IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, KANCHEEPURAM
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT,
KANCHEEPURAM.

PRESENT: **Tmt. Deepthi Arivunithi, M.L.,**
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Principal District & Sessions Court ,
Kancheepuram.

Friday the 27th day of March 2026

Crl.M.P.No.622/2026

V. Santhoshkumar, 39 years
S/o. T.S. Velu,
No.4, 7th Cross Street,
Rajaji Nagar,
Selaiyur
Kancheepuram-600073. ...Petitioner/Accused

// Vs //

State: Represented by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
CCB-3
Tambaram Commissionarate, Tambaram
Cr.No.27/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition came up before me for hearing today in the presence of counsels M/s. R. Gokulakrishnan, M. Tamizarasu, T. Maniarasu, E.T. Gnanavel, V. Gowthamkumar, appearing for the petitioner/Accused and Thiru. E.L.Kannan, the Public Prosecutor for the respondent/Prosecution, on perusal of reply submitted by Prosecution and upon hearing the arguments from the counsels on both side, upon perusing the entire records of the case, this Court passed the following:-

ORDER

The petitioner who was arrested on 16.03.2026 for commission of alleged offences under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, r/w 34 of IPC has filed the present petition seeking Bail under s.483 of the BNSS,

2023.

The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused has filed the present bail application on the ground that no offence as stated by the prosecution has taken place and that a false case has been foisted against him. It is pointed out that the petitioner/accused is the power agent of the defacto complainant and that the matter pertains to a purely civil dispute. While so, the petitioner/accused has been arrested on 16.03.2026 and is in custody till date. He would state that the petitioner/accused is ready to co-operate with the investigation agency and on these grounds, he would pray for grant of bail.

The learned Public Prosecutor on behalf of the respondent police would strongly oppose for the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner/accused is said to have aided the impersonation of the defacto complainant and a forged power of attorney which was created in favour of the petitioner/accused herein. He would point out that using the power of attorney, the petitioner/accused has converted the land belonging to the defacto complainant into various plots and has engaged in a fraudulent activities. He would further state that there is one previous case pending against the petitioner/accused which is of similar nature. While so, the investigation is pending in a preliminary stage and the other co-accused are yet to be secured by the respondent police and on these grounds he would strongly oppose for grant of bail.

Heard the parties concerned and perused the relevant records. At the time of arguments, the learned counsel for the petitioner/accused has contended that the mandatory directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras has not been followed by the respondent police at the time of arrest and that no reason of arrest was recorded by the respondent police. In view of the contention raised, this court has called for the CD file and perused the same. Upon perusal of records, it is seen that clear written grounds giving

reasons for effecting the arrest of the petitioner/accused have been recorded and produced before the trial court concerned. Hence, the contention raised in this regard does not merit consideration. The learned Public Prosecutor has stated that the present case relates to impersonation and creation of forged and fraudulent power of attorney in favour of the petitioner/accused and using the same the petitioner/accused has divided the land into several plots for his personal gain. Considering the nature of the accusation, this court find that the custodial interrogation may be necessary. Further, the nature of the accusation is such that it cannot be considered as a civil dispute between the parties. The learned Public prosecutor has stated that the investigation is in a preliminary stage and the co-accused are yet to be secured. Further, it is seen that one previous case pending against the petitioner/accused for similar offence. Merely because there is a discrepancy in the actual value of the property as stated by the defacto complainant and in the materials on record it cannot be stated that the complaint is false. Hence, considering the preliminary stage of investigation, the nature of the accusation and the fact that the co-accused are yet to be secured by the respondent police, this court is not inclined to grant bail. Accordingly the present petition is dismissed.

In the result, this petition is dismissed.

//This order has been dictated by me to the Stenographer, typed by her in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Court on this Friday the 27th day of March 2026.//

Sd./- Deepthi Arivunithi
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Principal District and Sessions Court,
Kancheepuram.

// True copy//

DEEPTHI ARIVUNITHI

Principal District and Sessions Judge
Digitally signed by DEEPTHI ARIVUNITHI
Location: KANCHEEPURAM
Date: 2026.03.27 19:10:29 +0530