



CRL OP(MD). No.21836 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 03.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

CRL OP(MD)No.21836 of 2025

T.Krishnamoorthy

... Petitioner / Accused No.5

Versus

The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Inspector of Police,
CCB,
Madurai City.
(Crime No.1 of 2025)

... Respondent / Complainant

PRAYER :-Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No.1 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police or on his appearance.

For Petitioner : M/s.W.Pamelin,
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamy,
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)



CRL OP(MD). No.21836 of 2025

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioner/Accused, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Crime No.1 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 and 120B of IPC, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the *defacto* complainant was cheated by the accused persons, who are alleged to have created forged documents pertaining to his property and attempted to sell the same. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and that he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that a civil suit is pending with regard to the property in question. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submitted that the petitioner is the main person involved in the crime and that he



CRL OP(MD). No.21836 of 2025

had created forged documents and committed impersonation. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. Hence, he strongly objected to the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions made on both side, there are specific allegations against the petitioner that he was involved in impersonation as well as in the forgery of documents. Hence, this Court is of the opinion that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

03.03.2026

pal

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
CCB,
Madurai City.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

3/4



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.21836 of 2025

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

pal

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.21836 of 2025

Date : 03.03.2026