



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 07.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

Vijayalakshmi ...Petitioner/A2

Vs

1.State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Trichy City Police Station (CCB),
Trichy.
(Crime No.21 of 2025)

2.Senthilnathan ...Respondents

(R2 is suo motu impleaded as per order of this
Court dated 03.02.2026 in CrI.O.P.(MD).No.19809
of 2025)

For Petitioner :Mr.J.Senthil Kumaraiah
Advocate.

For Respondent :Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (CrI. Side)

For Intervener :Mr.N.Ananda Kumar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482
of BNSS

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No.21 of
2025 on the file of the respondent police.

1/8



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY The petitioner/Accused No.2, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 409, 417, 420, 467, 468, 470, 471 and 120B of IPC, in Crime No.21 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1 and the petitioner are husband and wife. A1 cultivated the paddy from the year 1991 onwards as lessee in the subject property, which belonged to the defacto complainant's father. A1 had paid lease amount to the defacto complainant's father and after the demise of the defacto complainant's father, the A1 regularly paid lease amount to the defacto complainant's mother. The adangal extract of the subject property states that the A1 was the lease holder. The A1, the petitioner and other accused persons created false documents and



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

created lease deed in favour of the petitioner's husband and claimed title over the properties.

Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the lessee. He would further submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he was falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected in the above said incident. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervener would submit that the A1, the petitioner and other accused persons created false documents and created lease deed in favour of the petitioner's husband and claimed title over the properties. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent Police would submit that there was a dispute regarding the lease between the tenant and the land lord. He would further submit that the investigation is still pending and the offences are grave in nature. He fairly submits that the petitioner has no previous cases. However, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and nature of offence and considering the fact that the petitioner is a lessee and the petitioner has not executed any document and the alleged occurrence took place on 21.07.2023, however the date of FIR is on 08.10.2025 and hence, there is a delay in filing FIR and no



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

previous case is pending against the petitioner and hence, the interim anticipatory bail granted by this Court to the petitioner is made absolute, 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, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent Police once in a week ie., on Every Saturday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of eight weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation.



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

WEB COPY

[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 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



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

SCW 5560].

WEB COPY

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

(P D B J)

07.04.2026
2/2

vsg

To

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 19809 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J.,

vsg

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) No. 19809 of 2025

Date : 07.04.2026
2/2