



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.9166 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.9166 of 2026

1. Selvi
2. Rathinammal
3. Eshwari
4. Aruna
5. Selvaraj @ Selaraju
6. Venkateshwaran
7. Poomalai

... Petitioners

Vs.

State Rep. by Inspector of Police,
DCB, Dharmapuri Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.
(Crime No.03/2026)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.03 of 2026 on the file of the respondent Police, pending investigation.

For Petitioners : Mr.Swami Subramanian

For Respondent : Mr. P. Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.03 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant and his wife are the owners of a Natham house site property comprised in S.No.267/53 and S.No.567/52, which they had purchased in the year 1998 and for which patta was granted in the year 2006. It is alleged that, in the “A” Register, the names of the owners were wrongly entered as Selvi (A1), W/o. Pacchiyanan, and Eswari (A3), W/o. Pacchiyanan. It is the further case of the prosecution that one Ramesh, by using the address of his wife (A4), managed to include the name of the first petitioner in the “A” Register in respect of the property in S.No.267/53 by forging the signature of the Village Administrative Officer, and thereafter executed a Sale Deed bearing Document No.3319 of 2020 dated 20.10.2020 in favour of the third petitioner. Similarly, in respect of the property in S.No.567/52, a Sale Deed bearing Document No.2408 of 2020 dated 06.08.2020 was executed in favour of the first petitioner. It is further alleged that, on the strength of the above forged documents, A9 had threatened the de facto complainant to vacate the premises. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the defacto complainant and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that they are ready to abide by any conditions that may be



imposed by this Court and ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that though the de facto complainant is the rightful owner of the subject properties, the petitioners, by forging “A” Register entries and the signature of the Village Administrative Officer, created sale deeds in their favour. He would further submit that, on the strength of such forged documents, the accused had threatened the de facto complainant to vacate the premises. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. From the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on either side, it is seen that the allegations against the petitioners are that they had fabricated patta and executed sale deeds in the year 2020, in connection with which the present First Information Report came to be registered in the year 2026. It is the further contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that two civil suits are also pending in O.S.Nos.20 and 306 of 2021. At this juncture, though the learned Government Advocate (CrI. Side) opposed the application, he fairly submitted that the present First Information Report pertains to the sale deeds executed in the year 2020. Considering the factual



position, this Court is of the view that, at this length of time, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their 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.II, Dharmapuri** on condition that **each of the petitioners 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 petitioners fail 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 petitioners 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;**



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.9166 c



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

10.04.2026

kv

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dharmapuri.

2.The Inspector of Police,
DCB, Dharmapuri Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.

3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.9166 of 2026



C.KUMARAPPAN.J.

kv

Crl.O.P.No.9166 of 2026

10.04.2026