WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12.11.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.RAMESH

CRL.O.P.No.32935 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012689312026}

Saroja

..Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep by the Inspector of police,
CCB Police Station, tambaram City,
Kanchipuram District.

..Respondent

PRAYER: To enlarge the petitioner on bail in crime no.25 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Vijayakumar

For Respondent : Mr.Durai Gunasekaran,
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

The petitioner / Accused No. 2, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on **16.10.2026** for the alleged offences punishable under **Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, and 471 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code,** in **Crime No.25 of 2026** on the file of the respondent police, seeks **bail**.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the *de facto* complainant, one T.K.Kasthuri Rangan, lodged a complaint alleging that his vacant land

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Order QR

measuring 2,400 sq. ft. situated at Orathur Village was fraudulently dealt with by impersonating him and executing a General Power of Attorney (**Doc. No. 126/2009**, dated **12.02.2009**) in favour of the petitioner (A2). Based on the said Power of Attorney, within a week, the property was sold to the third accused, P.R. Janakiraman, vide Sale Deed (**Doc. No. 748/2009**, dated **19.02.2009**). Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and has been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that the alleged transaction took place in the year **2009**, whereas the present complaint has been lodged after an inordinate delay of **17 years**. He would also submit that the fourth accused (A4), who stood as a witness to the sale deed, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court taking into account the 17-year delay in lodging the complaint. Furthermore, both the General Power of Attorney and the Sale Deed are registered instruments available on the file of the concerned Sub-Registrar's Office, and the material part of the investigation is almost completed. Since the petitioner has been languishing in judicial custody from **16.10.2026**, he prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioner, in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

collusion with the other accused, created a forged General Power of Attorney by impersonating the *de facto* complainant and executed a sale deed in favour of A3 within a week, thereby grabbing the property. He would further submit that the investigation is still pending and vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that the alleged transaction pertains to the year **2009** and the complaint has been lodged after a delay of **17 years**, that the disputed Power of Attorney and Sale Deed are registered documents available with the concerned Sub-Registrar, that the co-accused (A4) has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, and also taking into account the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner from **16.10.2026**, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly**, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail** on her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) each with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of **the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I,**

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Order QR

Kancheepuram, and on further conditions that:

[a] 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 the identity proofs to ensure her identity;

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10:30 A.M. for a period of 15 days and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[d] the petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

[e] On breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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)13 SCC 283];**

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

12.11.2026

kmm

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Order QR

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 No.I, Kancheepuram.

2. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal – III.

3. The Inspector of police,
CCB Police Station, Tambaram City,
Kanchipuram District.

4. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Order QR

N.RAMESH, J.

kmm

CRL.O.P.No.32935 of 2026

12.11.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis