



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

Sumanth Reddy

... Petitioner

vs.

State rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
CCB ACP-II Team-Ii
Tambaram Metropolitan Police,
Sholinganallur, Chennai – 119.
Crime No.226 of 2021

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 447 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to transfer the proceedings which is now
pending in Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate
No.I, Tambaram to some other Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Suresh
for Mr.R.Nageswara Rao

For Respondent : Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam
Additional Public Prosecutor



Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner/A2 in Crime No.226 of 2021 for the offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC filed this Criminal Original Petition seeking a direction to transfer the proceedings in Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram to some other Court.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the complaint was lodged by Mrs.Archana Reddy, daughter of late K.N.Reddy (Retired Commander, Indian Navy) on 14.04.2021 stating that Sarala Reddy/A1 and petitioner/Sumanth Reddy/A2, son of A1 created forged documents and using the forged documents, cheated the defacto complainant and committed land grabbing of the property situated at No.10 Gandhi Nagar, Madambakkam ALS Main Road, Tambaram measuring an extent of 1 ground and 558 sq.ft. According to the defacto complainant, the property was purchased by her late father through registered Document No.907/1989. Her parents due to misunderstanding got separated in the year 1997, at that time, Sarala Reddy/A1, wife of Konda Reddy, brother of defacto



complainant's father, moved to the said property as care takers to her late father, continued to reside their till the death of K.N.Reddy, who died on 10.09.2017. The defacto complainant after the death of her father requested the accused to hand over the original property and transfer the documents of her father, at that time, she was informed that all documents destroyed. Later, after obtaining certified copies of documents from SRO, Tambaram, the defacto complainant found Sarala Reddy and her husband Konda Reddy impersonated Sarala Reddy as the wife of K.N.Reddy in several documents since 1997. A forged Will vide Document No.56 of 2005 dated 18.05.2005 created and using this forged will, further documents created in this case. The signature of late K.N.Reddy in the Will and in the disputed documents, found in variance by the forensic report dated 05.04.2021. It was also alleged that Sarala Reddy obtained Passport No.A4795584 by impersonating herself as the wife of K.N.Reddy. Thus, a case in Crime No.226 of 2021 registered on 19.04.2021 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC. During the course of investigation, the Inspector of Police arrested the petitioner/A2, recorded his confession and produced him for remand to judicial custody. Thereafter, police custody of petitioner/A2 taken on 01.09.2021 and six documents produced from TATA Capital to the respondent police. Now the



case in Crime No.226 of 2021 closed as further action dropped on 24.03.2025 and RCS notice served. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a petition seeking return of six documents in Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram. But the Lower Court for some reason kept the petition pending and dragging on the proceedings without any valid reason. Hence, the above petition filed seeking transfer of proceedings in Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 to some other Court.

3.The contention of the petitioner is that the defacto complainant Archana Reddy lodged a complaint against the petitioner and his mother as though documents fabricated by them and they attempted to take away the property of the defacto complainant's father. He further submitted that prior to registration of FIR, the petitioner submitted the original documents pertaining to his property for obtaining loan from TATA Capital and the list of documents are as follows:

- 1) Original Approved Plan
- 2) Original Patta in name of Sarala Reddy
- 3) Original Sale Deed 2168/1982 dated 29.03.1985
- 4) Original Sale Deed 907/1989 dated 03.03.1989



- 5) Original Sale Deed 817/2005 dated 08.02.2005
- 6) Original MODT in favour of TCFSL Doc.No.4/1018

4.After the complaint of the defacto complainant, the respondent by communication dated 03.09.2021 directed the TATA Capital Limited to produce the title deeds and all six documents produced by TATA Capital on 07.09.2021. The respondent police submitted these documents to the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram. Now the case after investigation closed as further action dropped. The defacto complainant simultaneously filed a writ petition in W.P.No.19204 of 2021 to cancel the documents alleged to be forged. The writ petition dismissed by order dated 12.01.2022, against which, defacto complainant herein filed a writ appeal in W.A.No.191 of 2022 and the same was dismissed by this Court by judgment dated 03.02.2022. Thereafter, the defacto complainant influenced the Deputy Inspector General of Registration, who filed an appeal challenging the same order passed in the writ petition in W.P.No.19204 of 2021 in W.A.No.619 of 2022. This Court by judgment dated 03.07.2024 finding that the defacto complainant influenced the Deputy Inspector General of Registration who filed writ appeal without any merits, dismissed the writ



appeal by condemning the act of the Deputy Inspector General of Registration. Thus the defacto complainant with false allegations was in the habit of filing petitions or sending representations to various authorities for obvious reason making a claim over the property of the petitioner. The respondent police after thorough investigation finding, no offence is made out, closed the case as further action dropped. Earlier petitioner filed a petition in Crl.O.P.No.32650 of 2025, to complete the investigation and to file a final report in Crime No.226 of 2021. This Court by order dated 01.12.2025 recording case in Crime No.226 of 2021 closed as further action dropped, disposed of the Criminal Original Petition. Thereafter, petitioner filed a petition seeking return of six documents collected during investigation but the petition not numbered and kept pending in Crl.M.P.SR.No.6122 of 2025. Again the petitioner approached this Court in Crl.O.P.No.563 of 2026 for a direction to number the petition. This Court by order dated 19.01.2026 directed the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram to number the return of property petition and thereafter, Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 given, but so far no orders passed. Hence, the present petition filed.



5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor filed his counter and submitted that in this case on the complaint of Mrs.Archana Reddy, daughter of late K.N.Reddy, a case registered in Crime No.226 of 2021 for offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC on 19.04.2021. In this case, originally two accused, namely, Sarala Reddy wife of Konda Reddy and Sumanth Reddy, son of Sarala Reddy. The said Sarala Reddy/A1 passed away on 25.04.2021. The defacto complainant's father died on 10.09.2017. Earlier, K.N.Reddy and his wife got separated in the year 1997, thereafter it was petitioner's parents who took care of late K.N.Reddy till his death. According to the defacto complainant, all documents and personal details of late K.N.Reddy destroyed by the petitioner and his mother and they created forged Power of Attorney, settlement deeds and sale deeds and usurped late K.N.Reddy property. The petitioner earlier mortgaged the property with TATA Capital, during investigation documents received and sent for forensic examination, forging of signature of late K.N.Reddy confirmed, but the finger print in the documents tallied. Since K.N.Reddy passed away on 10.09.2017 no further investigation could be done for this fact and hence, case was closed as further action dropped and served RCS Notice dated



Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

21.03.2025 to the defacto complainant through registered post. Thereafter, referred charge sheet filed before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram, pending as RCS.No.7 of 2026. The defacto complainant filed a protest petition, is under consideration. At this stage, the petitioner filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 seeking return of original documents. Since the defacto complainant filed a protest petition, the outcome of the protest petition in Crime No.226 of 2021 will have a direct barring on these documents and hence, it is kept pending not returned. He further produced a copy of the order passed on 06.04.2026 dismissing Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 and hence, the present petition becomes infructuous and prayed for dismissal.

6.Considering the submissions made and on perusal of the materials, it is seen that in this case, the undisputed fact is that FIR came to be registered on 19.04.2021 against Sarala Reddy/A1 and petitioner/Sumanth Reddy/A2. Sarala Reddy/mother of petitioner died on 25.04.2021. The defacto complainant's father died on 10.09.2017. During investigation, TATA Capital submitted six documents in aid of investigation and these documents were produced before the Lower Court in P.I.Nos.222 and 223 of 2021,



documents are case property. Further, documents sent for forensic examination. The Forensic report dated 05.04.2021 confirmed signature in the Will do not tally with signatures of K.N.Reddy confirming forgery. But the finger print found in the Power of Attorney Document No.1146/1997 and Sale Deed Document No.817/2005 shown no dissimilarity. There are now two sets of report, one as regards signature and another as regards fingerprint. Hence these reports have to be considered with other facts of the case. The respondent police closed the case as further action dropped for its own reasons, which is objected by defacto complainant and protest petition pending in RCS.No.7 of 2026. It is not in dispute that the defacto complainant filed protest petition and petitioner herein also filed his objections and the respondent police submitted their contentions. There are also other LRs to late Sarala Reddy and Konda Reddy. Only after conclusion of RCS.No.7 of 2026, the contention of the petitioner seeking return of documents merits consideration. All facts to be decided in the protest petition. Presently, prayer sought for in the present petition is forbidden in view of the order dated 06.04.2026 passed in Crl.M.P.No.286 of 2026 and this petition becomes infructuous.



Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

WEB COPY

7.In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed as
infructuous.

15.04.2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
cse



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
CCB ACP-II Team-Ii
Tambaram Metropolitan Police,
Sholinganallur, Chennai – 119.
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tambaram.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

cse

Crl.O.P.No.4692 of 2026

15.04.2026