



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.15112 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.15112 of 2025

1. Nagaraj

2. Dhanalakshmi

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State rep by its
Inspector of Police,
Pudupettai Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Cr.No.139 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police herein.

For Petitioners : Mr.T.Gananababu

For Intervenor : Mr.K.R.Ashwin Kumar

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana

Government Advocate (CrI. Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 120, 318, 335, 336, 337, 338 of BNSS r/w Section 82(9) of



Registration Act in Crime No.139 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the accused persons were involved in registering the sale deed by falsely projecting that the land belonging to the defacto complainant was their own, thereby, grabbed the defacto complainant's land which leading to the registration of the FIR. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that at the time of registration of this aforesaid land, the survey number has been wrongly given and now they have also rectified the same and rectification deed is also executed and the same is reported to the defacto complainant. Hence, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the Intervenor reiterated the prosecution case and vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners have also appeared before the Investigating Officer as per the interim direction granted by this Court and that the rectification deed in



Doc.No.1536 of 2025 is also registered, rectifying the survey number and also taken steps to rectify the patta also. Therefore, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the nature of allegations, the submissions made by both sides and the fact that now, the rectification deed is also to have been registered to redress the grievance raised by the defacto complainant in this case.

8. Considering the facts stated above, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with the following conditions.

(a) Interim bail granted to the petitioner is made absolute;

(b) The petitioners shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30a.m., for a period of three week and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

(c) 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



CrI.OP.No.15112 of 20__

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]*;

(d) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

29.01.2026

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-II, Panruti,
Cuddalore District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Pudupettai Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.15112 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.15112 of 2025

29.01.2026