



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.3110 of 2026

Kalaivani

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep by
Inspector of Police
Otteri Police Station,
Chennai District
(Cr.No.755 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.755 of 2025 dated on the file of the respondent police and pass orders.

For Petitioner : Mr. S. Kasi Rajan

For Respondent : M/s. J.R. Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 463,464,465,468 of IPC in Crime No.755 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner is A2. A1 and A3 in this case are husband and wife. A2 and the defacto complainant are sisters of of A1. Originally the property belongs to the mother of the defacto complainant and she has executed a settlement deed in favour of the defacto complainant. It is alleged that the petitioner herein colluded with A1 and A3 and impersonated themselves as owner of the property and cancelled the settlement deed executed to the defacto complainant and also executed forged settlement deed in favour of A3. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that there was some property dispute pending between the petitioners and the defacto complainant due to which a false case has been foisted against the petitioner. He further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are borne out of records and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary. However, the petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation and abide by any other stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that it is not only the case of creating forged documents and it is also a case of cheating by transferring the property belonging to the defacto complainant. Further the petitioner/A2 in this case acted as a attestator in the forged document. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the submissions made by both sides; the gravity of offence and the petitioner herein colluded with each other and created forged documents and cancelled the settlement deed executed to the defacto complainant and also transferred the same in the name of A3, this Court is not not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

10.02.2026

smn



To

1. The Inspector of Police
Otteri Police Station,
Chennai District

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



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

smn

Crl.O.P.No.3110 of 2026

10.02.2026