



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.29535 of 2025

C.Kesari

... Petitioner

Vs.

State by the Inspector of Police,
CCB Team III,
Tambaram City Police.
(Crime No.23 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in connection with Cr.No.23 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Maharajan
For Respondent : Mr.Udayakumar,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side).

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 473, 120B of IPC in Crime No.23 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is ranked as A2.

The first accused had alleged to have fabricated and forged the power of attorney in respect of 15 cents of immovable property belongs to Nandhagopal, Saraswathi of Singapore, situated at Palanthandalam Village, Sri Perumpudur Taluk, Kancheepuram District on 08.08.2006, and based on the said power of attorney, alienations were made in favour of the petitioner on 09.08.2006 by a document No.4589/2006 registered at Sub Registrar Office, Padappai. The petitioner is arrayed as A2 on the ground that he purchased the said property from A1 during the year 2006. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that A1 to A4 have involved in fabrication of the power of attorney in respect of 15 cents of immovable property and



based on the power of attorney, sale deeds and other documents were also executed. Hence, he opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the fact that the alleged transaction entered by the petitioner herein took place in the year 2006 and this petitioner has also sold the same to the other persons, I am of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary in this case, hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate I, Kancheepuram, Kancheepuram District** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only)** with **two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition



that:

WEB COPY



(a) If the petitioner 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;

[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 petitioner shall report before the respondent Police daily at 10.30 am for a period of four weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[d] On breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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]**;



WEB COPY

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

05.11.2025

kmm

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
CCB Team III,
Tambaram City Police.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

Crl.O.P.No.29535 of 2025



WEB COPY



05.11.2025