



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.2231 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.2231 of 2026

1. Devi

2. A.Punniyakodi

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State

Rep.by the Inspector of Police,

Central Crime Branch,

Tamabaram Commissionerate,

Chennai-600 119.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge this petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Cr.No.70 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Kumaradevan

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

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 419, 465, 467, 468 r/w 417, 420 r/w 120(b) of IPC in Crime No.70 of 2015, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. The prosecution case alleges that a property in Perungalatur Village for an extent of 0.52 (0.96.0) acres in S.No.287/A1 was originally owned by one Adhilakshmi Ammal. She settled the property to Rama Reddy @ Ramaiah who was her younger brother's only son(defacto complainant). After the demise of Adhilakshmi Ammal and Rama Reddy @ Ramaiah, the complainant is in possession of the property. Later, he came to know that Adhilakshmi Ammal gave power of attorney to one V.Sankar for selling the land. By virtue of the power of attorney, V.Sankar sold the land to the petitioners by way of registered sale deed before Padapai Sub-Registrar Office. Hence, the complaint has been lodged to take action against the Adhilakshmi Ammal, V.Sankar and the purchasers of the land namely Devi and A.Punniyakodi, the petitioners herein. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He submitted that the power of attorney given by the Adhilakshmi Ammal to one V.Shankar in the year 1993 and the lands were sold to the petitioners and all these transactions taken place in the year 1994 and FIR was registered in the year 2015. He further submitted that no action was taken by



the respondent for the past ten years and the co-accused was enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 02.12.2025 in Crl.OP.No.29996 of 2025. He also submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and reported that totally 52 cents belongs to the grandmother of the defacto complainant and lands were grabbed by the petitioners. She submitted that the investigation is pending in this case and opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.Considering the fact that the case itself was registered in the year 2015, the petitioners are only the purchasers, the co-accused was enlarged on anticipatory bail and all the allegations are borne out of records, I am of the view that custodial interrogation in this regard is not necessary for investigation. Hence, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.



7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their 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 each of the petitioners shall execute separate bonds 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 petitioners 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 petitioners shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of four weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;**

(d) 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



Crl.OP.No.2231 of 2025

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]***;

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

02.02.2026

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-I, Tambaram
2. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Tambaram Commissionerate,
Chennai-600 119.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.2231 of 2026

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.2231 of 2026

02.02.2026