



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 358 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-01-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 358 of 2026

1. Puthumai Lakshmi
W/o Ponraj
2. Ponraj
S/o. Shenbagaperumal
Both are Residing at,
no.14, Subramaniya Nagar,
Rettipalayam Road,
Melavelithottam,
Thanjavur District

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep. by The Inspector of Police
Central Crime Branch, Tambaram City
Chengalpet District.
Crime No.1/2025

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of BNS, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in Crime No. 1/2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): K.Hemanathan

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



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 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.

WEB COPY

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. Earlier, this Court dismissed the bail petition filed by the petitioner in Crl.OP.No.34101 of 2025 dated 16.12.2025 on the following reasons:



WEB COPY



“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. Since there is no change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the earlier order, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

09-01-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

DRL



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 358 of 2



K.RAJASEKAR J.

DRL

CRL OP No. 358 of 2026

09-01-2026



To

1. The Inspector of Police
Central Crime Branch, Tambaram City
Chengalpet District.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.