

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE AT TIRUVALLUR

Present: Dr. J. JULIET PUSHPA, Ph.D. (Law)

Principal District and Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur

Thursday, the 11th day of June, 2026

Crl.M.P.No:1976/2026

Rizwana Babu, D/o Babu

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
CCB, Land Grabbing Wing, Avadi, Police station
(Crime No: 51/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 01.06.2026 u/s 483 of BNSS praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s S. Mohanraj, the respondent police through the Public Prosecutor, and upon hearing the arguments of both sides, perusing the reply of the Public Prosecutor for the State/Respondent and perusing the records and material and hearing both sides, this court made the following:-

ORDER

Heard arguments of both side. Records perused. Petition filed u/s 483 of BNSS seeking to release the petitioners were was remanded on 08.05.2026 in Crime No. 51/2026 on the file of CCB, Avadi (Land Grabbing cell) police station registered for the offence u/s 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2) of BNS. The Bail petition u/s 480 of BNSS was dismissed by the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Poonamallee in CMP No. 934/2026 dated 22.05.2026.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, she has been falsely implicated only due to land dispute. The petitioner entered into a sale agreement and benefits for just Rs.5000/- , later, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint lodged the complaint before the respondent police as she never issued any general power of attorney to Ramakrishnan and he and he forged her passport and above property documents. Except executing the power of attorney, there is no other overtact as against the petitioner. The petitioner is neither the party nor executed any document in favour of other petitioners, This is the false case, she is in custody for the past 35 days, based on the complaint, FIR was registered the petitioner was arrested on 23.05.2026 and the investigation is pending.

Notice given to concerned police and reply received. The learned Public prosecutor argued that the defacto complainant lodged the complaint stating that she is the owner of plot No.32, Ettiamman Nagar, Thirumullaivoyal Village, in S.No.869/1 and 2. Under Doc.No.6560/93 of an extent of 2100 sq. ft. Recently she found that S. Ramachandran, S/o Srinivasan has obtained power of attorney in his name as if the defacto complainant given him power using that forged power of attorney by impersonating her signature by an impersonator, and on the strength of power deed under Doc.No.166/2024 dt. 09.12.2024, and on the strength of the said power of attorney , Ramakrishnan, executed a sale deed under forged sale agreement on 20.01.2025 and thereafter registered the sale deed under Doc.No.1197/2025 dated 31.01.2025 in favour of the petitioner, Petitioner knowing well that the property does not belong to the accused persons intentionally on receipt of Rs.5000/- signed in the document as purchaser, thereby the petitioner along with the other accused deceived the property of the defacto complainant, thus, based on the complaint, FIR was registered u/s 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2) of BNS , the petitioner was arrested on 08.05.2026 and the investigation is pending.

The petitioner states in this petition that there is no similar bail petition is pending before any other Court including Hon'ble High Court, Madras and the respondent has also not stated as to pending of any bail petition before Hon'ble High Court, Madras in this case. Hence, this Court considers that there is no impediment to entertain this petition and pass orders on merits.

As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, the investigation is pending in preliminary stage and the alleged offence is serious in nature.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) grave nature of offence
 - (ii) investigation is still pending
 - (iii) serious accusation of the offence as against the petitioner u/s 318(4) of BNS
 - (iv) specific overtact as against the petitioner as the person received and registered the property
 - (v) and also considering other facts and circumstances,
- this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 11th day of June, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s S. Mohanraj,
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Poonamallee
The Inspector of police, CCB, Land Grabbing Cell, Avadi police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai