



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.915 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.915 of 2026

V.E.S.Raja

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
Entrustment Document Fraud
II-Wing, 3rd Floor,
Central Crime Branch, Sholingnallur,
Tambaram City Police,
Chennai-600 119.

.. Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of
arrest by the respondent police in Cr.No.482 of 2025 on the file of the
respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.M.Kanishkaran

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner/A1, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 406, 420, 506(i) r/w 120(b) of IPC) in Cr.No.58 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution alleges that the petitioner joining hands with other accused projected themselves as dealing with the real estates and by showing bogus patta and also claiming themselves that they were the owners of various lands, collected a sum of Rs.2.04 crores from the defacto complainant. However, they have also come forward to enter into the memorandum of understanding by claiming that that they were the owners of the various lands situated in “Mapped” area. Subsequently, it revealed that these petitioners were not the owners of the land and when the defacto complainant has demanded back the money, they have also issued a cheque. Simultaneously, given instructions for stop payment for encashment of cheque to the banks. Hence, the defacto complainant has come forward to lodge the case.



3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that A1 and A2 have entered into the memorandum of understanding with the defacto complainant and A1 had already repaid Rs.84,00,000/- to the defacto complainant. Hence, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and on instructions submitted that A1 and A2 have entered into the memorandum of understanding with the defacto complainant and A1 had already repaid Rs.84,00,000/-. It is a classic case of cheating since without land, by showing memorandum of understanding, they have collected the huge amount from the defacto complainant and also utilizing the influence of A3 who was then Assistant Commissioner of Police attached with the Commissionerate and opposed to grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. I have also gone through the FIR and the statement recorded from the defacto complainant revealed that he has paid huge amount of Rs.2.04crores. It further revealed that A1 has already returned back a sum of Rs.84,00,000/- .



6. Considering the nature of allegations, the fact that A1 has already returned back a sum of Rs.84,00,000/- and though investigation is pending, I am 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 his appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate Court-I, Tambaram** 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 daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(d) The petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(e) The petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial:

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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]*;

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

21.01.2026

Vv



Crl.OP.No.915 of 2020

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate Court-I, Tambaram

2. The Inspector of Police,
Entrustment Document Fraud
II-Wing, 3rd Floor,
Central Crime Branch, Sholinganallur,
Tambaram City Police,
Chennai-600 119.

3.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.915 of 2026

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.915 of 2026

21.01.2026