



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 11876 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-05-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP No. 11876 of 2026

1. Sundaram
No.4/6, Avvai Nagar, Srinivasapuram, Raja
Annamalaipuram, Pattinapakkam, Chennai
District
2. Shanthi
No.4/6, Avvai Nagar, Srinivasapuram, Raja
Annamalaipuram, Pattinapakkam, Chennai
District
3. Jaya, D/o. Duraisamy,
No.4/6, Avvai Nagar,
Srinivasapuram,
Raja Annamalaipuram,
Pattinapakkam,
Chennai District.
4. Logavathi
W/o. Sugumar,
Residing at
No.4/6, Avvai Nagar,
Srinivasapuram,
Raja Annamalaipuram,
Pattinapakkam,
Chennai District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs



State Rep By, The Inspector of Police
The Inspector of Police,
CCB,
Land Grabbing Wing-III,
Avadi,
Chennai 600 054
(Crime No. 42 of 2026)

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.42 of 2026 pending investigation on the file the respondent police and pass such other orders deems fit and proper for the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Sureshkumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC in connection with the Cr. No.42 of 2026, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Andalammal executed general Power of Attorney appointing Periyannan in 1991, on the strength of general Power of Attorney, Periyannan had executed a sale deed in favour one Babu. In turn, the said Babu executed general power of attorney to Ganesan, the said



Ganesan executed the sale deed in favour of the defacto complainant namely Suresh Kumar in the year 2007. Subsequently, the legalheirs of Andalammal executed General Power of Attorney in favour of Logavathi, in turn, she has executed sale deed in favour of Rajan. The said Rajan executed in favour of Pradeep Reddy by creating fabricated documents. Hence the case.

3. The Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocents. They have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that a civil suit is pending between the properties regarding property disputes. He further submitted the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that a civil suit is pending between the properties regarding property disputes and there are no previous cases against the petitioners. However, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the Petitioners.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.



6. Considering the rival submissions on either side, considering the nature of offences, property dispute between the parties and already a civil case is pending between them and there is no previous cases reported against them, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate Court-II, Ponneri** on condition that each of the petitioners shall execute separate bonds 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 condition that:

[a] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police on every Saturday at 10.00 a.m. for a period of four weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

[b] the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;



[c] the petitioners shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.2023.

13-05-2026

VV

Note :

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.

2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.



To

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court-II, Ponneri.

2. The Inspector of Police
The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Land Grabbing Wing-III,
Avadi, Chennai 600 054

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 11876 of 2



P.DHANABAL, J.

VV

CRL OP No. 11876 of 2026

13-05-2026



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 11876 of 2

