



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6819 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 08.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 6819 of 2026

Murugan

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.9 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.KA.Raamakrishnan
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

For Intervenor : Mr.K.Jeyamohan
Advocate

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 9 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 for



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6819 of 2026

the offences punishable under Sections 465, 467, 471, 109 IPC, in Crime No.9 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant owns 85 cents of land in S.No.708A/2, Puthukulam Village, Palayamkottai Taluk, by way of partition. The petitioner with the conspiracy with accused No.1 and 4 has created a document for 29 cents. Hence, the case

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected in the above said incident. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. On Esaki purchased the land from one Ilango in the year 2009. From him A2 purchased the land in the year 2023, from him in the year 2026, A1 purchased the same through valid document. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submitted that the property originally belonged to the defacto complainant's father and by creating forged documents, the property was sold in the year 2009 by one Ilango to one Esakki and thereafter, Esaki and thereafter, the Esakki also participated in the



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6819 of 2026

revenue proceedings and by suppressing the same, the said Esakki sold the property to two others. Therefore, the petitioner knowing very well about the dispute between the parties and the said property is belongs to the defacto complainant, purchased the property and created encumbrance. Therefore, the offences are made out against this petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (CrI. side) submitted that the property originally belonged to the father of the defacto complainant and thereafter, this petitioner along with other accused created forged documents and investigation is at initial stage and the offences are grave in nature. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. However, the petitioner has no previous case.

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner and the alleged occurrence is took place in the year 2009 itself by sale of the property by one Ilango in favour of Esakki, these petitioners are subsequent purchasers and thereafter, he sold the property, considering the property dispute between the parties and the petitioner has no



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6819 of 2026

previous case and also considering the other facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli, Tirunelveli District and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police, at 10.30 a.m., on every Saturday for a period of eight weeks, thereafter, as and when required for interrogation:

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6819 of 2026

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)AIR SCW 5560].

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

(P D B J)
08.04.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli, Tirunelveli District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.9 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6819 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 6819 of 2026

Date : 08.04.2026