



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.34964 of 2025

Arunagiri

... Petitioner/ Accused-4

Vs

The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Kancheepuram District.
(Crime No.14 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, pleaded to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest by the respondent in Crime No.14 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Ms.Shakila Jaffer Khan

For Intervenor : Mr. A.L. Franc Paul Asirvadam

For Respondent : M/s. J.R. Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 34 of IPC in Crime No.14 of 2025 on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner/ A4 herein is that A1 and A2, in collusion with the other accused, created forged documents and entered into an unregistered sale agreement with the defacto complainant in respect of a property which did not belong to them, thereby cheating the defacto complainant of a sum of Rs.1.56 Crores. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and has been roped in without any material to connect him with the alleged offence. It was further submitted that he has not collected any money from the defacto complainant. She also pointed out that the co-accused has already been granted bail by this Court in CrI.O.P.No.32756 of 2025 dated 01.12.2025. Hence, she prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



4. The learned counsel for the intervenor raised strong objections to the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, submitting that a sum of Rs.1.56 Crores was cheated from the defacto complainant by the petitioner and the other accused by way of sale of land. Hence, he opposed to grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent, while opposing the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are ten accused involved in this case and that the petitioner has been arrayed as A4. It was further submitted that a sum of Rs.1.56 Crores was cheated from the defacto complainant by the petitioner and the other accused by way of sale of land and that the investigation is still pending. She also pointed out that the co-accused has already been granted bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.32756 of 2025 dated 01.12.2025. However, he opposed to grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



6. Considering the submissions made on either side, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the nature of the allegations, and taking note of the fact that the allegations in the FIR are taken place in the year 2013 and that the complaint was lodged belatedly, and also considering that the co-accused has already been granted bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.32756 of 2025 dated 01.12.2025, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sriperumbudur** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only)** with **two sureties each** for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[a] if the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of copy of this order, this Order shall stand automatically cancelled;



[b] the sureties shall affix his 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 his identity;

[c] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[d] 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]**;

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

07.01.2026

kmm



K. RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

WEB COPY

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Kancheepuram.
2. The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Kancheepuram District.
(Crime No.14 of 2025)
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P. No.34964 of 2025

07.01.2026