



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 10026 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 10026 of 2026

V Senthilkumar
S/O.Veeramuthu,
No.1302 B-Type.
TNHP, Thiruverkadu,
Avvappakkam,
Ambattur Taluk,
Tiruvallur District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep By, The Inspector of Police
The Inspector of Police,
R-4, Sundarapandiyanar Angadi Police Station,
T.Nagar,
Chennai District.
(Crime No. 69/2025)

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to police the Petitioner on bail in the event of arrest by the respondent the Respondent in Crime No.69 of 2025 dated 02.04.2025 pending on the file of Police, R-4 Soundarapandiyanar Angadi L . Station, T.Nagar, Police Chennai, and thus render justice

For Petitioner(s):

Mr. Sakthivel Natarajan

For Respondent(s):

MR.P.DHILEEPAN,
GOVT.ADVOCATE (CRL SIDE)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 316(2), 318(2), 296(b) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.69 of 2025 on the



file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The allegation is that the petitioner received a power of attorney for the purpose of looking after the property. However, by taking advantage of the relationship, he sold the property after obtaining huge amount as a maintenance charges. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court on 23.09.2025 by this Court in Crl.OP.No.24586 of 2025. However, due to some illness, the petitioner was unable to comply with the said direction. Subsequently, he filed a petition seeking extension of time, which was allowed by this Court in Crl.MP.No. 21234 of 2025, by order dated 13.11.2025. Even thereafter, the petitioner was unable to surrender and hence, he filed another application for further extension in Crl.OP.No.1512 of 2026, which came to be dismissed by this Court on 23.01.2026. Hence, the present petition has been filed.

4. The relevant portion of the order in Crl.OP.No.248586 of 2025 dated 23.09.2026 is as follows:

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(2), 296(b) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.69 of 2025, on



WEB COPY



the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation is that the petitioner received a power of attorney for the purpose of looking after the property. However by taking advantage of the relationship, he sold the property after obtaining huge amount as a maintenance charges. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner during the life time of the defacto complainant's husband, with his consent sold the property also paid the sale consideration with the parties which is not properly reflected in the FIR, and false complaint lodged by the defacto complainant. He further submitted that the petitioner shall co-operate with the investigating and he is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to furnish sufficient solvent sureties for his release. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police reported that the petitioner having obtaining power of attorney not only received a huge amount as maintenance charges also sold the same to the third parties and received a cash consideration of Rs.68 lakhs, thereby cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner based on the power of attorney had sold the property and if any violation of power agent is reported, the same shall be resolved through other legal proceedings, the allegations against the petitioner are covered by various documents, this Court is of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary in this case, hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate at Saidapet, Chennai, 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 of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned learned 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) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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 petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the petitioner has been misusing the process of Court by filing repeated petitions without complying with the directions issued by this Court. He further submitted that costs may be imposed on the petitioner. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner, without prejudice to his defense and contention, is ready and willing to deposit an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- to the credit of the Chief Justice Relief Fund. Hence, he prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and also perused the records available.

7. It is no doubt true that, by order dated 23.09.2025, which has been



extracted herein above, this Court had observed that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. However, the petitioner failed to comply with the conditions imposed and has filed three applications. Considering the conduct of the petitioner, and also taking note of the fact that the petitioner has come forward to deposit an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- to the credit of the "Chief Justice Relief Fund", this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) as cost to the **Chief Justice Relief Fund**, and on such payment, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai**, 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 of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further conditions:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned learned 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 two 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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 petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

21-04-2026

DRL

To

1.The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet, Chennai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
R-4, Sundarapandiyanar Angadi Police Station,
T.Nagar, Chennai District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 10026 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

DRL

CRL OP No. 10026 of 2026

21-04-2026