



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

Crl.R.C.No.2136 of 2025

A. Ravi

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch (DCB)
Avadi

... Respondent

PRAYER : This petition is filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS Act to set aside the order dated 06.10.2025 passed in Crl.M.P.No.261 of 2025 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate-II, Ponneri and pass orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Shanmugan Sundaram, senior
counsel for Mr.R. Vinayaga Vishnu

For Respondent : Mr.Dr.C.E. Pratap,



Government Advocate

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case is filed to set aside the order dated 06.10.2025 passed in Crl.M.P.No.261 of 2025 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate-II, Ponneri.

2. The facts of the case is that the petitioner is unaware of the claim of the defacto complainant. He has been arraigned as Accused No.8 out of totally 8 accused in this case. Now the respondent police has filed the final report and the same is taken on file in CC.No.85 of 2024 for the alleged offence under Sections 419,429,465,468 and 471 of IPC. The sum and substance of the case is that the accused created forged documents and impersonated the original owner and executed sale deed and sold various plots. The petitioner in good faith purchased one of the dispute property from the A2 believing the title to be valid and with



WEB COPY

knowledge of any impersonation or fraudulent activity, due to which he has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he filed a CrI.M.P.No.261 of 2025 before the Judicial Magistrate-II, Ponneri to discharge him from this case and the same was dismissed on 06.10.2025. Challenging the same the petitioner has filed the present petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he is no way connected to the alleged offence as stated in the complaint. In fact as an authentic purchaser, the petitioner paid all necessary charges and applied for transfer of records in good faith, without any intention or involvement in the alleged fraudulent activities. Hence prays to allow this petition.

4. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent submits that the accused persons entered into criminal conspiracy and created forged documents. The petitioner is also one of the party in the criminal conspiracy. Hence, prays to dismiss this petition.



WEB COPY

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

6. On a perusal of records, it is seen that the the petitioner is a innocent purchaser and he did not know about the alleged execution of forged documents and impersonation of the original owner by the other accused persons. In fact the petitioner herein as a bonafide purchaser had paid necessary charges and applied and mutated the revenue records in his name by obtaining patta, thereafter as on date sale deed also canceled by him due to the alleged complaint, thereby the petitioner is not the owner of the property, therefore to prosecute the case for impersonation and forgery, there was no materials to attract the offence, therefore he is liable to discharge from the proceedings.

7. For the foregoing reasons, this Criminal Revision case is allowed and the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate-II, Ponneri in Crl.M.P.No.261 of 2025 on 06.10.2025 is set aside.



05.11.2025

WEB COPY

smn

To

1. The learned Judicial Magistrate-II, Ponneri
2. The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch (DCB), Avadi
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

smn

CrI.R.C.No.2136 of 2025

05.11.2025