



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.11216 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06.05.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP No.11216 of 2026

Radhaas

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
CCB Tambaram Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.
(Crime No.59 of 2025)

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of B.N.S.S. Act, pleaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with the Crime No.59 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.D.Padmanabhan


For Respondent(s):

Mr.A.Damodharan

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 26.03.2026 for the alleged offences under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120B of IPC, in Crime No.59 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the owner of the subject property situated at Kayarambedu Village, Chengalpattu District.

According to the prosecution, one Sekar executed a Power of Attorney in favour of the Petitioner in respect of the same property. It is alleged that, based on the said Power of Attorney, subsequent sale transactions were executed in favour of third parties. The prosecution alleges that the documents were created without valid title over the property. It is further alleged that the accused persons created forged documents and cheated the complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner would submit that the Petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in the case and that he had merely acted as a Power of Attorney based on a registered document. He would further submit that the Petitioner is in judicial custody from 26.03.2026 and is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court and seeks for bail.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the Respondent Police reiterated the prosecution case and would submit that the petitioner had participated in the execution of the disputed documents by acting as Power of Attorney. He would further submit that the Petitioner had sold the subject property, thereby forging the Power deed. Since the Petitioner is the main perpetrator, he would vehemently oppose for grant of bail to the Petitioner.



5. I have given my anxious consideration to either side submissions and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the fact that the Petitioner had impersonated the defacto complainant and executed a false Power deed, which resulted in sale of the property to third parties and also by taking note of the grave offence and the nature of allegations, the Trial Court had rightly dismissed the Bail Petition filed by the Petitioner. Hence, this Court is also not inclined to grant bail to the Petitioner at this stage.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

06.05.2026

vsn/jas

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate – II, Chengalpattu.
2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB Tambaram Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.11216 of 2



L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

vsn/jas

CRL OP No. 11216 of 2026

06.05.2026