



CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 10.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

1. Anupkumar
2. Palpandi

...Petitioners/Accused

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Periyakulam Police Station
Theni.
(Crime No. 424 of 2025)

2. Rampriya Dilip


*(R2 is suo motu impleaded vide order dated
18.12.2025 in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.23476 of 2025)*

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Karnan
Advocate.

For R1 : Mr.M.Karunanithi
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For R2 : Mr.K.Sudalaiyandi
For Intervenor : Mr.M.Raja Karthikeyan



CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

WEB COPY

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-


For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 424 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 336(2), 336(3) and 329(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in Crime No. 424 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner created a forged will in respect of the property belongs to the defacto complainant's family and on the strength of the forged will, the first petitioner executed a lease deed in favour of the second petitioner and based on the same, the second petitioner is disturbing the possession of the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the property belongs to the defacto complainant's family and a civil suit is



CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

pending between the parties in respect of the property and the first petitioner created a forged will and thereby cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they were 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. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, a case has been registered for the offences punishable under Sections 336(2), 336(3) and 329(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in Crime No. 424 of 2025. He further submits that there is a property dispute between the parties and the petitioners have no previous case. He would further submit that the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

7. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, and the relationship between the parties and even according to the prosecution, the petitioners are not a signatory to the will and they have not executed any document based on the will executed in their favour and so far, the will has not been put to challenge and already the defacto complainant has filed a civil suit in respect of the properties and also considering the fact that no previous case is pending against the petitioners, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are 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, Periyakulam, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners shall report before the



CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

[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.

apd

(P D B J)
10.04.2026
(2/2)



CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate, Periyakulam.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Periyakulam Police Station
Theni.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 23476 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 23476 of 2025

Date : 10.04.2026
(2/2)