



CRL OP Nos. 29966 & 30015 of
2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

**CRL OP Nos. 29966 & 30015 of 2025
and CRL MP Nos. 20636 & 21288 of 2025**

1. RAMAN

S/o.Anjaneya Reddy, No.43/1,
E.B.Koot Road, Tiruvalam, Katpadi
Taluk, Vellore District.

Petitioner(s) in
Crl.O.P.No.29966 of 2025

1. SUNDRAM

2.Amsa

Petitioner(s) in Crl.O.P.No.30015 of
2025

Vs

1. The State Rep by, The Inspector of
Police,
District Crime Branch, Vellore District.
Cr.No.07/2025.

Respondent(s) in both
Crl.O.Ps.



COMMON PRAYER

To enlarge the petitioners on bail and anticipatory bail in Cr.No.07/2025 on the file of the respondent police and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): in M.Sathish Kumar
Crl.O.P.No.29966 of
2025

For Petitioner(s): in S Siva Kumar
Crl.O.P.No.30015 of
2025

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gopinath
in both Crl.O.P.S. Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

COMMON ORDER

The petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.29966 of 2025, who were arrested on 09.10.2025 by the respondent police in connection with Crime No.07 of 2025 for the offences punishable under sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 120B of IPC, seeks bail.

2. The petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.30015 of 2025, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences under sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 120B in Crime No.07 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

3. The allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners joined together and executed a sale deed claiming A1 and A2 are the legal heirs of the late Krishnaswami and late Dhanabakiyam and stating that their ancestral are having valid title to the properties. However, it is stated by the defacto



complainant that the defacto complainant has purchased the lands as early as in the year 1995, and all the revenue records stands in the name of the defacto complainant. Based on the complaint, A3 was arrested and A1 and A2 are absconding.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.30015 of 2025 submitted that in the year 1957 itself, Dhanabakiyam had purchased the property situated in new survey number 83/3, And by suppressing the said sale, the vendor of the de facto complainant has sold the total extent of 3.70 acres in favour of the de facto complainant. Hence, the de facto complainant has no right over the land sold in favour of Dhanabakiyam in survey number 83/3. Further, according to him, the extent of land purchased by Dhanabakiyam is 1.88 acres. Hence, they are having right over the same, and they have executed the sale deed in favour of A3. Hence, prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/A3 in Crl.O.P.No.29966 of 2025 submitted that A3 has verified all the revenue records and after verification of the records, he has come forward to purchase the property, and there is no intention to cheat anyone, hence, prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that totally two properties were purchased by the de facto complainant. Firstly, he purchased the



property to the extent of 1.25 acres from one Asthammal from S.No.83/2, similarly, land in survey number 83/3, to the extent of 3.17 acres of land was purchased in the year 1995 itself. And from that day onwards, the de facto complainant is in possession and enjoyment of the property, and they have mutated the records, and the records were also produced before this court. Hence, opposed to grant bail and anticipatory to the petitioners.

7.The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) appearing for the respondent police reported that the petitioner A3 was arrested on 09.10.2025, and A1 and A2 are absconding. The investigation in this case is pending. Hence, opposed to grant bail for A3 and anticipatory bail for A1 and A2 respectively.

8. I have considered the submissions made on both sides and perused the records. The records revealed that in the year 1957 itself, Dhanabakiyam had purchased some land situated in survey number 83. Similarly, she has also sold 1.25 acres of land to one Asthammal in the year 1969. In both the documents, there is no mention about the subdivision made in survey number 83. However, it is an admitted fact that in survey number 83/3, the de facto complainant is having patta, and other revenue records stands in his name. This shows that from the date of purchase onwards, the de facto complainant has been in possession of the property.



9. That being so, without having any revenue records, purely based on oral claim that the land purchased by Dhanabakiyam falls within the survey number 83/3, the petitioners A1 and A2 sold the property in favour of A3, which itself shows that this is a clear case of fabrication of records, and they have grabbed the property of the de facto complainant. Hence, I am not inclined to grant bail and anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, these criminal original petitions are dismissed.

14-11-2025

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

mpa

To

1.The State Rep by, The Inspector of
Police,
District Crime Branch, Vellore District.
Cr.No.07/2025.

2.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP Nos. 29966 & 30015 of
2025



K.RAJASEKAR J.
mpa

**CRL OP Nos. 29966 &
30015 of 2025
and CRL MP Nos. 20636
& 21288 of 2025**

14-11-2025