



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.868 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.868 of 2026

P.Aruvi @ Arivu

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Entrustment Document Fraud
II-Wing, 3rd Floor,
Central Crime Branch, Sholinganallur,
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 anticipatory bail in the event of arrest of his arrest in respect of Cr.No.58 of 2025 on the file of the r Inspector of Police, Central Crime Branch, Entrustment Document Fraud, II-Wing, 3rd Floor, Central Crime Branch, Sholinganallur, Tambaram City Police, Chennai-600 119 .

For Petitioner : Mr.Ragunathan A

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



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.No.868 of 2025



ORDER

The petitioner, 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 they deal with the real estate business 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. 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/A4 submitted that the petitioner was only the attestor of the document and he has not collected any money from the defacto complainant and 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 though it is stated that the petitioner herein has not directly subscribed his signature as one of the party in memo of understanding. He was also witness to the document and he has also jointly and actively participated in cheating the other accused and opposed to grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have also gone through the records and other connected materials revealed that admittedly A4/P.Aruvi @ Arivu who is attestor of the document and there is no allegations that he availed any benefit from the money paid by the defacto complainant.



6. Considering the nature of allegations, the fact that the petitioner is only the attester of the document 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 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.868 of 2020

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate I, Tambaram
2. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
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.868 of 2026

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.868 of 2026

21.01.2026