

**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 04th day of June 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.1717 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003572-2026)

Ashvwin, aged about 32 years, S/o.Vinayagam,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Peerkankaranai Police Station,
Cr. No.187 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu
Prohibition of Harassment of women (Amendment) Act, 2002.

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.E.Vijay, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused and M/s.R.Thirumurugan, the learned Public Prosecutor is appearing for the respondent/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 punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of women (Amendment) Act, 2002.

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 is falsely implicated in this case; he was arrested and remanded on 15.05.2026 and he is under judicial custody for the past 21 days; 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 petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant. Suspecting her character, petitioner used to harass her physically and verbally. On the occurrence day, the petitioner abused her with filthy words and beaten her and also threatened her with dire consequences and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. It is seen the petitioner is the husband of defacto complainant, and the issue seemed to be family dispute. The petitioner is under judicial custody for the past 21 days, therefore, substantial portion of investigation ought to have been completed by this time. Therefore, considering the duration of custody, relationship between the parties, stage of investigation and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. 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.I, 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 respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of 30 days;
3. The petitioner/accused should not tamper with 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 the open Court on this the 04th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

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