



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.Nos.24505 & 22084 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.Nos.24505 & 22084 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.No.16209 of 2025

Riyaz ... Petitioner/A2-in Crl.O.P.No.24505/2025
Murugesan ... Petitioner/A1-in Crl.O.P.No.22084/2025

Vs.

The Inspector of Police
Yelagiri Police Station,
Tirupattur District.
(Crime No.37 of 2025)

... Respondent

COMMON PRAYER : Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of the arrest in Crime No.37 of 2025 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.24505/2025	: Mr.M.Karthik for Mr.S.Yavavarun
For Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.22084/2025	: Mr.M.Arun
For Respondent in both Crl.O.P.Nos.	: Mr.S.Udayakumar Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.Nos.24505 & 22084 of 2025



For Intervenor in
both Crl.O.P.Nos.

: Mr.M.Himavanth

COMMON ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections **420, 465, 468, 471 & 474 of IPC, in Crime No.37 of 2025**, on the file of the respondent Police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation is that these petitioners/A1 & A2 have colluded and come forward to sell the 20 cents of land in favour of the defacto complainant which was not in existence and the defacto complainant came to know about the same and subsequently lodged a complaint in the year 2022. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A2 submitted that based on the power of attorney in his favour, he sold the property. He was not aware about the title deed of one Pachaimmal. Further, the learned counsel for A1 submitted that since he purchased the land from A2, he sold the land to the defacto complainant. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to



WEB COPY

abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to furnish sufficient solvent sureties for their release. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the property was purchased by the defacto complainant by paying Rs.36 lakhs and applied for patta on the basis of registered sale deed. However, through the Revenue Authorities, it was revealed there is no such land as described in the schedule of property purchased by the defacto complainant. Hence, he come forward with the complaint, for receiving of Rs.46 lakhs from the accused herein.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reported that both the petitioners colluded and shown some other land to the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant purchased the same without properly verifying the same. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Considering the fact that the defacto complainant had purchased the land which was not in existence by paying huge amount, in the year



WEB COPY

2022. Though it was contended that he was cheated, the facts reveals that he purchased the property in the year 2022 and he came to know about the nature of land in the year 2023 itself and he come forward to lodge a complaint only in the year 2025. Further, all the transactions taken place between the parties are only through documents and custodial interrogation in this regard is not necessary, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

7. 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 learned **Judicial Magistrate No.III, Tirupattur District**, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of **Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) each, with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;



WEB COPY



[b] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the Application for Surety ship [Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of the identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[c] the petitioners shall report before the respondent Police daily at 10.30 a.m for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[d] however, both the petitioners shall co-operate with the investigation including submitting sample signatures if any required by the Investigating Officer;

[e] On breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)13 SCC 283]**;

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.Nos.24505 & 22084 of 2025

8. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition
is also ordered.

23.09.2025

dna

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Tirupattur District.

2.The Inspector of Police
Yelagiri Police Station,
Tirupattur District.
(Crime No.37 of 2025)

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.Nos.24505 & 22084 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

dna

CrI.O.P.Nos.24505 & 22084 of 2025
and
CrI.M.P.No.16209 of 2025

23.09.2025