



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.34844 of 2025

Bhuvaneshwari

Petitioner

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-I, EDF-III
Beta-VI,
Vepery,
Chennai-600007.
(Crime No.63 of 2025)

Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest
by the Respondent police in Crime No.63 of 2025 pending investigation on the
file of Central Crime Branch-I, Vepery, Chennai-07.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Palaninathan

For Intervenor : Mr.K.Gowthaman

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was apprehending arrest at the hands of the
respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 409, 420, 465,
468, 471, 34 and 120B of IPC in Crime No.63 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. It is seen that, this Court on 23.09.2025 dismissed the petitioner's anticipatory bail in Crl.O.P.No.12619 of 2025 by stating the following reasons:

WEB COPY

“10. I have considered the submissions made on either side and perused the records. In this case, A1, the Power of Attorney holder, has already been arrested and detained in custody for a period of 90 days. A2, who is the wife of A1, is said to have purchased the property from A1 through three registered sale deeds. Though it is reported that she purchased the property for valuable consideration, the investigation reveals that no sale consideration actually passed between A1 and A2 and that the transaction was a sham sale.

11. Considering the materials on record, it appears that there was clear connivance between A1 and A2 in depriving the defacto complainant of her property. Hence, I am of the view that A2 is not entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail. However, with regard to the petitioners/A6, A7, A8, and A9, who are only attesting witnesses to the documents, custodial interrogation is not necessary since their role was limited to attestation and they were not involved in fabrication of the documents. Accordingly, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the said petitioners/attestors, subject to certain conditions.”

3. Now, without any change in circumstances, the present petition has been filed. Hence, considering the fact that earlier merits of the case was already considered and there is no change in circumstances, this Court is not inclined to revisit the earlier anticipatory bail petition.



4. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

WEB COPY

02.01.2026

kmm

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-I, EDF-III Beta-
VI, Vepery,
Chennai-600007.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR J.

kmm

CRL.O.P.No.34844 of 2025

02.01.2026



WEB COPY

