

**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 28th day of July 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.2357 of 2026 (S.C. No. 134 of 2015 pending on the file of
the Assistant Session Judge / Subordinate Judge, Madurantakam)
(CNR No. TNCG01-004651-2026)

Arumugam @ Ananthan, S/o.Perumal,
Aged about 55 years,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Chithamur Police Station,
Cr. No.200 of 2006
U/s.394 and 397 of IPC.

.. Respondent/Complainant

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.J.Selvaprakash, the learned counsels are 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

O R D E R

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.394 and 397 of IPC.

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that since the petitioner failed to appear before the court, NBW was issued against him,

susequently on execution of NBW, the petitioner has been arrested and remanded on 06.07.2026 and he is under judicial custody for the past 23 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 to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, strongly objected to grant bail to the petitioner by stating that the occurrence has taken place during the year 2006. The sessions case was taken on file in the year 2025. Due to the absence of the petitioner, NBW was issued on 24.04.2017 and the petitioner has absconded himself for the past nine years. After a great difficulty, now only the petitioner has been secured and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. From the records, it is seen that since the petitioner has absconded for the past nine years, due to which the trial of the case has been stagnated without any progress, it is the apprehension of the prosecution that if the petitioner is released on bail, again he will abscond thereby, trial of the case will get stalled. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner/accused, the petitioner has absconded himself for about nine long years and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. **Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.**

Pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 28th day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.