



WEB COPY

CRL OP(MD) NO. 20940 of 2025
BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD) NO. 20940 of 2025

Kalaiselvi @ Kalaichilvi

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Of Tamilnadu
Rep By Inspector Of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Pudukkottai District

Crime No.21/2025

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Sricharan Rangarajan,
Senior Counsel
for Mr.T.Leninkumar


For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, Additional Public Prosecutor

Prayer:

C-24AB.For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.21/2025 on the file of the respondent police

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 336(3) and 340(1) of BNS in Crime No.21 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2.The case of the prosecution is that on 09.10.2025, one Chandrasekaran, lodged a complaint before the respondent police stating that he is a power of attorney holder of one Paul @ Anpualagan S/o. Adimoolam who is a Singapore citizen. His principal owned a property bearing Plot No.1 but a complaint was mistakenly lodged against Plot No. 2, which belongs rightfully to the petitioner, measuring a total extent of 5,670 square feet, comprised in T.S.No.6087, Janaki Nagar, Pudukkottai. His principal's original name is Anpualagan, and in the year 2017, he changed his name to Paul. One Veerappan/AI, with the aid of the petitioner, fabricated a power of attorney as if the complainant's principal appointed the said Veerappan as his power agent, and on the strength of the power of attorney, the said Veerappan conveyed the said property in favour of one Suriya Kittappa on 05.10.2024. The complainant's principal at no point of time executed any power of attorney appointing the said Veerappan as his power agent. The signature found in the so called power of attorney is not his principal's signature. The said Veerappan, along with the petitioner, to defraud the complainant's principal, fabricated the document and disposed of the said property. Hence, the apprehension of arrest. Hence, a case has been registered as against the petitioner.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and she has not committed any offence. He seeks this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent submitted that the offences committed by the petitioner are serious in nature.

5.The Accused No.1 in Crime No.21 of 2025 on the file of the respondent Police has filed an undertaking affidavit that he would cancel the Document No.7089 of 2024, dated 05/10/2024 which was executed in favour of one Dr.Suriya Kittappa, W/o, Saravana Kumar within a period of three months. This Court is accepting the said undertaking affidavit.



6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court has granted interim protection to the petitioner. Taking into consideration of the fact that the A1 has filed the under taking affidavit, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

7.Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Pudukkottai, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and on further conditions that:

[a]the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or bank pass book to ensure their identity.

[b]the petitioner shall report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.

[c]the petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d]the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e]On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if



the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner is released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[f]If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

8.Post on 03.02.2026 for reporting compliance.

28-11-2025

Tmg

To

1. Inspector Of Police, District Crime Branch,
Pudukkottai District

2.Judicial Magistrate No.II, Pudukkottai.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.