

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

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

Dated: Monday, the 13th day of July 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.2312 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-004606-2026)

D.Aruneshwaran, S/o.Dhavaselvam,
Aged 34 years,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
T-4, Sankar Nagar Police Station,
Cr. No.215 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.194(3) of BNSS, 2023 r/w. Sec.108 of BNS, 2023.

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.Anandraj.C, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused and of M/s.V.Krishnamoorthy, 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.480 and 483 of BNSS 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

2. The petitioner/accused has been charged for the offences U/s.194(3) of BNSS, 2023 r/w. Sec.108 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 would submit that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case; he was arrested and remanded on 16.06.2026; the earlier bail application was dismissed by this

court in CrI.M.P. No.2058 of 2026 dated 29.06.2026; now the petitioner is under judicial custody for the past 28 days; best part 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 and thereby prayed for enlargement on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, would submit that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased. During their marital life, the petitioner has used to abuse and harass her physically. On the occurrence day, the petitioner has abused and beaten her. Out of frustration, the deceased ended her life by way of hanging. He further submit that the Revenue Divisional Officer enquiry is not yet completed and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. It is the case of abetment of suicide. It is seen the occurrence has taken place on 15.06.2026 and the petitioner/accused is in custody from 16.06.2026. Total period of custody exceeds 28 days. Though the learned Public Prosecutor contended that the Revenue Divisional Officer enquiry is not yet completed, on perusal of the First Information Report and the complaint, there is no allegations made by the defacto complainant, as if any dowry harassment made. More so, after completion of about one month from the date of occurrence, substantial portion of investigation ought to have been completed by this time. Since the petitioner has permanent residence within the jurisdiction of the respondent police station, there is no possibility of flee from justice. Taking into consideration the duration of custody, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, stage of investigation, the the 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 District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Pallavaram, 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 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 13th day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Pallavaram.
The Inspector of Police, T-4, Sankar Nagar Police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.