

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

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

Date: Wednesday, the 10th day of June 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.1850 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003600-2026)

Subbulakshmi, aged 31 years, W/o.Anandan, .. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Perumbakkam Police Station,
Cr. No.80 of 2026
U/s.296(b), 115(2), 109(1), 351(3) of BNS, 2023.

.. Respondent/Complainant

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.V.Krishnamoorthy, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused and of 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 U/s.296(b), 115(2), 109(1), 351(3) 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; she was arrested and remanded on 09.05.2026; the earlier bail application was dismissed by this court in Crl.M.P. No.1510 of 2026 dated 29.05.2026; now the petitioner is

under judicial custody for the past 33 days; the petitioner's name is not found place in the FIR; only based on the confession statement of the other accused she has been implicated in this case, which is not admissible in evidence; the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the co-accused have been granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P. Nos.1053 of 2026 dated 09.04.2026 and 1293 of 2026 dated 30.04.2026; that apart, the petitioner is now three months pregnant; moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon her and she 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 there is prior motive in existence between the defacto complainant's sons and one John and others. While so, on 14.03.2026 at 06.30 P.M., at the instigation of the petitioner, the other accused have waylaid the defacto complainant's son one Palayam, uttered filthy words towards him, attacked him with knife and caused injuries. When the defacto complainant tried to secure him, the accused persons have threatened them with dire consequences. The petitioner is the wife of the other prime accused and she is involved in three other previous cases and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. It is seen from the records that the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 33 days. It is seen the injured person has been discharged from the hospital, therefore, substantial portion of investigation ought to have been completed by this time. Further the co-accused has been granted bail by this court. Though the petitioner has been arrayed as accused based on the disclosure statement of the other accused, no incriminating materials have been found place against the petitioner. Taking into consideration the duration of custody, injured person has been granted bail by this court, the co-accused have been enlarged on bail, the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and also considering overall the facts and circumstances of the

case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused.

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.II, Alandur, 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 30 days;
3. The petitioner/accused shall not tamper with the evidence either during investigation or trial;
4. The petitioner 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 10th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Alandur.
The Inspector of Police, Perumbakkam Police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison (Women), Puzhal, Chennai.