



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 18679 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.07.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 18679 of 2026

T.R.Suresh Kumar

..Petitioner/A4

Vs

The State,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
CCB-Tambaram,
Tambaram District.
Crime No.90 of 2026.

..Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023 to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in respect of Crime No.90 of 2026 on the file of the respondent, pending investigation.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizhselvakumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.N.Palanivel
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner/A4, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468 & 471 r/w Section 34 of IPC in Crime No.90 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



2. According to the prosecution case, A1 and A2 fabricated the records in respect of the subject land and deposited the title deeds with the REPCO Bank and received a loan to the tune of Rs.2,00,00,000/-. The allegation against this petitioner is that he assisted A1 and A2 in the fabrication of the documents. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case and has nothing to do with the alleged impersonation. He would further submit that there are about five accused and A3 was enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.15696 of 2026 dated 22.06.2026 and he seeks parity as that of A3. He would submit that the allegation against A3 / M.Venkatesan, who is the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.15696 of 2026, is that he was roped in as an accused for the similar overtact as that of the petitioner herein.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police opposed the anticipatory bail application by reiterating the prosecution case and fairly submitted that A3 was already released on anticipatory bail in Crl.O.P.No.15696 of 2026 dated 22.06.2026.

5. While considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner in respect of a parity, this Court would like to extract paragraph No.5



of the order dated 22.06.2026 in Crl.O.P.No.15696 of 2026, which is as follows:

WEB COPY

“5. On a perusal of the FIR, it is seen that the occurrence is alleged to have taken place on 14.03.2019, whereas the FIR came to be registered only on 15.04.2026. In view of the said factual position, and considering the further fact that the occurrence pertains to the year 2019, this Court is of the view that, at this length of time, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.”

6. According to the prosecution, though this is a cheating case involving Rs.2,00,00,000/-, the only overtact alleged against the petitioner is that he assisted A1 and A2. However, a similarly placed person / A3 was already enlarged on anticipatory bail on 22.06.2026 in Crl.O.P.No.15696 of 2026. Therefore, this Court is inclined to give parity to the petitioner as that of the co-accused / A3.

7. In such view of the circumstances and considering the limited overt act alleged against this petitioner and the fact that A3 had already been released on anticipatory bail, this Court is of the firm view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Hence, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail with certain conditions.



8. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy is made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate – I, Kancheepuram, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** with two sureties, each for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further conditions that:

[a] If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned learned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

[b] The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for suretyship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[c] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of 30 days and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

[d] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

[e] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.



WEB COPY



[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the Petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the Petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]**;

[g] If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

16.07.2026

smv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court – I, Kancheepuram.
2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-Tambaram,
Tambaram District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 18679 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

smv

CRL OP No. 18679 of 2026

16.07.2026