



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.36043 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.36043 of 2025 and
Crl.M.P.No.1277 of 2026

R.R.Vasudevan @ Ramvasudevan

... Petitioner/A1

Vs.

The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
DCB Police, Villupuram & District.
(Crime No.5 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest pending investigation in Crime No.5 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner	: Mr.John Sathyan, Senior Advocate For Mr.G.Saravanan
For Respondent	: Ms.J.R.Archana, Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For Intervenor	: Mr.S.Natarajan

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence **under Sections 465, 471, 419 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 in Crime No.5 of 2025** on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner herein is



ranked as A1 and he joined hands with other accused involved in fabrication of power of attorney as if the same was executed by the defacto complainant. On the strength of fabricated power of attorney, a sale deed was registered in the year 2008 in favour of the other accused by A1. The defacto complainant recently came to know about the fabrication of records and registration of sale deed and hence he has come forward with the present complaint and a case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the entire allegations said to have been taken place as early as in the year 2007 – 2008. The defacto complainant himself executed and registered a power of attorney in favour of A1, the petitioner in this case. Based on this registered document, a sale deed has also been executed and that there is no misappropriation or fabrication of records as alleged by the defacto complainant and he is ready to co-operate with investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the power of attorney claims to have been executed in favour of A1 is a fabricated document. By producing a copy of the power of attorney, the learned counsel



submitted that the photographs affixed on the registered power of attorney do not belong to the defacto complainant and this itself clearly reveals that it is a case of impersonation and fabrication of records. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, submitted that the First Information Report (FIR) has been registered only recently and the investigation in this case is still pending and no one was arrested so far. Hence, she opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. I have also gone through the records and other connected materials. It reveals that the alleged power of attorney set to have been executed in the year 2007 and sale deed was executed in the year 2008 and subsequently other transactions were taken place between the parties. The First Information Report registered almost 18 years later the registration of documents, I am of the view that to investigate the case of nature, custodial interrogation is not necessary since all the allegations are only borne out of records, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to 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 (15) days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Villupuram, Villupuram District**, 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 conditions:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned learned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) 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 identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) **The petitioner shall report before the respondent police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;**

(d) **The petitioner shall fully cooperate with the investigation, including providing sample signatures and thumb impressions as required by the Investigating Officer.**

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the



conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560];***

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition stands ordered.

27.01.2026

ssi

To:

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.1, Villupuram, Villupuram District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police, DCB Police, Villupuram & District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR,J.

ssi



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.36043 of 2025



Crl.OP.No.36043 of 2025

27.01.2026