



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.03.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CrI.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

Bharath

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State Represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Tirupathur Town Police Station,
Tirupathur, Tirupathur District.
(Crime No.426 of 2024)

Now transferred to
2.State Rep. By the Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Tirupathur, Tirupathur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail
in the event of his arrest in connection with Crime No.426 of 2024 on the file
of the Inspector of Police, Tirupathur Town Police Station, Tirupathur,
Tirupathur District.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Vinodh Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)



Crl.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 466, 467, 471 of IPC in Crime No.426 of 2024, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant, one Thulasinathan, lodged a complaint before the respondent police against A1. It is alleged that the schedule mentioned property was purchased by the de facto complainant under a sale deed dated 13.07.2011 in Doc.No.2250 of 2011. Further, the de facto complainant issued a General Power of Attorney to A1 dated 10.06.2016 in Doc.No.7601 of 2016. Thereafter, A1, who was maintaining the property, sold the same to the petitioner on 03.05.2024 in Doc.No.1678 of 2024 by way of execution and registration of a sale deed. Aggrieved over the same, the de facto complainant lodged a complaint alleging that the sale transaction was based on a forged life certificate, and the present FIR was registered against the said Power of Attorney holder/A1 in Cr.No.426 of 2024. Hence, the case.



Crl.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that his name was not at all referred to in the FIR. He further submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and sought anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that, in furtherance of the FIR, a final report was filed before the Court against A1. However, the learned Magistrate, upon consideration, ordered further proceedings and, based on further investigation, summons have been issued. He would further submit that, though the petitioner was not named as an accused in the FIR or in the initial final report, during the course of further investigation, his involvement has been brought to light.

5. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, and taking note of the fact that the petitioner was not a named accused in the FIR and in the first final report, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.



Crl.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

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 (15) days from the date on which the order copy is made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirupathur**, 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 30 days, 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.***



Crl.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

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.

27.03.2026

cda

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirupathur.

2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Tirupathur, Tirupathur District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Tirupathur Town Police Station,
Tirupathur, Tirupathur District.

4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

Crl.O.P.No.7822 of 2026

27.03.2026