



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.34101 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

**CRL OP NO.34101 of 2025
and CRL MP NO.24048 of 2025**

1. Puthumai Lakshmi
2. Ponraj

... Petitioners/ Accused

Vs

The State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Tambaram City,
Chengalpet District.
(Crime No.1 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to grant bail to the petitioner/accused in
Crime No.1 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. C.V. Kumar

For Intervenor : Mr. R. John Sathyan
For Mr. G. Magesh Kumar

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



Crl.O.P.No.34101 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 29.10.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of BNS in Crime No.1 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, the petitioners herein joined hands with other accused created a forged unregistered WILL over the defacto complainant's property situated at Kannivakkam Village, Vadalur Taluk, Chengalpattu District totalling to an extent of 3.26 acres, purportedly executed by one Lakshmi Ammal, who is the mother of the defacto complainant in this case, in favour of the first petitioner herein; that thereafter, based on the strength of the said bogus WILL, the accused executed Settlement Deed over the said property in favour of her husband, who is the second petitioner herein. Hence, a complaint was lodged by the defacto complainant before the respondent police and subsequently, the petitioners herein were arrested.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that



Crl.O.P.No.34101 of 2025

the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they are in judicial custody since 29.10.2025; that the petitioners have no previous antecedents; and that the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court, hence prays to grant bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor raised strong objection for the grant of bail to the petitioners by stating that, originally the subject property belongs to one Lakshmi Ammal, who has four children and the defacto complainant is one among them; that the said Lakshmi Ammal died intestate on 14.05.1996 leaving behind the defacto complainant and other children as her Class I legal heirs; that upon her death, they inherited the said property and after the demise of other children, the defacto complainant in this case is in possession of the said property; that whileso, the first petitioner herein had created a bogus unregistered WILL as though, the said Lakshmi Ammal had executed a WILL in her favour over the said property; that on the strength of the said bogus WILL executed a Settlement Deed in favour of her husband, who is the second petitioner herein in order to grab the defacto complainant's property.

5. 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 seven accused involved in this case and the petitioners herein are arrayed as A2 and A3; and that the investigation of this case is pending.

6. I have considered the submissions made on both sides and also gone through the materials available on record, which reveals that the first petitioner herein is not having any connection with the deceased Lakshmi Ammal and the petitioners herein are alleged to have joined hands with other accused, created a bogus unregistered WILL, fabricated the records and also executed a settlement deed over the defacto complainant's property in order to grab the same.

7. Considering the above facts, nature of offence, taking note of the fact that the investigation of this case is pending and if the petitioners are enlarged on bail, there is possibility of tampering with the witnesses and hampering the investigation process, hence this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed and consequently, connected criminal miscellaneous petition stands



ordered.

WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.34101 of 2025

stn

16.12.2025

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Tambaram City,
Chengalpet District.
(Crime No.1 of 2025)
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K. RAJASEKAR, J.

stn



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.34101 of 2025

**Crl.O.P. No.34101 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.No.24048 of 2025**

16.12.2025