

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

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

Date: Wednesday, the 10th day of June 2026

Crl.M.P. No.1736 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003562-2026)

K. Raju, aged 37 years, S/o. Kumar,
No.45, S2, Amrita Flats,
Vijayalakshmi Street, Lakshmi Nagar,
Mudichur, Chennai - 600 048.

.. Petitioner/accused

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Selaiyur Police Station
Cr. No.03 of 2026
U/s.465, 468, 471, 420, 120(B) of IPC.

.. Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioner/accused U/s.482 of B.N.S.S. praying to enlarge him on anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of respondent police for the alleged offences U/s.465, 468, 471, 420, 120(B) of IPC in connection with the Cr. No.03 of 2026 of respondent Police Station.

3. The learned counsel who appeared for the petitioner/accused

would submit that a false case has been foisted against the petitioner; he has no way connected with the said offence as alleged; he is only the subsequent innocent purchaser; already some of the co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail by this court as per the order in Crl.M.P. No.205 of 2026 dated 12.02.2026; 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 and thereby prayed for enlargement on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, would submit that the accused persons conspired together, created forged death certificate and legal heir certificates of the owner of the subject property Munusamy and by using the forged documents, the accused have executed forged document in respect of the subject property. He would further submit that the petitioner is only the subsequent, bonafide purchaser and he has no role played in the offence. Further, he expressed his no objection in granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. On perusal of records and from the submissions, it is alleged the defacto complainant was cheated by the other accused A4, A5 & A6. This petitioner - who is the bonafide purchaser, has been arrayed as A7. It is further seen some of the co-accused have been granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P. No.205 of 2026 dated 12.02.2026. Moreover, the Public Prosecutor has expressed his no objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations, the co-accused have been already enlarged on anticipatory bail by this court, the prosecution has no objection in granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioner, in the event of arrest or his surrender before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram within 15 days, is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the same Magistrate, 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 identify proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity;
- 2.** The petitioner are directed to report before the respondent station daily at 10.30 A.M. for 30 days;
- 3.** The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or hamper the investigation in any manner;
- 4.** The petitioner should comply with the conditions contemplated u/s.482 (2)(i), (ii) and (iii) of B.N.S.S.;
- 5.** 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 ***AIR 2006 S.C. 100 – P.K. Shaji vs State of Kerala.***

Pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 10th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram.
The Inspector of Police, Selaiyur Police Station