

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

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

Date: Tuesday, the 09th day of June 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.1726 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003564-2026)

Srinivasan, aged 39 years, S/o.Arjuna,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
C.C.B., Tambaram
Cr. No.101 of 2026
U/s.406, 420, 468, 471, 506(i) of IPC.

.. Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

This petition is filed by the petitioner/accused U/s.483 of BNSS 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

2. The petitioner/accused is facing charges for the alleged offences punishable U/s.406, 420, 468, 471, 506(i) of IPC.

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the

petitioner is falsely implicated in this case; he was arrested on 12.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 29 days; the petitioner has no connection with the said offence as alleged; since he is the friend of other accused one Roobesh, he was roped in this case; he has not received any single rupee from the consideration of the crime; moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon him and he is ready to offer substantial sureties before the Court, thereby prayed for enlargement on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, strongly objected to grant bail to the petitioner stating that the subject matter property belonged to the defacto complainant's wife by way of sale right from the year 1996. While so, the petitioner along with other accused have created fake and bogus death certificate of the defacto complainant and his wife, and also obtained a fraudulent Legal Heir Certificate of them as if one Roobesh is the sole legal heir of them. Later, by using those fraudulent documents, the accused have sold the subject property to third parties, thereby grabbed the defacto complainant's property. He would further submit that the said Roobesh and the present petitioner are friends, and both were colluded themselves and committed an offence. Out of the consideration of the crime, the petitioner has shared the money with the said Roobesh thereby the petitioner had actively participated in the offence. Moreover, the other accused are yet to be arrested and the investigation is not yet completed. At this stage, if the petitioner is released on bail, he will tamper with the evidence and hamper the investigation. Hence, he prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, nature of

allegations levelled against the petitioner and the role played by him in the offence, the other accused involved in the offence are not yet arrested, the investigation seemed to be not yet completed, the strong objection made by the learned Public Prosecutor and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. **Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.**

Pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 09th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.