

**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 23rd day of July 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.2422 of 2026
(CNR No.TNCG01-004851-2026)

1. Hari Babu, aged 18 yers, S/o.Madhan,
2. Gopinath, aged 19 years, S/o.Ananthan,

.. Petitioners/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu

Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Chengalpattu Taluk Police Station,

Cr. No.436 of 2026 (*)

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.126(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 351(3) of
BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.25(1A) of The ARMS Act, 1959 (*)

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.R.Ranjith, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioners/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.483 of BNSS 2023, seeking to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

2. The petitioners/accused is facing charges for the alleged offences punishable U/s.126(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 351(3) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.25(1A) of The ARMS Act, 1959 (*).

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

(*) Amended as per the order in memo dated 24.07.2026.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case; they were arrested and remanded on 27.06.2026 and they are in judicial custody for the past 27 days; the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the co-accused have been granted bail by this court as per the order in CrI.M.P. Nos.2317, 2325 of 2026 dated 14.07.2026; moreover, the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon them and they are ready to offer substantial sureties before the court, thereby prayed for enlargement on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, would submit that it is the case in counter to Cr. No.435 of 2026. On 24.06.2026 in the noon hours, while the defacto complainant and his friends were consuming alcohol, dispute arose between defacto complainant and the petitioners and others and that they took the defacto complainant's cellphone and fled away. In continuation to that, on the next day, both the parties formed themselves and assaulted each other and caused injuries, taken back the cellphone, attempted to assault each other with knife and also threatened them with dire consequences and prays for the dismissal of the petition. But, he fairly admits that the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital.

6. From the records, it is seen the petitioners are in judicial custody for the past 27 days. It is submitted that the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and that the co-accused were granted bail by this court by orders dated 14.07.2026. It is seen, substantial portion of investigation has been completed. The petitioners seemed to be the first offenders, no previous case is pending against them. Since they have permanent residence within the jurisdiction of the respondent police, there

is no possibility of flee from justice. Considering the duration of custody, injured persons were discharged from the hospital, facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

7. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioners/accused are ordered to be released on bail on their execution of bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpattu, 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 petitioners/accused are directed to report before the respondent police station daily at 05.30 P.M. for 30 days;
3. The petitioners/accused shall not tamper the evidence either during investigation or trial;
4. 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 23rd day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpattu.
The Inspector of Police, Chengalpattu Taluk Police Station.
The Superintendent, District Prison, Chengalpattu.