



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No. 31756 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NO. 31756 of 2025

1.Rani
2.Anandhan

Petitioners

Vs

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police
District Crime Branch, Thiruvannamalai
Thiruvannamalai District
Crime No. 08 of 2025.

...Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the
event of their arrest pending investigation in Crime No. 08 of 2025 on the
file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.Appaswamee VR
For Intervener : Mr.B.Vetrivel
For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent
police for the offences punishable under Section IPC in Crime No. 264 of
2023 on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners herein sold the land to the de-facto complainant representing that they were in possession of three cents of land allotted as per the assignment patta. However, upon further investigation, it was revealed that there was no such land available in the Survey Number mentioned in the Patta. Hence the complaint.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that they were served with an assignment patta in the year 1978 itself and they were in possession and enjoyment of the same. Subsequently, they obtained an FMB sketch from the Village Administrative Officer to identify the property, and thereafter, a computer patta was also issued in respect of the same. Based on the above documents, the petitioners sold the property in favour of the de-facto complainant. However, the Revenue Department now disputes the land claiming that the land in possession of the de-facto complainant falls within the public area of the layout. He further submits that the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions imposed by this Court. He prays to grant anticipatory bail the petitioners.



WEB COPY

4.The learned Counsel for the Intervener/Defacto complainant submitted that there was no such land available in the Survey Number sold by the petitioners herein in favour of the de-facto complainant and the Patta was also produced and the same is also forged document. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the report of the Revenue Divisional Officer, states that though some documents were issued in favour of the petitioners herein as per the proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 2748/06, the connected papers are not available in the office of the Revenue Department and the property could not be identified. Though it is stated that the property is not available in the said survey number. I am of the view that the allegations covered in this case are borne out from the records, hence, I am of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary.



WEB COPY

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is 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.I, Thiruvannamalai**, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only)** **with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(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 a.m for a period of three 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 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 themselves as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)13 SCC 283]**;

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

18.12.2025

MSM

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thiruvannamalai.

2.The Inspector of Police
District Crime Branch, Thiruvannamalai
Thiruvannamalai District
Crime No. 08 of 2025.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 31756 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

MSM

CRL OP NO. 31756 of 2025



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No. 31756 of 2025

18.12.2025.