



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.30414 and 30254 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NOS.30414 and 30254 of 2025

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 1. Yuvaraj | ... Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.30414 of 2025 |
| 2. Jaya | ... Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.30254 of 2025 |

Vs

The State rep. by, The Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Kancheepuram District. (Crime No.03 of 2025)	... Respondent
---	----------------

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to grant bail to the petitioner/accused in Crime No.03 of 2025 registered on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.30414 of 2025 : Mr. Rajakumar C.

For Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.30254 of 2025 : Mr. A. Vinoth Kumar

For Respondent(s)	: Mr. A. Gopinath Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
--------------------------	--



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.30414 and 30254 of 2025

ORDER

The petitioner/ Yuvaraj and the petitioner/ Jaya were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 12.09.2025 and 21.08.2025, respectively for the offences punishable under Sections 319, 336, 338, 340, 318 and 3(5) of BNS in Crime No.210 of 2025, registered on the file of the respondent police, seek bail. The earlier bail application of the petitioner/ Jaya in Crl.O.P.No.27740 of 2025 was dismissed by this Court, vide order dated 10.10.2025.


2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner/ Jaya herein joined hands with other accused, impersonated herself as the defacto complainant and executed General Power of Attorney deed in respect of defacto complainant's land in favour of the petitioner/ Yuvaraj; that through which the petitioner/ Yuvaraj sold two parcels of land 0.44 cents and 0.39 cents to third parties by registered sale deeds, vide Doc.No.7907/2024 dated 18.12.2024 and Doc.No.175/2025 dated 10.01.2025, respectively; that while the defacto complainant verified the records, she found that the accused persons had fraudulently created a fake Aadhaar card in her name



and by means of impersonation, the accused persons had created General Power of Attorney and sale deeds in respect of her property. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case; that the main accused/ Stephenraj, who arrayed as A7 was already granted bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kancheepuram, vide order dated 09.09.2025 in CMP.No.668 of 2025; that the petitioners herein were in judicial custody 12.09.2025 and 21.08.2025, respectively; and that the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court and sought for bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent while opposing the bail to the petitioners reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are totally 10 accused involved in this case and the petitioners herein are arrayed as A1 and A2; that the specific overt act against the petitioners herein is that the petitioner/ Yuvaraj colluded with other accused persons, fraudulently created fake



Aadhaar card of the defacto complainant and executed a General Power of Attorney Deed in favour of him by impersonating the defacto complainant; that the specific overt act against the petitioner/ Jaya is that she had impersonated the defacto complainant and executed the General Power of Attorney deed; that thereafter subsequent transactions were taken place among the accused over the defacto complainant's property; and that the investigation of the case is pending.

5. Though, it is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the main accused/ Stephenraj was granted bail by the lower Court, on perusal of the record, it shows that he was released on mandatory bail, since the final report was not filed within the mandatory period.

6. Considering the submissions made on both sides, facts of the case, gravity of offence, taking note of the fact that there is no change of circumstances after the dismissal of the earlier bail application of the petitioner/ Jaya in Crl.O.P.No.27740 of 2025, the specific overtact attributed against the petitioner/ Yuvaraj and taking note of the fact that the investigation of this case is pending, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.30414 and 30254 of 2025

7. Accordingly, these criminal original petitions stand dismissed.

11.11.2025

stn

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Kancheepuram District.
(Crime No.03 of 2025)
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.30414 and 30254 of 2025

K. RAJASEKAR, J.

stn

CRL OP NOS.30414 and 30254 of 2025

11.11.2025