

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I,
CHENGALPATTU.**

Present: Tmt.V.Lavanya, M.L.,
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Chengalpattu.

C.M.P.No.676/2026

Dated this the 17th day of March 2026.

N.Nagarajan,
S/o.Natarajan.

.. Petitioner/Accused

/Vs/

State of Tamil Nadu,
The Inspector of Police,
CBCID Chengalpattu PS,
Cr.No.1/2025,
U/s.109, 120(B), 419, 420, 465, 466, 468, 471 of IPC.

..Respondent/Complainant

The bail petition coming on this day before me in the presence of M/s. M.Muneeswaran, Counsel for the petitioner/accused and the App-II of the respondent, till this day this court passed the following..

ORDER

1. The Petitioner is accused of offence U/s. 109, 120(B), 419, 420, 465, 466, 468, 471 of IPC in Crime Number 1/2025. He is remanded to Judicial custody on 11.03.2026.

2. Brief of facts stated in the petition:-

The petitioner is innocent and falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is the only earning member in the family. This is the first bail application. The petitioner is ready to furnish substantial sureties and ready to abide any condition imposed by this court. On the above grounds, the petitioner prayed to grant bail.

3. Notice was served to the respondent police and Additional Public Prosecutor. It is stated in the reply of the Inspector that, this is a case of land fraud involving creation of fake documents and impersonation to grab the land illegally. The complainant A.T.Thilagavathy through her authorized agent had given a complaint regarding grabbing of her land and forgery committed in respect of her land by way

of fake documents and impersonation. In this case the prime accused L.B.Senthilkumar confessed about conspiring with the other accused persons to grab 1 acre 8 cent land at Kazhipattur Village. During the course of investigation the photograph used for impersonating P.Nithyanandam when uploaded in the NAT GRID portal for verification and identification, it was revealed that the accused Nagarajan who is the petitioner herein is the person who impersonated P.Nithyanandam. During the course of investigation it was admitted by the accused that he colluded with the other accused and by way of impersonating P.Nithyanandam he had executed power of attorney in favour of the accused Srinivasan at Thiruporur Sub Registrar Office on 08.10.2015. The petitioner also subsequently cancelled the power of attorney by again impersonating as P.Nithyanandam on 01.08.2019. The petitioner received cash from the accused L.B.Senthilkumar through Baskar as his share. The cellphone of the petitioner is seized in this case. The finger print of the petitioner has to be sent for expert opinion for comparison. If the petitioner is released on bail he may tamper the evidence, destroy and conceal the documents. He may aid the other accused for evading the arrest. On the above grounds, the prosecution objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The defacto complainant filed intervene petition through her counsel. The following facts are stated in the intervenor petition.

(i) The power of attorney of the defacto complainant one Mr.P.Saravanan had filed this intervene petition objecting to grant bail to the petitioner. It is submitted in the petition that the defacto complainant had given complaint before DGP on 14.09.2023 for the offences of Forgery, impersonation etc., and based on the same FIR No.3/2024 was registered by the DCB-II of Chengalpattu. However, inspite of dismissal of Anticipatory Bail applications by the main accused one L.B.Senthikumar and M.Inbarasu, the DCB-II police failed to secure the custody of those accused. Hence, the defacto complainant approached the Hon'ble High Court for transfer of investigation and accordingly, the case was transferred to the CBCID and FIR in

Cr.No.1/2025 was registered on 01.03.2025. Thereafter, this petitioner was arrested by the CBCID police.

(ii) The petitioner at the instance of L.B.Senthil kumar had played a key role to grab the land of the defacto complainant illegally by way of impersonation. By using the voter id of another person which was in the name of defacto complainant's husband and his father the petitioner had impersonated twice. The petitioner has played a main role by impersonating at the Sub Registrar Office. Releasing the petitioner will affect the interest of the society. The custodial interrogation is necessary in this case. The gravity of the offence is serious in nature. The petitioner was dodging the police for long time and if he is enlarged on bail, the respondent police can never find other accused persons. The petitioner will intimidate the other accused and may hamper and tamper the witnesses. With the political connections, the petitioner will shield the other accused and facilitate them to escape. On the above said grounds prayed to dismiss this bail application.

5. Records perused. The petitioner is in custody for 7 days. On perusal of records, it is alleged that the property owned by the defaco complainant namely one A.T.Thilagavathy was grabbed by the group of accused persons mentioned in the FIR along with the petitioner by impersonating the defacto complainant, by forging various documents, by creating bogus identity cards and by creating bogus bank accounts. The above offence is very serious in nature and it is against the public interest. In this case, according to the defacto complainant the officials of the sub registrar office are also involved. The investigation is recently been transferred to the CBCID for proper investigation. The petitioner is alleged to have involved in falsification of public documents and committed offence of impersonation for monitory gain. The alleged offences requires detailed investigation. The submissions of the prosecution and the defacto complainant shows that the investigation is yet to be completed and granting bail to the petitioner may cause serious hindrance in the progress of the investigation. Further as argued by the intervenor the legal process of comparison of finger print of petitioner with the finger print in the alleged fake

documents are yet to be done. Further, as contended by the intervenor and the prosecution, the investigation regarding money trail is also pending. The investigation with regard to the petitioner and the alleged offences against him are in very preliminary stage. Hence, considering the above stated facts and circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, this bail application is dismissed.

Dated this the 17th day of March 2026.

Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Chengalpattu.