



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 12-09-2025**

WEB COPY

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI**

**CRL OP No. 24359 of 2025**

1. Syed Sayeed Ahmed  
S/o.Syed Hamidullah,  
No. 386, Peerji Street,  
Jaffarabad,  
Vaniyambadi Taluk,  
Vellore District-635754
2. Zahoor Ahmed T.H Alias Jaru Ahamath  
S/o Hajee Basha,  
No.128 O.P. Street,  
Jaffarabad,  
Vaniyambadi Taluk,  
Vellore District-635754.

..Petitioner(s)


Vs

State Represented by  
The Inspector Of Police,  
Ambalur Police Station,  
Thirupathur District.  
Crime No.91/2025

..Respondent(s)

To enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest in connection with Crime No.91/2025, pending investigation, on the file of respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. A.Ramesh



WEB COPY



For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Udayakumar,  
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

### **ORDER**

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest in the hands of respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 49, 61(2), 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 346, 296(b) of B.N.S. in Crime No.91 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of prosecution is that the defacto complainant is residing at Chikkanankuppam Panchayat and her father R.Rangasamy, who died on 14.06.2003. Her father's original legal heirs are totally seven and he is having 76 cents of land in Survey No.133/5A2, Patta No.2236, which was not transferred till 26.08.2024. However, one Rajalingam conspired with one Mani, Pathmanaban, Kupppammal joined together, used fake Tahsildar seal and created a fake legal heir certificate with the help of petitioners and thereafter, patta was transferred in the name of Rajalingam. Hence, the complaint was registered against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel appearing for petitioners submitted that the defacto complainant's father is having land at Chikkanankuppam Panchayat and



WEB COPY

he died on 14.06.2003. He would submit that A1 to A3 have created fake legal heir certificate and A1 is still in custody. He would submit that the petitioners are arrayed as A5 and A6 and they have signed only as witnesses in the settlement deed, except that, they are not connected with the allegation of creating fake Tahsildar seal as well as forged legal heir certificate in respect of property belong to her father. He would also submit that they are innocent persons, they are no way connected with the offence and they have not committed any of offence as alleged by the respondent police. He would also submit that they have been falsely implicated in this case and they will abide by any condition that may be imposed by this court. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for respondent would submit that totally six accused involved in this case, in which the petitioners are arrayed as A5 and A6. He would submit that A1 was arrested and A2 to A4 are still absconding. He would submit that the first petitioner is running a xerox shop and they have signed as witnesses in the settlement deed. He would also submit that if they are released on anticipatory bail, they would hamper the investigation and tamper the witnesses and the investigation is




almost completed. However, he would vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

5. Considering the facts and circumstances and the specific overtact as against these petitioners is that they are witnesses to the settlement deed and the fact that the investigation is almost completed, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **Judicial Magistrate, Vaniyambadi** and they shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each, **in which one surety must be a blood surety**, 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 condition that:

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;



WEB COPY

(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police on every Tuesday and Saturday at 10.30 a.m. for the period of four months and they shall cooperate for the investigation.

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the 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]*; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

12.09.2025

rpp

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate, Vaniyambadi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police, Ambalur Police Station, Thirupathur Dt.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 24359 of 2



**RPP**

**CRL OP No. 24359 of 2025**

**12-09-2025**