



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P.No.10615 of 2026
& Crl.M.P.No.7912 of 2026

Paulrajan

... Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State represented by the Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Kanchipuram District.
Crime No.7 of 2025

... Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023 to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of her arrest in connection with Crime No.7 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.K.G.Senthilkumar

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

For Intervenor(s) : Mr.X.Selva Soundar

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent Police for the alleged offences under Sections 465, 468, 471, 420 and 34 of IPC in Crime No.7 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The learned counsel for the petitioner, pleading innocence on the part of the petitioner and false implication in the case, seeks the indulgence of this Court. He would submit that the co-accused has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 27.03.2026 in CrI.O.P.No.7817 of 2026 and hence, on the ground of parity, the petitioner may also be granted anticipatory bail.

3. The case of the prosecution, as put forth by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police, opposing the grant of anticipatory bail, is that the petitioner, in collusion with the other accused, had dishonestly induced the defacto complainant, Karunakaran, to execute a power of attorney in favour of one Vinoth on the false promise of securing a higher sale price for his property, and thereafter, without the knowledge or consent of the defacto complainant, caused the property to be sold to a third party for a substantial consideration, which was not paid to the defacto complainant, thereby committing offences of cheating, forgery, and criminal conspiracy.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor, submitting that an application has been filed seeking cancellation of bail granted to the co-accused, strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the learned counsel appearing for the intervenor, and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record.

6. Taking note of the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, and considering the fact that the co-accused has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground of parity, as custodial interrogation is not required at this stage, subject to certain conditions.

7. 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-I, Kanchipuram, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten 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;



WEB COPY



(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for suretyship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019'].

The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identity proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday 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. 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.

Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

28.04.2026

skr



To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-I, Kanchipuram
2. The Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Kanchipuram District.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras



WEB COPY



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

skr

Crl.O.P.No.10615 of 2026

28.04.2026