

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

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

Date: Thursday, the 11th day of June 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.534 of 2026 (P.R.C. No.38 of 2025 on the file of the learned
Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram)

(CNR No. TNCG01-001161-2026)

Sudhakarraj Vedagiri, S/o.Vedagiri

Aged about 37 years,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,

Rep. by the Inspector of Police,

Medavakkam Police Station,

Cr. No.155 of 2025

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.103(1), 126(2), 303(2) of BNS, 2023

// and //

Saravanan, S/o.Ramakrishnan

.. Intervenor/defacto complainant
in Crl.M.P. No.754 of 2026

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

ORDER

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

2. The petitioner/accused is facing charges for the alleged offences

U/s.103(1), 126(2), 303(2) of BNS, 2023.

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/accused would submit that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case; he has been arrested and remanded on 30.09.2025; he is under judicial custody for the past 255 days, i.e., for more than eight months; in this case, after completion of investigation, Final Report has been laid and cognizance of offence has taken on file as P.R.C. No.38 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram; 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 praying for enlargement on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, would submit that the deceased is the brother of the defacto complainant. The deceased's wife had illicit relationship with the petitioner quite some time, later left the petitioner and again live together with her husband (the deceased). But, the petitioner threatened the deceased's wife to join company with him. The deceased also lodged a complaint before the Police station against this petitioner. While so, on the occurrence day, the petitioner picked up quarrel with the deceased, brutally attacked him with knife thereby murdered him. He would further submit that the petitioner was already detained under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, and the same is not yet been revoked and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. The learned counsel who appearing for the intervenor/ defacto complainant made his arguments in consonance with the arguments made by the learned Public Prosecutor and opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Cursory perusal of records would show that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 30.09.2025. Total period of custody exceeds 255 days, i.e. for more than eight months. Though it is pleaded by the learned Public Prosecutor that the petitioner has already been detained under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, this court is of the considered view that mere detention under the Act 14 of 1982 is not an criteria to discard the right of bail of the petitioner. As far as the present case is concerned, it is seen after completion of investigation Final Report has been laid, case has been taken on file as P.R.C. No.38 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram. Under such circumstances, this court is of the considered view that keeping the petitioner/accused further in prison will not serve any purpose for the investigating agency. Taking into consideration the duration of custody, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner/accused, investigation has been completed and case has been numbered as P.R.C. and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioner/accused is ordered to be released on bail on his execution of bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties (**out of which, one surety should be blood relatives**) for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram, 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 identity proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity;
2. The petitioner/accused is directed to report before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram daily at 10.30 A.M. for 30 days;

3. The petitioner/accused shall not tamper with the evidence during trial;
4. The petitioner/accused shall not abscond during trial;
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 in ***AIR 2006 SC 100 - P.K. Shaji Vs State of Kerala.***

Pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 11th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram.
The Inspector of Police, Medavakkam Police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.