

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENGALPATTU**

Present : Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Dated: Wednesday, the 01st day of April 2026

CrI.M.P. No.827 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-001830-2026)

Balamurugan, aged 55 years, S/o.Murugan,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Tambaram.
Cr. No.14 of 2026
U/s.419, 420, 465, 468, 471 of IPC

.. Respondent/Complainant

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.P.Praveen Kumar, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused and M/s.R.Thirumurugan, the learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/complainant, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following

ORDER

This petition is filed U/s.480 and 483 of BNSS 2023, seeking to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

2. The petitioner/accused is facing charges for the alleged offences U/s.419, 420, 465, 468, 471 of IPC.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply received. Heard both sides; records perused.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the lawful owner of the subject property by virtue of a sale deed dated

28.05.1993. While so, the petitioner along with the other have created a forged power deed in favour of one R.Soundarrajan, later by using the said power deed the accused have sold out the subject property to one Mahalakshmi, in turn, she mortgaged the subject property with a finance company, hereby grabbed the defacto complainant's property. Thereby, a case has been registered in Cr. No.14 of 2026 of the file of the respondent police station.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner/accused has been falsely implicated in this case; he was arrested and remanded on 26.02.2026 and he is under judicial custody for the past 35 days; the petitioner is only the witness in the disputed sale deed; that apart the petitioner has no role played in the offence and he has no knowledge about the occurrence; moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon him and is ready to offer substantial sureties before the court and thereby prayed for enlargement on bail.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, re-iterated the prosecution case and objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. From the submissions, it is seen the alleged transactions have taken place during the year 2023. It is further seen the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 26 days. It is pleaded by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is only the witness in the alleged sale deed, which is not disputed by the learned Public Prosecutor. The petitioner seemed to be the first offender, no previous is pending against him. He has permanent residence therefore there is no possibility of flee from justice. Taking into consideration the duration of custody, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, he seemed to be the witness and also

considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioner/accused is ordered to be released on bail on his execution of bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram, with further conditions that;

1. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression (LTI) in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce copy of any identity proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity.
2. The petitioner/accused is directed to report before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of 30 days;
3. The petitioner/accused shall not abscond and shall not tamper the witnesses either during investigation or trial;
4. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report to the learned Magistrate and the learned Magistrate shall take appropriate action as if the conditions have been imposed by the Magistrate himself/herself in accordance with the decision in *AIR 2006 SC 100 - P.K. Shaji Vs State of Kerala*.

Pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 01st day of April 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram.

The Inspector of Police, Central Crime Branch, Tambaram.

The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.