



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.24169 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.09.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

CrI.O.P.No.24169 of 2025
and CrI.M.P.Nos.16509 & 16510 of 2025

M.Vedha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-II, Team XVI (LFIIN-II),
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
(Crime No.217 of 2022)

2. P.G.Unnikrishnan

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records in C.C.No.1399 of 2024 on the file of the Metropolitan Magistrate for Exclusive trial of CCB cases and CBCID Metro cases, Chennai and quash the same in so far as the petitioner/accused No.1.

For Petitioner : Mr.Y.Venkatesan

For Respondent : Mr.R.Vinothraja
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)




Crl.O.P.No.24169 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY Challenging the final report filed by the first respondent in C.C.No.1399 of 2024 before the Metropolitan Magistrate for Exclusive trial of CCB cases and CBCID Metro cases, Chennai, in connection with Crime No.217 of 2022 registered for the offences under Sections 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120(b) of IPC @ Sections 420, 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 120(B) of IPC, the present Criminal Original Petition has been filed.

2. The crux of the allegation is that the first accused, by impersonation, created a forged power of attorney and alienated the property belonging to the de-facto complainant, which had been purchased by him in the year 1987, in the name of her husband, who in turn sold the property to the third and fourth accused. Hence the complaint.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that a compromise decree is already in force between the parties and that the de facto complainant is not the owner of the property. He further submitted that the first complaint given against the petitioner has already been closed and therefore, final report in respect of the second complaint is not maintainable.



CrI.O.P.No.24169 of 2025

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

WEB COPY

5. At the outset, this Court is of the view that the contention of the petitioner is not relevant at all. The very crux of the allegation is with regard to impersonation and forgery and the materials collected by the prosecution clearly indicate that impersonation took place and that the signature and the thumb impression do not tally with the disputed signature.

6. In such view of the matter, this Court cannot go into those factual aspects and conduct a roving enquiry while exercising its jurisdiction under section 482 Cr.P.C./528 BNSS. Therefore, this Court finds no merits to quash the proceedings and holds that it is a fit case for trial.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

03.09.2025


ham

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate for Exclusive trial

3/5



Crl.O.P.No.24169 of 2025

of CCB cases and CBCID Metro cases, Chennai.

WEB COPY

2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-II, Team XVI (LFIIN-II),
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.24169 of 2025

N. SATHISH KUMAR, J.

ham

***Crl.O.P.No.24169 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.Nos.16509 & 16510 of 2025***

03.09.2025