



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.15584 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :21.05.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

**CRL OP NO. 15584 of 2025**

Pagmavathi, F/ 40 years,  
D/o SeSeshathri

... Petitioner

Vs

The State Rep.by,  
The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch, Chengalpattu District.

Crime No.2 of 2025

... Respondent(s)

**PRAYER:** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of B.N.S.S.,  
pleased to enlarge the petitioner on bail, in Crime No.2 of 2025 on the file of  
the respondent Police.

**For Petitioner(s):** Mr.G.Mageshkumar

**For Respondent(s):** Mr.V.J.Priyadarsana,  
Government Advocate (crl.side)

### **ORDER**

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 17.04.2025 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 336, 340, 318, 62 of BNS 2023 in Crime No.2 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.



Crl.O.P.No.15584 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Seshathri executed a general power deed on 27.03.2023 in respect of a property to an extent of 0.66 cents situated at Chengalpattu Town in survey No.1458/1 in favour of one Santhiya, who is wife of one M.S.Senthilkumar. On the next day, the power holder namely Santhiya executed a sale deed in favour of her husband Senthilkumar. The sale consideration was fixed at Rs.66 Lakhs to be paid to the said Seshathri, out of which Rs.17Laksh was paid to him by the said M.S.Senthilkumar and it was accepted that the remaining amount shall be paid after the patta is transferred in his favour.

3. In the said circumstances, the petitioner, who is the daughter of Seshathri alleged to have applied for transferring patta before the Revenue Divisional Officer. But, since there was a counter claim, the RDO instructed the petitioner to approach the competent civil court.

4. In order to receive the balance sale consideration amount from the said Senthilkumar, the petitioner colluded with the other accused, created forged court order, as if the High Court directed the Revenue Authorities to issue patta in favour of the said Senthilkumar. Therafter, using the said



Crl.O.P.No.15584 of 2025

WEB COPY

fabricated fraudulent court order, the petitioner applied for patta, as though the Senthil Kumar applied the same, thereby created forged government records and also tried to cheat the government.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has nothing to do with the above allegation and it was between the seller, viz. petitioner's father and the said Senthilkumar. He further submitted that one Raji, one of the accused had gave the court order to the petitioner, as if a direction was given by the court in CMP No.29 of 2024, directing the revenue authorities to issue patta. The said revenue authorities sent a communication to the court concerned to verify the veracity of the order, by which the whole thing came out. In such circumstance, the petitioner is in no way connected with the allegations raised by the prosecution and hence, he seeks to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police has reiterated the prosecution case and opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.No.15584 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. In view of the above submission made by the learned Government Advocate and also taking into account the heinous nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

21.05.2025

mst

**Note:-**

- 1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the official website of this Court.**
- 2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in official website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.**



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.15584 of 2025

**N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.**

mst

Crl.O.P.No.15584 of 2025

21.05.2025