



CRL OP(MD). No.7437 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 16/04/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.7437 of 2026

Raja

... Petitioner/ Accused No.1

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by,  
The Inspector of Police,  
City Crime Branch,  
Trichy District.  
Crime No. 33 of 2025.

... Respondent/ Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 33 of 2025 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioner : Dhilipan Pandian,  
Advocate.

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

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD), No.7437 of 2026

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 467 and 468 (Corresponding Section 318(4), 336, 338 and 336(2) of BNS, 2023), in Crime No.33 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the Plot No.76 situated at Ganapathi Nagar, Shanmug Nagar, Uraiyur, Trichy, is originally belong to one Sakunthala. She executed a power deed in favour of one Sankaran. He executed a sale deed in favour of one Jeyaraj on 27.03.1991 and thereafter, the said Sankaran executed a sale deed with respect to the very same property in favour of one Raja. The said Raja in turn, executed a sale deed in favour of the husband and son of the defacto complainant on 31.08.1998. When the defacto complainant tried to sell the same, she came to know that the alleged property had already been sold twice. She immediately contacted the said Raja and he replied that he purchased the said Plot from one Sankaran/A1 and he was no more and instructed her to contact the real owner Sakunthala. Hence, she contacted the real owner Sakunthala/A2 and her husband/A3 and insisted them to execute a



CRL OP(MD), No.7437 of 2026

Rectification Deed to correct the plot number from 76 to 75. They refused to do the same and tried to sell Plot No.75. Hence, he lodged a complaint before the City Land Grabbing Special cell, Tiruhirappalli. They advised her to file a separate fraud complaint regarding Plot No.76. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that the petitioner is the subsequent purchaser and no previous case is pending against him. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that the original owner, Sakunthala/A2 is dead and the petitioner herein is a subsequent purchaser and he has no previous case.

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



CRL OP(MD), No.7437 of 2026

6. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and there is a land dispute between the parties and the occurrence took place in the year 1998 and the petitioner has no previous case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, 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, Trichy District**, and on further conditions that:

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

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

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



CRL OP(MD), No.7437 of 2026

WEB COPY

[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 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.

16.04.2026

dss

P. DHANABAL,J

dss

To

5/6



CRL OP(MD), No.7437 of 2026

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,  
Trichy District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,  
City Crime Branch,  
Trichy District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER  
IN  
CRL OP(MD) No.7437 of 2026

Date : 16/04/2026