

**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 14th day of July 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.2407 of 2026
(CNR No.TNCG01-004786-2026)

D.Rajesh, aged 33 years, S/o.Dhandapani,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Neelankarai Police Station,
Cr. No.278 of 2026
U/s.306 of BNS, 2023

.. Respondent/Complainant

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.L.S.Janarthananraj, 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

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.306 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 01.07.2026; the earlier bail application was dismissed by the

learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Sholinganallur in CrI.M.P. No.524 of 2026 dated 07.07.2026; now the petitioner is under judicial custody for the past 14 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 prayed for enlargement on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, contended that the defacto complainant is the Manager of the film Actor Ravi Mohan. The petitioner - who was working a driver, stolen a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- from the Bureau (almirah), while the said Ravi Mohan was away from his house. Further, the petitioner had spent the crime proceeds lavishly and that no recovery has been made from the petitioner. He further submitted that the investigation is not yet completed and if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he will indulge in similar type of offence. Hence, he strongly objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. It is alleged that the petitioner has stolen a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- from the house of his employer's bureah, while he was not in the house. It is submitted by the learned Public Prosecutor that the petitioner had spent the stolen money in a lavish manner and no recovery has been made from him. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner/accused, the investigation is not yet completed 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 the open Court, on this the 14th day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.