



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7051 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 22.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 7051 of 2026

1.Padma
2.Sudharani
3.S.M.Jayanthi

... Petitioners

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
DCB, Dindigul.
(Crime No.10 of 2026)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.Muthu Saravanan for Mr.R.Jothiraj
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.J.Jeyakumaran
Advocate

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 10 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 for



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7051 of 2026

the offences punishable under Sections 316(1), 318(3), 318(4), 335, 340(2), 351(2) of BNS, in Crime No.10 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and other accused has colluded together and fabricated the documents which belongs to the commercial shops in Dindigul and thereby cheated the defacto complainant and also threatened with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected in the above said incident. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The father of the petitioners along with the defacto complainant and her parents entered into partnership deed for the purpose of developing the property, by putting up construction thereon. Each holding some shares in the property. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submits that the offences are grave in nature. There was a dispute between the parties regarding



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7051 of 2026

partitioning the property. There was a money transaction between the parties.

They cheated a huge amount. A1 was arrested in this case and gave confession.

Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Investigation is still pending. The petitioners have no previous case.

5.The learned counsel for the intervenor also submitted that the petitioners along with other accused persons fabricated the documents and cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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 petitioners, there is a dispute between the family members in respect of partnership firm and the main contention raised by the learned counsel for the intervenor is that as if her mother executed partition deed they created the documents dated 09.11.2017, but the said Susila Devi is still alive and she has not raised any objection and the defacto complainant is none other than the daughter of the Susila Devi, the next allegation as against the deceased Mohana Renga Raj and the allegations are against these



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.7051 of 2026

petitioners are found all partnership firm has been transferred to the account of the petitioners, apart from that there is no allegation against these petitioners and, these petitioners not transferred the funds from any account and considering the pendency of civil suit already filed by the parties, though one previous case is pending, in that case they were granted bail, all the alleged occurrence stated to have taken place born out of the records, thereby, there is no scope to tamper the evidence, and also considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

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

[b] the petitioners 1 and 3 shall report before the respondent police at 10.30 a.m., on every Saturday, for a period of four weeks, thereafter, as and when required for interrogation; the second petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of one week, thereafter as and when required for interrogation;



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.7051 of 2026

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

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

[e] the petitioners 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 petitioners 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].

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

(P D B J)
22.04.2026

TM

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul.

2.The Inspector of Police,
DCB, Dindigul,
(Crime No.10 of 2026)



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7051 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

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

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 7051 of 2026

Date : 22.04.2026