



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.5442 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 17.03.2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE. K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

CRL.OP.(MD).No.5442 of 2026

I.Shanmuga Sundaram

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Inspector of Police,
CCB Tirunelveli Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.1 of 2026)

... Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Venkatesh

For Respondent : Mr.M.Karunanithi
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.R.J.Karthick

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER in all cases :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 1 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER: The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 308(2),329(3), 337, 339 of BNS, in



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.5442 of 2026

Crime No.1 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is the first accused in Crime No.1 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police. There is allegation against the petitioner and other accused that they are forged the Death Certificate of one Mariappan and fabricated the sale deed dated 28.12.1973. Even prior to that the Mariappan sold the property to Durai Samy Nadar. From the Durai Samy Nadar, the defacto complainant purchased the property and he claimed that he is the owner of the property. In view of the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, the respondent police registered the case for the above said offences.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the suit is pending in O.S.No.28 of 2026 on the file of the Principal District Munsif, Tirunelveli. False case was registered by the respondent police. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. There is no occurrence has taken place as alleged in the FIR. Hence, he sought anticipatory bail for the petitioner.

4.The learned counsel for the defacto complainant would submit that



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.5442 of 2026

after registration of case the petitioner and other hench men entered into the property and criminally intimidated the complainant to withdraw the complaint and caused expensive damage to the entire properties. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would reiterate the above said submissions made by the learned counsel for the defacto complainant.

6.In view of the allegations made against the petitioner in earlier complaint and subsequent allegations made against him that he along with hench men threatened the complainant to withdraw the earlier complaint, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7.Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

17.03.2026

TM

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
CCB Tirunelveli Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

3/5



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.5442 of 2026

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.5442 of 2026

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.5442 of 2026

Date : 17.03.2026