



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.7276 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23.03.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No.7276 of 2026

1. Palanivel
2. Karthikeyan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Crime Branch CID Headquarters,
Chennai.
Crime.No.01 of 2026

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023 to enlarge the petitioners on bail pending investigation, in Crime No.01 of 2026 on the file of respondent Police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.T.Muruganantham

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 11.02.2026 for the alleged offences under Sections 465, 466, 471 and 219 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 337, 340(2) and 257 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) in Crime No.01 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with the other accused have relied upon bogus documents in WP.Nos.20496 and 23804 of



2013 for regularization of service and subsequently, the Government preferred an appeal before this Court in WA.No.766 and 767 of 2016 claiming that the petitioners along with the other accused have relied upon bogus documents, wherein this Court had directed the Department to initiate departmental action against them. Subsequently, the departmental proceedings was initiated and a case was registered against them. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that A1 has already been released on bail by the learned Principal Session Judge, Namakkal on 29.10.2025. He further submitted that even according to the prosecution the alleged fabrication took place in the year 2013, however, the petitioners were under incarceration since 11.02.2026. Apart from that there could not be any possibility for the involvement of second petitioner, who being 24 years old, to be part of this case. Hence, he prayed to grant bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioners. He further submits that the investigation is at the preliminary stage and this case was seriously viewed by the Division Bench of this Court and thereafter, the case was transferred to CBCID.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the



learned counsel on either side and also perused the records available.

WEB COPY

6. Though A1 was enlarged on bail, the investigation is still at the preliminary stage. It is also seen from the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) that the investigation has been transferred to CBCID only after the enlargement of A1. Hence, the contention of the respondent that, custodial interrogation of the petitioners may require cannot be faulted. Hence, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

23.03.2026

rap



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.7276 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

rap

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Crime Branch CID Headquarters,
Chennai.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

3. The XVIII M.M.Saidapet, Chennai

4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal.

CRL OP No.7276 of 2026

23.03.2026