



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.15685 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.05.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

Crl.OP.No.15685 of 2025

Raju A

... Petitioner(s) /Accused

Vs.

State by Sub-Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch II,
Chengalpattu.

... Respondent(s)/ Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner/ accused on anticipatory bail pending investigation in Crime No.2 of 2025 on the file of the respondent.

For petitioner(s) : Mr.Dharma Raj

For Respondent(s) : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 336, 340, 318 & 62 of BNS in Crime No.2 of 2025 seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner/accused had created a forged court order, purportedly directing the issuance of patta in his favour. Based on this fabricated document, he attempted to obtain patta. Upon verification by the Sub-Collector, it was found that the said court order was not genuine. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the allegations made in the FIR are false and baseless, and that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He further submitted that the petitioner is willing to cooperate with the investigation, and that custodial interrogation is not required. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police, while opposing the grant of anticipatory bail, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioner had created a forged court order, as if it was passed by a competent court, to obtain patta fraudulently. He further submitted that the petitioner is having nine previous



Crl.OP.No.15685 of 2025

cases registered against him.

WEB COPY

5. Heard learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the seriousness of the allegation, the nature of the offence, and taking into account the criminal antecedents of the petitioner with nine previous cases, this Court is of the considered opinion that this is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail at this stage.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

22.05.2025

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
skr

To

1. Sub-Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch II, Chengalpattu

Page No.3 of 5



Crl.OP.No.15685 of 2025

2. The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court, Chennai.

WEB COPY

3. Judicial Magistrate-II, Chengalpattu

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

skr

Crl.OP.No.15685 of 2025



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.15685 of 2025

22.05.2025