



CRL OP(MD). No.4842 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 05.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

CRL OP(MD)No.4842 of 2026

Murugan

... Petitioner / Accused No.10

Versus

The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Inspector of Police,
Palani Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.61 of 2025)

... Respondent / Complainant

PRAYER :-Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No.61 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police or on his appearance.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Muthu Ganesa Pandian

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamy,
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)



CRL OP(MD). No.4842 of 2026

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioner/accused, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Crime No.61 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 120-B, 406, 420, 465, 471 and 506(1) of IPC, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and other accused persons are in occupation of a portion of the land belonging to the defacto complainant. It is alleged that they created a forged patta and other revenue records and attempted to sell the said property. Hence, upon receipt of the complaint, the respondent police registered a case against the accused persons for the above offences.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the property originally belonged to the Neikaranpatti Zamin constituency and, after the enactment of the Tamil Nadu Land Reforms (Fixation of Ceiling on Land) Act, 1961, a portion of the land was assigned to various persons,



CRL OP(MD). No.4842 of 2026

including the petitioner. Thereafter, the patta issued in favour of the petitioner was cancelled without issuing any notice to him. Hence, a dispute has arisen between the accused persons and the defacto complainant. The learned counsel also submitted that all the relevant records and incriminating materials are available in the records and, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary. Accordingly, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that the petitioner and the other accused persons have created forged pattas and revenue records and attempted to sell the property. He further submitted that some of the accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail. He therefore contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the truth and to effectively carry out the investigation. Accordingly, he objected to the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court heard the learned counsel on either side and perused



CRL OP(MD). No.4842 of 2026

the materials placed on record.

WEB COPY

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the type set of papers filed by the petitioner, which *prima facie* disclose that there were ceiling proceedings under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Land Reforms (Fixation of Ceiling on Land) Act, 1961, and that the defacto complainant had lost title to the property, and that he subsequently resumed the proceedings, and further that some of the accused persons have filed writ petitions before this Court challenging the cancellation of the patta, this Court is of the opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary. Therefore, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Palani, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees



CRL OP(MD). No.4842 of 2026

Ten Thousand only) with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent Police or to the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further conditions that:

(a) the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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) AIR SCW 5560]*; and



CRL OP(MD). No.4842 of 2026

WEB COPY

(f) if the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS, 2023.

05.03.2026

pal

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court,
Palani.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Palani Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.4842 of 2026

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

pal

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.4842 of 2026

Date : 05.03.2026