



CRL OP(MD). No.8109 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 17/10/2025

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD). No.8109 of 2025

1.Jayachandran,
S/o.Late. Rasu Thevar

2.Vivekanandhan,
S/o.Jayachandran

... Petitioners

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch – II,
Madurai, Madurai District.
(Crime No.Not Known of 2025)

... 1stRespondent/Complainant

2.J.Ranjith Kumar

.. 2nd respondent/defacto
complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Murugappan,
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.S.S.Manoj,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

For Intervenor/
defacto complainant : Mr.V.Thirumal,



CRL OP(MD), No.8109 of 2025

WEB COPY

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.Not Known of 2025 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/accused, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 292, 318(2), 336(3), and 351(2) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.Not Known of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner is 70 years old and doing social works through politics and second petitioner is his son. They sold a plots to the informant of this case in the year 2009 and subsequently the informant in the year 2015 sold that house plots properties through a registered sale deed No.4274/2015 to another person. Further after 15 years, the informant/defacto complainant lodged the present complaint alleging that there is small variation in the extent of the aforesaid sold out plots. Hence, the case.



CRL OP(MD), No.8109 of 2025

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners has lay out and sold the properties and they have not committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution, and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready and willing to abide by any conditions which may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submitted that the investigation is going on. However, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the petitioners originally have purchased only 1 acre and 50 cents, but subsequently, they have grabbed the adjoining properties belonged to other land owners and have lay out to 2 acres and 18 cents and sold the same. He also produced the proceedings issued by the Thasildar, Thirumangalam in Na.Ka.No.2781/25/e4 dated 18.07.2025 wherein it is stated that the petitioner infact lay out was laid for 2 acre 18 cents.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.8109 of 2025

S.SRIMATHY,J

PJL

Hence, it is seen that the allegation made by the intervenor has *prima facie* confirmed. If there is land grabbing, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

17.10.2025

PJL

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch – II,
Madurai, Madurai District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD). No.8109 of 2025**