



CRL OP(MD). No.19910 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 11.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

CRL OP(MD)No.19910 of 2025

1. Santhi
2. Chellathai
3. Muniyasamy

... Petitioners/
Accused Nos.1 to 3

Versus

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by the Sub Inspector of Police,
Vachakarapatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(in Crime No.130 of 2025)

... 1st Respondent /
Complainant

PRAYER :-Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on Bail in the event of their arrest by the respondent police in Crime No.130 of 2025 on the file of the Sub -Inspector of Police, Vachakarapatti Police Station, Virudhunagar District.

For Petitioners : Mr.C.Jeya Prakash

For Respondent : Mr.M.Karunanidhi
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)



CRL OP(MD). No.19910 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Crime No.130 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant made a complaint before the respondent police stating that the grandmother of the defacto complainant namely Annapoornam died. Further, the property belongs to the said Annapoornam in which, the first accused had obtained a power of attorney by forging the legal heir certificate of Annapoornam and also executed power deed in favour of the second accused and on the basis of the power deed the second accused executed sale deed in favour of the third accused. Hence all other accused conspired together cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the present case.



CRL OP(MD). No.19910 of 2025

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the third petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this Court dated 12.11.2025. He further submitted that this Court had already granted interim anticipatory bail to the second petitioner. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the second petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that Accused Nos. 1 and 2 had jointly conspired, and in order to defeat the rights of the de facto complainant, created fabricated records, namely a death certificate, legal heir certificate, and revenue documents. Hence, custodial interrogation is very much necessary as the petitioners are allegedly involved in the forgery of the death certificate and other related documents. Accordingly, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that there is a serious allegation against the second petitioner, and the custodial interrogation is very much required, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the second petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No.19910 of 2025

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed as
against the second petitioner.

ebsi

11.03.2026
2/2

To

1. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Vachakarapatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.19910 of 2025

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

ebsi

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.19910 of 2025

Date : 11.03.2026
2/2