

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

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

Date: Monday, the 23rd day of March 2026

Crl.M.P. No.352 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-000648-2026)

1. Raja Annamalai, S/o.Kuppan Sangali,
No.304, 305, Parvathi Palace,
Shivpuri Colony, Chembur,
Mumbai, Maharashtra - 400 071.
2. R.Devaki, W/o.Raja Annamalai,
No.304, 305, Parvathi Palace,
Shivpuri Colony, Chembur,
Mumbai, Maharashtra - 400 071.

.. Petitioners/accused

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Tambaram
Cr. No.51 of 2025
U/s.406, 409, 420, 120(B) of IPC.

.. Respondent/Complainant

// and //

V.R.T. Balaji, S/o.Talasayanam,

.. Intervenor/defacto complainant
in CMP No.841 of 2026

This petition for anticipatory bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.D.Vasanth, the learned counsel appearing for petitioners/accused, M/s.R.Thirumurugan, the learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/complainant and of M/s.S.Balasubramanian, the learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following:

ORDER

The petition in Crl.M.P. No.352 of 2026 is filed by the petitioners/accused U/s.482 of B.N.S.S. to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail, whereas the petition in Crl.M.P. No.841 of 2026 is filed by the defacto complainant/intervenor in order to object to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

2. The petitioners/accused apprehend arrest at the hands of respondent police for the alleged offences U/s.406, 409, 420, 120(B) of IPC in connection with Cr. No.51 of 2025 of respondent Police Station.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply submitted. Heard both sides. Records perused.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the owner of the subject property, he was putting up construction in the subject matter property. Since he was in need of money to complete the work, he searched for financiers. At that time, one Lakshmanan approached the defacto complainant, introduced himself as private financier and promised to offer a loan amount of Rs.70,00,000/- and obtained the original documents, three signed blank cheque leaves and four pronotes and gave Rs.8,00,000/-, and promised to give the rest of the loan amount at the earliest. However, the said Lakshmanan sold the defacto complainant's documents to one Dinesh, in turn, the said Dinesh sold the said documents to one Basker, Jeyaprakash and Ethiraj. Thereafter, all the accused have colluded together, induced the defacto complainant by their sweet-coated words by introducing the first petitioner that he is a honest financier and persuaded him to execute a power of attorney deed in favour of the 1st petitioner. Later, on 26.12.2023, on the pretext of executing a Mortgage Deed, the accused have called the defacto complainant to the Sub

Registrar's office at Tambaram, where they intentionally executed a settlement deed in favour of the 2nd petitioner - who is none else the wife of the 1st petitioner, thereby the accused have deliberately cheated the defacto complainant. Thereby, a case has been registered in Cr. No.51 of 2025 on the file of respondent police station.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners/accused would submit that the petitioners/accused have been falsely implicated in this case; the 1st petitioner had purchased the subject property from the defacto complainant for a valid consideration of Rs.1,66,70,000/- and paid advance amount of Rs.1,38,00,000/- on several installments; on 27.12.2023, the 1st petitioner paid the remaining amount of Rs.30,00,000/- to the defacto complainant, thereafter, he executed a registered sale deed in favour of the 2nd petitioner. However, the defacto complainant demanded more money to complete the work and the petitioners engaged one Sheik Mohammed to carry out the work and finish the construction of the building. But, the defacto complainant and his henchmen had obstructed the same, hence the 2nd petitioner filed a suit for injunction against the defacto complainant in O.S. No.63 of 2024 and the same was decreed on 18.09.2025. Moreover, the defacto complainant also filed a civil suit against the petitioners and others in O.S. No.151 of 2024 and the same is pending. While being so, taking advantage of the petitioners' innocence, the defacto complainant tried to grab more money from them; moreover, the petitioners are ready to offer substantial sureties before the court and they are ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon them and prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, vehemently contended that taking advantage of the age of the defacto complainant and

his urgent need of money, cleverly cheated him by stating one or another reason. The accused have joined hands, on the pretext of executing a mortgage deed, without the knowledge or consent of the defacto complainant, they settled the subject property in the name of the 2nd petitioner. Though the petitioners claimed that they have paid the entire sale consideration, the accused have transacted money to various accounts which belonged to the other accused, in turn, the other accused have deliberately failed to pay the amount to the defacto complainant. Further, all the accused are known to each other, they acted as syndicate, thereby the accused have actively participated in the offence of cheating. Moreover, the investigation is only at the preliminary stage and the other co-accused are not yet secured and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

7. The learned counsel who is appearing for the defacto complainant/ intervenor made his arguments in consonance with the arguments made by the learned Public Prosecutor. He would further submit that even at the time of executing sale deed in favour of the 2nd petitioner, the accused have made the defacto complainant to wait outside the SRO Office and executed a sale deed by forging his signature in the life certificate, thereby cheated him. Further all the accused are one gang, their *modus operandi* is targeting loan seekers and using their innocence by sweet coated words, make them believe and grab their properties. The defacto complainant's money is not yet recovered and therefore he strongly opposed for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. It is allged that, on the pretext of extending financial assistance to the defacto complainant, the accused have obtained the original documents of the subject property from him, in turn, by using sweet coated words and also by using his financial situation, the accused have executed a sale deed

in respect of the subject property without the knowledge or consent of the defacto complainant, thereby grabbed his property and chaeted him. From the submissions, it appears that the petitioners/accused along with other accused are known to each other, thereby they acted as a syndicate / group. It is the submisson learned Public Prosecutor that the other accused are yet to be secured and the investigation is only at the preliminary stage; if the petitioners are enlarged on bail, it will cause great prejudice to the prosecuting agency. It is submitted by the learned Public Prosecutor as well as by the learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant that the accused one Ethiraj, who played a major role in the occurrence is involved in similiar type of offences and he is having previous antecedents. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, nature of allgations levelled against the petitioners, the swindled amount is not yet recovered, co-accused are not yet secured, the investigation is only at the preliminary stage and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

9. In the result, the petition in Crl.M.P. No.352 of 2026 is dismissed; the intervenor petition in Crl.M.P. No.841 of 2026 is closed.

Pronounced by me in open court, on this the 23rd day of March 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.