



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No. 35436 of 2025

Mediseti Venkata Suresh Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

The State, Rep. By its
The Station House Officer
Sedarapet Police Station
Puducherry District
Crime No. 97 of 2025.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 97 of 2025 on the file of respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Padmanabhan

For Respondent : Mr.M.V.Ramachandra Murthy
Public Prosecutor, Govt. of Puducherry.

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 318(4), 336(3) and 340(2) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No. 97 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner is the son of the de-facto complainant in this case and he has fabricated the retirement partnership deed of the firm, as if, his father was retired and consequently, involved in various commercial documentations. Hence, the complaint has been immediately lodged by the de-facto complainant.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations levelled against the petitioner is false and there is no fabrication of records as alleged. He further submits that his father lodged the complaint due to the difference of opinion and he is ready to co-operate with the investigation and all the bank accounts have also been frozen by the respondent herein. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that though it is alleged that the petitioner involved in fabrication of records including the retirement partnership deed, there is no allegation of any impersonation and siphoned off money from the partnership firm and he further submits that investigation is pending. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

5. Considering the nature of allegations and also the fact that the dispute regarding the partnership firm and the fabrication of the retirement partnership deed and other documents, since the allegations are borne out from the records, that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary, however, the petitioner shall co-operate for the investigation shall provide sample signatures for the purpose of investigation.

6. With the above observations, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions. 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.IV, Pondicherry**, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty 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 a copy of this order, this order



shall stand automatically cancelled;

[b] 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 their identity;

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

[d] the petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation, and provide sample signatures for the purpose of investigation, if any required.

[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]**;



WEB COPY



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

05.01.2026

MSM

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Pondicherry.

2. The Station House Officer
Sedarapet Police Station
Puducherry District
Crime No. 97 of 2025.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

MSM

Crl.O.P.No. 35436 of 2025



WEB COPY



05.01.2026