



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.8973 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 08.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 8973 of 2026

1. Saradha
2. Jeyaraman
3. Baradharam @ Shri Baratharam ... Petitioners
Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Madurai City,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.44 of 2025) ...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Gowrishankar
Advocate.
For Respondent : Mr.A.Balasubramanian
Government Advocate (Crl. side)
For Intervenor : Mr.Ramsiva
Advocate

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 44 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8973 of 2026

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471 and 474 of IPC, in Crime No.44 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with the other accused created forged documents and transferred the property belonged to the defacto complainant in their names. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case and they are no way connected in the above said incident. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by this Court. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) fairly submits that the offences are grave in nature. The petitioners along with other accused persons created forged documents by obtaining directions from the High Court by suppressing all facts and transferred the property in their names, despite of the



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.8973 of 2026

order of District Revenue Officer, Madurai. Hence, he vehemently opposed the granting of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Investigation is still pending.

5.The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the petitioners earlier committed same kind of offence and the First Information Report has been registered in the year 2012 and that is also pending. Thereafter again the petitioners indulged in similar kind of offence and already the defacto complainant filed writ petition and in that writ petition also it is seen that the petitioners have committed cheating, thereby he strongly objected to grant 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 and considering the fact that there is a dispute between the parties and even according to the case of prosecution the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2021 and the First Information has been registered in the year 2025 and by this time investigation might have been completed and even according to the case of prosecution the offences are borne out of records and there is no scope for tampering the evidence and also



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.8973 of 2026

considering the fact co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by this Court

and also considering all other facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai on condition that the petitioners shall 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 Magistrate concerned and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

[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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8973 of 2026

[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)
08.06.2026

aav

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8973 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

aav

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 8973 of 2026

Date : 08.06.2026