



CRL OP(MD). No.21335 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.21335 of 2025

Santhi

... Petitioner/
Accused No.1

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

2. Kannan
(R2 is suo motu impleaded as per order of
this Court dated 25.11.2025 in Crl.O.P
(MD) No.21335 of 2025)

... 2nd Respondent

PRAYER :-Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner/Accused No.1 on Bail in the event of her 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 Petitioner : Mr.M.Vivek Kumar



CRL OP(MD). No.21335 of 2025

For R1 : Mr.M.Karunanidhi
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)
For R2 : Mr.S.Loganathan

ORDER : The Court makes the following order :-

The petitioner/Accused, who apprehends 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, seeks 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.21335 of 2025

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the third accused was already granted anticipatory bail by this Court dated 12.11.2025. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved any of the forged document. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first 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 petitioner is 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. The learned counsel appearing for the defacto complainant also reiterated the said submission and sought for dismissal of the bail application.



CRL OP(MD). No.21335 of 2025

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that there is a serious allegation against the petitioner and further earlier application was dismissed by this Court dated 12.11.2025 and there is no change of circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

ebsi

11.03.2026

1/2

To

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

4/5



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.21335 of 2025

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

ebsi

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21335 of 2025

Date : 11.03.2026
1/2