



Crl.OP.No.32473 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.11.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

**Crl.O.P.No.32473 of 2025**

Adhikesavan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch,  
5<sup>th</sup> Team, Vepery,  
Chennai.

... Respondent

(Cr.No.132 of 2014)

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya  
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his  
arrest in respect of Cr.No.132 of 2014 on the file of the The Inspector of  
Police, Central Crime Branch, 5<sup>th</sup> Team, Vepery, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Mohan Raj

For Respondent : Mr.L.Baskaran  
Government Advocate

**ORDER**

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under



Crl.OP.No.32473 of 2025

Sections 420, 463, 465, 467, 468, 471, 474 and 448 r/w 120B of IPC in

Cr.No.132 of 2014, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, in collusion with other accused, was involved in fabrication of records and the sale of the property belonging to the defacto complainant, which led to the registration of the FIR. Hence, the present petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he had received a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- from one of the accused, namely Gnanasekaran, and solely on that basis he has been arrayed as an accused. He contended that the petitioner was not involved in the alleged acts of forgery or fabrication of records and therefore prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, by filing a counter, submitted that A5 is alleged to be one of the main accused and, in the sale of



WEB COPY

various properties belonging to the defacto complainant, A5 had collected a sum of Rs.71.20 lakhs, out of which the present petitioner had received Rs.9,00,000/-. He further submitted that the investigation is still pending and that a notice for appearance has already been issued to the petitioner. However, instead of appearing, the petitioner has filed the present petition. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record. It reveals that the major allegations in this case are primarily against A1 to A5, and it is stated that the petitioner had received a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- from A5. Considering that the case was registered in the year 2014, I am of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be necessary. Hence, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from

3/6



the date on which the order copy made, before the learned *Metropolitan*

*Magistrate, CCB & CBCID Cases, Egmore* 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 learned

Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) 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 identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) **The petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday 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 aforesaid conditions, the



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.32473 of 2025

learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]***;

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

**27.11.2025**

Vv

To

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB & CBCID Cases, Egmore
2. The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch,  
5<sup>th</sup> Team, Vepery,  
Chennai.
3. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court of Madras,  
Chennai 600 104.

**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

5/6



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.No.32473 of 2025



Vv

**Crl.O.P.No.32473 of 2025**

**27.11.2025**