



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.Nos.21217 & 11164 of 2025

M.Kuberan @ Sankar

... Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.21217 of 2025

1. R.Natarajan

2. P.Vijayakumar

... Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.11164 of 2025

Vs.

State Rep by
Inspector of Police,
DCB, Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri.
(Crime No.4 of 2025)

... Respondent in both Crl.O.Ps.

COMMON PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita of BNSS, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.4 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner	: Mr.V.Ramamurthy (In Crl.O.P.No.21217 of 2025) Mr.Mohamed Ismail (In Crl.O.P.No.11164 of 2025)
For Intervenor	: Mr.N.Manoharan (In both petitions)
For Respondent	: Mr.Gopinath Government Advocate (Crl. Side) (In both petitions)



COMMON ORDER

The petitioners, who were apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 465, 466, 468 & 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.4 of 2025, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they approached the defacto complainant, who is the owner of land measuring about 2.17 acres, and represented that they would assist him to get development approval for the said land. Believing their representation, the defacto complainant allegedly agreed to execute an Agreement for Sale in favour of A2. It is further alleged that the petitioners produced certain DTCP approval plans, which according to the defacto complainant were fabricated, and based on the same, they attempted to sell the property to various persons by collecting money from them without proper documentation, and cheated the defacto complainant.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the allegations made by the defacto complainant are false and there was no fabrication of documents as alleged. According to him, the original documents were voluntarily handed over by the defacto complainant for the



purpose of documentation. It was further submitted that substantial amounts had already been paid to the defacto complainant and due to misunderstanding between the parties, the present complaint has been lodged. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to cooperate with the investigation.

4. Insofar as A3 and A4 are concerned, the learned counsel submitted that they had only signed the document as witnesses and they have not played any role in the alleged cheating. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that the petitioners had initially approached the defacto complainant under the pretext of assisting him in obtaining loan facilities and for development of the land and thereafter induced him to execute an Agreement for Sale in favour of A2. It is further submitted that the document relied upon by the petitioners shows that a sum of Rs.1 Crore had been paid as advance on the date of the agreement, however the mode of payment has not been property explained.



6. The learned counsel for Intervenor submitted that the petitioners attempted to take advantage of the fabricated document, tried to deal with the property and sell the land to third parties, that the investigation is still in progress, hence, opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. This Court has considered the submissions made on either side including the intervenor and perused the materials placed on record.

8. The major allegation against the petitioners is that they had colluded together and fabricated an Agreement for Sale stating that the defacto complainant had agreed to sell the property for a total consideration of Rs.6.51 Crores and that a sum of Rs.1 Crore had been paid as advance on the date of the agreement. However, the said document does not disclose the mode of payment of the alleged advance amount. When this Court raised a query to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners regarding the mode of payment of the said amount, no satisfactory explanation was forthcoming.

9. The materials available on record prima facie indicate that there are serious allegations relating to fabrication of documents and cheating in respect of valuable immovable property and the investigation is still at a



crucial stage.

WEB COPY

10. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations as discussed above and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners would hamper the course of investigation.

11. In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

12. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions stand dismissed.

14.11.2025

kmm



To

1. The Inspector of Police,
DCB, Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

Crl.O.P.Nos.21217 & 11164 of 2025

14.11.2025