KUVALASSERY P.O., TRIVANDRUM,
PIN - 695512

BY ADVS.
P.T.JOSE
P.V.BABY

RESPONDENT/APPLICANT:

THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF
ENFORCEMENT,
DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT, KOCHI ZONAL OFFICE,
KANOOR CASTLE, A.K. SHESHADRI ROAD, KOCHI, PIN -
682011

BY ADV JAISHANKAR V.NAIR, SC, ENFORCEMENT
DIRECTORATE

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
24.09.2024, ALONG WITH Bail Appl.No.1215/2024, THE COURT ON
THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**C.S.DIAS,J**

=====

BA Nos. 1215 and 1216 of 2024

Dated this the 24th day of September, 2024**COMMON ORDER**

The applications are filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure by the accused 1 and 2 in Crime No. ECIR/KCZO/42/2023, which is registered by the Enforcement Directorate, Kochi, Ernakulam, against six accused persons for allegedly committing the offence under Section 3 and punishable under Section 4 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 ('Act', for short). BA No.1215/2024 is filed by the first accused and BA No.1216/2024 is filed by the second accused. As the applications arise out of the same crime, they are consolidated, jointly heard and are being disposed of by this common order. The petitioners were arrested on 21.11.2023.

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on the basis of complaints received by the Maranalloor Police Station,



Thiruvananthapuram from several complainants, Crime Nos.726, 838, 1071, 1072 and 1073 of 2023 were registered against the accused, who are the President and Secretary of the Kandala Service Co-operative Bank, Kandala, Maranalloor, Thiruvananthapuram ('Bank', in short), for committing the offence punishable under Sec.420 of the Indian Penal Code. It is alleged that the President and Secretary of the Bank betrayed the trust of the complainants by accepting deposits from them after offering a high rate of interest with the intention of cheating the complainants. Even though the complainants requested the Bank to return their money on several occasions, the Bank failed to return their money. The accused have cheated the complainant in Crime No.726/2023, Rs.19,50,565/-; the complainant in Crime No.838/2023, Rs.53,24,821/-; the complainant in Crime No.1071/2023, Rs.26,38,747/-; the complainant in Crime No.1072/2023, Rs.10,10,070/-; and the complainant in Crime No.1073/2023, Rs.13,50,000/-. Thus, the accused have cheated the complainants of a total amount of Rs.1,22,74,203/-. As the offence under Sec.420 is a scheduled offence under Sections 2 (1) (x) and 2 (1) (y) of the Act, it prima facie appears that the accused have committed the offence under Section 3 punishable under Section 4 of the Act, which requires a detailed investigation. Accordingly, ECIR/KCZO/42/2023 was



recorded and the investigation under the Act was initiated. During the course of the investigation, it has been unveiled that several other FIRs have been registered by the Kerala Police against the accused. Hence, inquiries under the Act have also been conducted with respect to multiple FIRs registered against the accused. In the investigation, it has been revealed that the first accused and his associates have made an unlawful gain with corresponding loss to the Bank, by indulging in several irregularities in the management of the Bank, namely, illegal spending of money for appointments of staff by providing them salaries and promotions, illegal spending of money for construction, illegal spending of money for loan/share for the Maranalloor Ksheera Vyavasaya Sahakarana Sangham, illegal taking of loans/MDS, illegal spending of money for purchase of vehicles etc., which are proceeds of the crime as defined under Sec.2(1)(u) of the Act. By indulging in the above criminal activities, the first accused and his associates have generated proceeds of the crime. Further investigation is in progress, to ascertain the money laundering activities connected with the proceeds of crime, including its concealment, possession, acquisition or use and projection or claiming it as untainted money. In addition to accused 1 and 2 (the petitioners, who are father and son), the accused 3 to 6 namely, B.Jayakumari, Aswathy R.B, V.R Balamurugan and



Abhima M.B (the wife, daughters and son-in-law of the 1st accused) have also been arrayed as accused.

3. The petitioners have contended in their applications for bail that they were arrested on 21.11.2023. Their applications for bail were dismissed by the Special Judge by Annexure-1 common order. The first accused is diagnosed with left ventricular hypertrophy. He was admitted to the Department of Cardiology in the KIMS Hospital on 1.9.2008. He has had recurrent episodes of sudden falls and loss of consciousness. On 9.11.2023, he was again admitted to the Department of Cardiology in the KIMS Hospital with a history of systemic hypertension and dyslipidemia. While the first accused was in judicial custody, he was treated in the General Hospital, Ernakulam on several occasions. The Trial Court has failed to evaluate the change of circumstance after the filing of the complaint. Annexure-1 order is unjustifiable and illegal, and against the principles of natural justice. The respondent has no case that the accused have collected or received any money from the complainant or misappropriated the same. The amounts were credited directly to the Bank. The grounds of arrest stated by the respondent are entirely different from those mentioned in the complaint filed by the respondent before the Trial Court. The complaint filed by the respondent is unsustainable in law



and is liable to be quashed. The first accused was thoroughly questioned and his statements were recorded on various dates. He was also given in custody to the respondent for three days. The accused 3 to 6 have already been enlarged on bail. The further detention of the petitioners will not serve any purpose. It will take several months for the trial to conclude. The Trial Court has failed to consider the various contentions that were urged. The petitioners have no criminal antecedents. They are the sole breadwinner of their families and are willing to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court. Furthermore, the second accused is not an elected member nor an employee of the Bank. Therefore, by no stretch of imagination can he be implicated as an accused. The respondent has no case that the second accused had collected or received any money from the complainants or misappropriated the funds of the complainants. The learned counsel relied on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arvind Kejriwal v. Directorate of Enforcement** [2024 KHC Online 6361] to reinforce his submissions. Hence, the applications may be allowed.

4. The learned Standing Counsel for the respondent has filed bail objection reports in the two applications, inter alia, reiterating the contentions in the complaints. It is contended that the first accused,



who was the President of the Bank, had facilitated for availing illegal loans/MDS for Rs. 187.21/- Lakh in the name of his family members. Out of the said amount, Rs.130.25/- Lakh was given as loan to his son, the second accused. Now the total amount due from the petitioners to the Bank is Rs.187.21/- Lakh and its interest. It is now revealed from CW13, the present Secretary of the Bank, that the accused had availed the loans by submitting the title deeds of the same property purchased in the names of the accused 1 and 3 for Rs.9,50,000/- as collateral security, that too without a valuation certificate, and that multiple loans were availed by the second accused and the family members. The Bank has not initiated any recovery proceedings against the first accused and his relatives. The first accused has admitted in his statement that 28 loans were availed by him and his family members, and the outstanding amount is Rs.187.21/- Lakh, out of which Rs.130.25/- Lakh was availed by the second accused. Similar revelations have been made by the second accused. The materials on record reveal that the first accused and his family members are guilty of the offence of money laundering and are involved in the process and activities connected with the proceeds of the crime, namely, its generation, possession, acquisition, projection and use of the same as defined under Section 3 of the Act and punishable under Section 4 of



the Act. There are sufficient materials to prove that the accused have committed the above offences. The petitioners have failed to dilute the twin conditions under Section 45 (1) of the Act. The applications are meritless and are only to be dismissed.

5. The first accused has filed a reply statement, inter alia, contending that all the loans were sanctioned through proper resolutions passed by the Bank. It is due to the COVID-19 pandemic, that the repayments of the loans were affected and certain difficulties arose in repaying the deposits to the depositors. When the above information spread, all the depositors started demanding a refund of their deposits, which led to a liquidity crunch. Then, the committee members resigned, and an ad-hoc committee was appointed to look after the affairs of the Bank. The principal allegation of the complainants is that the President and Secretary of the Bank accepted deposits by offering a high rate of interest, which is totally false. The offences under Secs.409 and 420 will not be attracted. The loans were not fraudulently availed by the accused 1 and 2 or their relatives. There is no money laundering involved in the case. The first accused has also produced Annexures A2 to A50 documents to substantiate his contentions. Therefore, the applications may be allowed.

6. Heard; Sri. P.V Baby, the learned Counsel for the petitioners



and Sri. Jaishankar V. Nair, the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners reiterated all the contentions raised in the bail applications and the reply statement. He took this Court through the statements of the witnesses. He contended that the second accused is in no way connected with the Bank. He has been implicated only because he is the son of the first accused. The first accused has been the President of the Bank for the last 35 years. There is no allegation against the first accused. It is only because of the COVID-19 pandemic that the Bank was unable to pay interest and refund the deposited amounts as demanded by the depositors. The fact that the Secretary of the Bank has not been arrested to date proves the falsity of the crime. The accused 3 to 6 are the wife, daughters and son-in-law of the first accused, who have already been released on bail. As per the bylaws of the Bank, the Director Board is empowered to grant loans. The learned Counsel contended that there was no illegality in sanctioning the loans, which was by the Board. The first accused is 70 years of age and is suffering from various ailments. Now that the investigation is complete and the complaint has been filed. There is no legal impediment in enlarging the petitioners on bail. Hence, the applications may be allowed.



8. The learned Standing Counsel for the respondent seriously opposed the applications. He submitted that there are incriminating materials to substantiate the petitioners' involvement in the crime. The first accused is the mastermind of the crime. The second accused has received the proceeds of the crime. There are five FIRs registered against the first accused. The first accused has, by abusing his position as the President of the Bank, sanctioned loans to the second accused and his family members on the strength of his own property as collateral security. In the inquiry conducted by the Registrar of the Co-operative Societies, a loss of Rs.53/- crore has been caused to the Bank. The second accused has invested the proceeds of the crime in a Supermarket and a Milk Society. There are reasonable grounds to hold that the petitioners have committed the above offences. The petitioners have not diluted the rigour under Section 41 of the Act. The learned Counsel relied on the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Vijay Madhanlal Choudhary v. Union of India** [2022 SCC Online SC 929], **Nimmagadda Prasad v. CBI** [(2013) 7 SCC 466], **Y.S Jagan Mohan Reddy v. CBI** [(2013) 7 SCC 439], **Gautam Kundu v. Directorate of Enforcement** [(2015) 16 SCC 1], **Rohit Tandon v. Directorate of Enforcement** [(2018) 11 SCC 46] and **Directorate of Enforcement v. Gopal Reddy** [2022 SCC Online SC 1862] to reinforce his



submissions. He prayed that the applications be dismissed.

9. The prosecution case is that the first accused, who was the former President of the Bank, and his associates lured depositors to invest money in the Bank on the assurance of paying a high rate of interest. When the depositors asked for the return of their money, the accused failed to return the same because the accused had, by that time, misappropriated the money for their own purpose. Thus, they have committed the offence under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, which is a scheduled offence under the Act and is, therefore, an offence punishable under the Act. As of now, 63 FIRS have been registered against the accused by different complainants/depositors of the Bank.

10. The materials on record reveal that, in the audit conducted by the Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies, he found that the accused have cheated the Bank of Rs.57,24,18,470/- by making illegal appointments, providing salaries and promotions for staff, spending money on constructions, sanctioning loans/MDS, purchasing vehicles etc.

11. In searches conducted by the respondent, it has been unveiled that the Bank had sanctioned Rs.2.04/- Crore to Maranalloor



Ksheera Vyavsaya Sangham Limited, and multiple loans for several crores of rupees to the family members and relatives of the first accused on the strength of one title deed of the property belonging to the first accused and his wife/3rd accused offered as collateral security. It is also apparent that the Bank has not initiated any recovery proceedings against the accused to recover the outstanding dues. Likewise, defaulted chitti amounts were closed by the Bank and MDL accounts were opened in the names of defaulters. It is alleged that the first accused had instructed the Secretaries of the Bank not to forward the overdue loan details to the Joint Registrar of the Co-operative Societies, to avoid coercive proceedings.

12. The materials placed on record also reveal that Rs.11,90,861/- is deposited in the name of the 1st accused; Rs.90,42,544/- is deposited in the name of the 2nd accused; Rs.1,50,48,564/- is deposited in the name of the 3rd accused; Rs.42,87,345/- is deposited in the name of the 4th accused; and Rs.78,63,407/- is deposited in the name of the 5th accused.

13. It is also discernible that the 1st accused, in his statement dated 15.11.2023, has stated that he and his family members have availed 28 loans and the principal outstanding amount is Rs.187.21/-



Lakh, but the Bank has not declared the loan account as a Non-Performing Asset. Instead, only an arbitration reference case has been initiated to recover the defaulted amount from the accused. He has also mentioned in his statement dated 21.11.2023, that 19 loans for Rs.1,33,35,000/- were availed in his family member's name by pledging one title deed i.e., sale deed No.193/2013.

14. The investigation conducted to date shows that the 1st accused has opened bank accounts in the name of benamies. The overdue amount towards the agricultural loans availed from the Bank is Rs.12.05/- Crore.

15. The power of the Courts to grant bail to a person accused of an offence under the Act is circumscribed by Section 45 of the Act. It is apposite to refer to the said provision, which reads as follows:

“45. Offences to be cognisable and non-bailable—

(1) [Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), no person accused of an offence [under this Act] shall be released on bail or on his own bond unless]

(i) the Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for such release; and

(ii) where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the Court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail:

Provided that a person, who is under the age of sixteen years or is a woman or is sick or infirm [or is accused either on his own or along with other co-accused of money-laundering a sum of less than one crore rupees] may be released on bail, if the Special Court so directs:



Provided further that the Special Court shall not take cognizance of any offence punishable under section 4 except upon a complaint in writing made by:-

(i)the Director; or

(ii)any officer of the Central Government or State Government authorised in writing in this behalf by the Central Government by a general or a special order made in this behalf by that Government.

[(1-A) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), or any other provision of this Act, no police officer shall investigate into an offence under this Act unless specifically authorised, by the Central Government by a general or special order, and, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed;

(2)The limitation on granting of bail specified in [***] of sub-section (1) is in addition to the limitations under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or any other law for the time being in force on granting of bail.”

16. Section 45 of the Act starts with a non-obstante clause, which has an overriding effect on the general provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr. P.C). There is a specific embargo to grant bail to a person accused of an offence under the Act i.e., (i) that the Public Prosecutor must be given an opportunity to oppose the application for bail, and (ii) the Court must be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused person is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while he is on bail.

17. In addition to the above stipulation, Section 65 of the Act mandates that the provisions of the Cr. P.C shall apply in so far as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. Also, Section 71 of the Act states that the provisions of the Act shall have an overriding effect notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in any other law for the time being in force. Therefore, the conditions enumerated in Section 45 of the Act have to be complied with even in



respect of an application for bail made under Section 439 of Cr. P.C. Consequently, the power to grant bail to a person accused of having committed an offence under the Act is not only subject to the limitations imposed under Section 439 of Cr. P.C., but also subject to the rigour imposed by the twin conditions of sub-section (1) of Section 45 of Act.

18. In **Gautam Kundu v. Directorate of Enforcement** [(2015) 16 SCC 1], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the compliance of Section 45 of the Act is mandatory to grant bail to an accused person.

19. In **Vijay Madhanlal Choudhary v. Union of India** [2022 SCC Online SC 929] a three-judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed in the following manner:

“400. It is important to note that the twin conditions provided under [Section 45](#) of the 2002 Act, though restrict the right of the accused to grant of bail, but it cannot be said that the conditions provided under [Section 45](#) impose absolute restraint on the grant of bail. The discretion vests in the Court which is not arbitrary or irrational but judicial, guided by the principles of law as provided under [Section 45](#) of the 2002 Act. While dealing with a similar provision 633 supra at footnote No.3 prescribing twin conditions in MCOCA, this Court in *Ranjitsing Brahmajeetsing Sharma*, held as under:

“44. The wording of [Section 21\(4\)](#), in our opinion, does not lead to the conclusion that the court must arrive at a positive finding that the applicant for bail has not committed an offence under the Act. If such a construction is placed, the court intending to grant bail must arrive at a finding that the applicant has not committed such an offence. In such an event, it will be impossible for the prosecution to obtain a judgment of conviction of the applicant. Such cannot be the intention of the legislature. [Section 21\(4\)](#) of MCOCA, therefore, must be construed reasonably. It must be so construed that the court is able to maintain a delicate balance between a judgment of acquittal and conviction and an order granting bail much before commencement of trial. Similarly, the Court will be required to record a finding as to the possibility of his committing a crime after grant of bail. However, such an offence in futuro must be an offence under the Act and not any other offence. Since it is difficult to predict the future conduct of an accused, the court must necessarily consider this aspect of the matter having regard to the



antecedents of the accused, his propensities and the nature and manner in which he is alleged to have committed the offence.

45. It is, furthermore, trite that for the purpose of considering an application for grant of bail, although detailed reasons are not necessary to be assigned, the order granting bail must demonstrate application of mind at least in serious cases as to why the applicant has been granted or denied the privilege of bail.

46. The duty of the court at this stage is not to weigh the evidence meticulously but to arrive at a finding on the basis of broad probabilities. However, while dealing with a special statute like MCOCA having regard to the provisions contained in sub-section (4) of [Section 21](#) of the Act, the court may have to probe into the matter deeper so as to enable it to arrive at a finding that the materials collected against the accused during the investigation may not justify a judgment of conviction. The findings recorded by the court while granting or refusing bail undoubtedly would be tentative in nature, which may not have any bearing on the merit of the case and the trial court would, thus, be free to decide the case on the basis of evidence adduced at the trial, without in any manner being prejudiced thereby”.

401. We are in agreement with the observation made by the Court in *Ranjitsing Brahmajeetsing Sharma*. The Court while dealing with the application for grant of bail need not delve deep into the merits of the case and only a view of the Court based on available material on record is required. The Court will not weigh the evidence to find the guilt of the accused which is, of course, the work of Trial Court. The Court is only required to place its view based on probability on the basis of reasonable material collected during investigation and the said view will not be taken into consideration by the Trial Court in recording its finding of the guilt or acquittal during trial which is based on the evidence adduced during the trial. As explained by this Court in *Nimmagadda Prasad*, the words used in [Section 45](#) of the 2002 Act are “reasonable grounds for believing” which means the Court has to see only if there is a genuine case against the accused and the prosecution is not required to prove the charge beyond reasonable doubt”.

20. In **Directorate of Enforcement Versus Aditya Tripathi** [2023 SCC OnLine SC 619] the Honourable Supreme Court has held that merely because for a chargesheet has been filed, it cannot be a ground to release the accused on bail in connection with the scheduled offences under the Act. Investigation for the predicated offences and the investigation by the Enforcement Directorate for the



scheduled offences under the PML Act are different and distinct.

21. In **Y.S Jagan Mohan Reddy vs. CBI** [(2013) 7 SCC 439], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has made the following observations:

“34. Economic offences constitute a class apart and need to be visited with a different approach in the matter of bail. The economic offences having deep-rooted conspiracies and involving huge loss of public funds need to be viewed seriously and considered as grave offences affecting the economy of the country as a whole and thereby posing serious threat to the financial health of the country.

35. While granting bail, the court has to keep in mind the nature of accusations, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public/State and other similar considerations”.

22 In **Himanshu Chandravadan Desai v. State of Gujarat** [(2005) 13 SCC 234], which bears similarities to the case on hand, the accused, who were the Directors of a Bank, had siphoned off crores of rupees of the Bank by granting bogus loans, fabricating fictitious letters of credit in the names of their friends, relatives and associates with inadequate security. The Honourable Supreme Court declined to enlarge the accused on bail considering the huge amount involved in the systematic fraud, and apprehending danger of the appellants attempting to tamper with the evidence by pressuring the witnesses.

23. On a careful analysis of the facts and circumstances of the cases, the incriminating materials placed on record against the petitioners, the law on the point, and on considering that there are reasonable grounds to hold that the petitioners have committed the above offence and that they are likely to commit the offences if they are enlarged on bail, I am of the definite view that the petitioners are not entitled to be released on bail at this stage.



2024:KER:71204

B.A Nos.1215 and 1216 of 2024

19

Resultantly, the bail applications are dismissed.

Sks/24.9.2024

Sd/- C.S.DIAS, JUDGE

APPENDIX OF BAIL APPL. 1215/2024

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

- Annexure 1 ANNEXURE 1- ORDER PASSED BY THE COURT
BELOW DATED 29/01/2024
- ANEXURE A2 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G1330/2017 dated 29/11/2017 of the office
of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A3 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G1335/2017 dated 29/11/2017 of the office
of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A1 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G.1329/2017 dated 29/11/2017 of the
office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A5 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G1334/2017 dated 29/11/2017 of the office
of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A6 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G.881/2018 dated 26/6/2018 of the office
of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A6 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G.1332/2017 dated 29/11/20217 of the
office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A8 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G.1331/2017 dated 29/11/20217 of the
office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A9 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G.401/2018 dated 19/3/2018 of the office
of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A10 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G.1336/2017 dated 29/11/20217 of the
office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A11 True photocopy of the release deed No.
G.1333/2017 dated 29/11/20217 of the
office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam



- ANEXURE A12** True photocopy of the release deed No. G.404/2018 dated 19/3/2018 of the office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A13** True photocopy of the release deed No. G.987/2012 dated 15/6/2012 of the office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A14** True photocopy of the release deed No. G.988/2012 dated 15/6/2012 of the office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A15** True photocopy of the release deed No. G.882/2018 dated 26/6/2018 of the office of the SRO. Ooruttambalam
- ANEXURE A16** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1116/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A17** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1117/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A18** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1123/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A19** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1126/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A20** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1127/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A21** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1129/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A22** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1130/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A23** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1120/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A24** True photocopy of the ARC No. 2227/2023 along with summons dated 10/11/2023
- ANEXURE A25** True photocopy of the ARC No. 1142/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023



- ANEXURE A26 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1136/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A27 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1135/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A28 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1140/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A29 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1134/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A30 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1133/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A31 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1132/2023 along with summons 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A32 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1124/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A33 : True photocopy of the ARC No. 1121/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A34 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1118/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A36 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1125/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A37 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1137/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A38 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1131/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A39 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1139/2023 along with summons dated nil
- ANEXURE A40 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1138/2023 along with summons 7/10/2023
- ANEXURE A41 True photocopy of the ARC No. 1128/2023 along with summons dated 7/10/2023



2024:KER:71204

B.A Nos.1215 and 1216 of 2024

23

- ANEXURE A42** True photocopy of the agreement for sale of properties executed by son namely Akhiljith dated 15/10/2023
- ANEXURE A43** True photocopy of the agreement for sale of property executed by son-in-law of the petitioner namely Balamurugan dated 16/10/2023
- ANEXURE A44** True photocopy of the account closed receipt dated 29/3/2012 in the name of Sulochana
- ANEXURE A45** True photocopy of the account closed receipt dated 28/3/2017 in the name of Sulochana
- ANEXURE A46** True photocopy of the account closed receipt dated 28/3/2017 in the name of Sulochana
- ANEXURE A47** True photocopy of the account closed receipt dated 1/11/2012 in the name of Abhima
- ANEXURE A48** True photocopy of the account closed receipt dated 28/3/2017 in the name of Ajith Kumar
- ANEXURE A49** True photocopy of the account closed receipt dated 28/3/2012 in the name of Ajith Kumar
- ANEXURE A50** True photocopy of the account closed receipt dated 28/3/2012 in the name of Ajith Kumar



2024:KER:71204

B.A Nos.1215 and 1216 of 2024

24

APPENDIX OF BAIL APPL. 1216/2024

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

Annexure 1

**ANNEXURE A1- COPY OF ORDER PASSED BY THE
COURT BELOW DATED 29.01.2024**