



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 19.02.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD).No.1401 of 2026

1.Mareeswari

2.T.S.Jeyakumaran @ Jayakumaran

... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Sivakasi East Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.61 of 2026)

... Respondent

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Prabu

For Respondent : Mr.S.S.Manoj
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.S.M.A.Jinnah
Mr.M.Kannan

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.61 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER: The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(2), 318(4),



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

336(2), 336(3), 340(2), 296(b), 351(2) and 3(5) of BNS in Crime No.61 of 2026

on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 18.01.2026, at about 23.00 hrs, the defacto complainant namely Dhivan Oli lodged the complaint before the respondent police. The defacto complainant runs an Offset printing press in the name and style of “Dhivan Offset”. The Accused No.5 who is a mediator in Real Estate Business informed that the land in S.F.No.47.48 situated in Old T.S.No.66 and 61 in Block No.8. Ward C to an extent of 5605.96 sq.feet is for sale and the said land belongs to the Accused No.1 and the petitioners/Accused No.2.3 & Accused No.4. Further, the Accused No.5 said that the Accused No.1 decided to sell this land for his urgent need which arose due to the marriage of his elder daughter. The Accused No.5 introduced the Accused No.4 to the defacto complainant and said that the Accused No.4 already paid advance to the Accused No.1 and the Petitioners/Accused No.2 & 3 in respect of the land property and directed to pay advance to the Accused No.4 on purchasing this property. The sale consideration was fixed as Rs.26.50/- per 1 Sq. Yard and the total amount is Rs.81,90,000/- for 312 Sq. Yards. On 04.08.2025, the defacto complainant paid Rs.10,00,000/- as advance to the Accused No.4 in the Grocery Store owned by the son of Accused No.2 and the Accused Nos.4 & 5



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

executed the unregistered Sale Deed No.9946/2025 in respect of this property

witnessed by the persons namely Nandakumar and Suriyanarayanan.

Thereafter, on 23.08.2025, the defacto complainant paid the cash of Rs.

20,00,000/- to Accused No.4 in the defacto complainant's office and Accused

No.4 endorsed it back of the unregistered deed. This payment was witnessed by

Nandakumar and the Accused No.4. Then, the defacto complainant measured

the land property and fenced the same with the expense incurred at Rs.40,000/-.

The Government Guide Line Value for the land to an extent of 6.5 cents is Rs.

22,65,750/-. Therefore, the defacto complainant remitted Rs. 11,00,000/- to the

Accused No.4 by the Cheque No.268802 issued by the the wife of the defacto

complainant namely Rahmath Yasmin through her TMB Account towards

clearance of the same in the Bank Account of the Accused No.4. Thereafter, on

18.09.2025, the defacto complainant paid the balance amount Rs.40,90,000/- to

Accused No.1 and Petitioners/Accused No.2 & 3 in the house of the defacto

complainant's friend namely Mohamed Sheriff. On that day, the Accused No.1

and the Petitioners/Accused No.2 & 3 executed the Sale Deed No.9946/2025 in

favour of the defacto complainant and his wife before the Sub Registrar Office,

Sivakasi. The Accused No.5 received the Commission of Rs. 1,64,000/- for this

sale. The defacto complainant also gave Rs.2,43,917.50/- to the Accused No.

10 who is the Document Writer. In this state, one Muralidaran claimed that the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

above said property belongs to his father and he uprooted the fence and the stones laid in this land and threw them away. Therefore, the defacto complainant lodged the complaint before the respondent Police and revealed the fact after enquiry, the land originally belonged to one Nagarathinam vide document No.941/1954 registered in Sub Registrar Office, Ramanathapuram, through the Partition Deed. Nagarathinam executed the Sale Deeds Document Nos.3255/1971, 3256/1971 to the persons namely Vembathukalai and Ayyanadar in respect of this land property. Vembathukalai and Ayya Nadar executed the Sale Deeds in Document No.966/1982 and 968/1982 dated 12.03.1982 in favour of the father of Muralidharan. Thereafter, over the registration of the Partition Deed No.2046/1996 dated 30.06.1996, the said property was acquired by Muralidharan. The defacto complainant expressed all these facts to the Accused No.4 & 5. On 19.10.2025, the Accused No.1 assured by his writing in a Rs.500/- Bond Paper to the defacto complainant and one Shalini who was the purchaser of the land next to this land property to return their money within 26.10.2025 in the presence of the Accused No.5 to 10. Thereafter, on 19.10.2025, the Accused No.4 & 5 returned the Rs.10,00,000/- to the defacto complainant and he came to know that the Accused No.4 & 5 returned the amount Rs.14,00,000/- to Shalini. The Accused No.1, 4 to 10 and the Petitioners/Accused No.2 & 3 refused to return the balance amount given



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

Rs.71,98,000/-, Further, the defacto complainant lodged this complaint to recover the amount Rs.2,43,917/-, the commission Rs.1,64,000/- given to the Accused No.4 and the expenditure of Rs.40,000/- incurred for fencing and to take action to recover the amount of Rs.69,00,000/- given by shalini to the Accused Nos.1, 4to 10 and Petitioners/Accused No.2 and 3. Hence, a case has been registered.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they have not committed any offence. He seeks this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Further, the 1st accused has already been arrested.

5.The allegations against the 1st petitioner is that she has signed, impersonated and signed and created the documents and sold the property to one Dhivan Oli, who is his wife Yasmin. Dhivan Oli has filed an intervening petition.



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

6. When the case was heard in the earlier occasion, it was submitted that the original owner is one Pal Raj. The transaction is that one Nagarathnam has sold the property to one Iyanadar and Vembathukalai. In turn, they sold to PRP.Ramaswamy and family. The said family entered into partition on 1996. Subsequently, the property was partitioned. The said Palraj has got their share and he is the owner of the property. It is further submitted that while executing a sale deed, one Mareeswari, who is the daughter of the Nagarathna did not sign the document. The the said Nagarathna was having four sons who are shown in the sale deeds. A son was born after 1971. A1 and A2 had created legal heir certificates stating that they are the sole legal heirs of Nagarathna. But Nagarathna was having four more sons which is stated in the sale deed. Therefore, it is evident that the petitioners have created the document and sold the property.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the offence and the specific overt act against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

WEB COPY

19.02.2026

TMG

TO

1.The Inspector of Police,
Sivakasi East Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1401 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J.

TMG

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.1401 of 2026

Date : 19.02.2026