

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

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

Date: Tuesday, the 24th day of March 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.677 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-001568-2026)

Sumit Raj, aged 22 years, S/o.Selvan Raj

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Chengalpattu Taluk Police Station
Cr. No.156 of 2026
U/s.64(1), 75, 77, 78, 296(b), 351(2) of BNS, 2023
r/w. Sec.67A of I.T. Act.

.. Respondent/Complainant

// and //

Karthika, W/o.Jegan Tamailarasan

.. Intervenor/defacto complainant
in CMP No.800 of 2026

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

ORDER

The petition in Crl.M.P. No.677 of 2026 is filed by the petitioner/ accused U/s.483 of BNSS 2023, seeking to enlarge the petitioner on bail, whereas, the Crl.M.P. No.800 of 2026 is filed in order to object to grant bail to the petitioner/accused.

2. The petitioner/accused is facing charges for the alleged offences punishable U/s.64(1), 75, 77, 78, 296(b), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.67A of I.T. Act.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply received. Heard both sides. Records are perused.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the victim is the married women, working in a private company. She had straint relationship with her husband. While the victim went to Kolkata tour, the petitioner/accused got acquaintance with the victim which developed into friendship, later they had physical relationship together. Later, she joined company with her husband. However, the petitioner/accused contacted the victim over phone and by showing their close relationship videographs thereby compelled her to have physical relationship with her. Therafter, though the victim suffered with illness, he demanded to have relationship. Since the victim refused, the petitioner/accused shared their close relationship videographs to her husband and also threatened the victim with dire consequences. Thereby a case has been registred on the file of respondent Police Station.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner/accused was arrested and remanded on 01.03.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 24 days; most of the investigation has been completed; 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 prayed for enlargement on bail.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, re-iterate the prosecution case and objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel who appearing for the intervenor/defacto complainant made his arguments stating the complainant's case and objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. It is alleged that the victim and the petitioner had consensual physical relationship together, later, the victim left the company of the petitioner and joined company with her husband, the petitioner had sent their close relationship videographs to the victim and her husband thereby threatned her. It is seen the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 26 days. Substantial portion of investigation ought to have been completed by this time. Taking into consideration the duration of custody, stage of investigation and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

9. 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 for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpattu, 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 respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of 30 days;
3. The petitioner/accused shall not tamper the evidence either during investigation or trial;
4. The petitioner/accused shall not abscond either during investigation or 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 open Court, on this the 24th day of March 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpattu.

The Inspector of Police, Chengalpattu Taluk Police Station

The Superintendent, District Jail, Chengalpattu.