

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

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

Date: Monday, the 03rd day of August 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.2429 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-004867-2026)

1. Bala @ Balakrishnan, aged about 38 years, S/o. Kali,
2. Paramasivam, aged about 20 yers, S/o. Mari,

.. Petitioners/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Thuraipakkam Police Station,
Cr. No.276 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.296(b), 126(2), 115(2), 324(3), 308(2), 351(3) @ 311 of BNS, 2023

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.K.Sundaramoorthy, 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

O R D E R

This petition is filed U/s.483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

2. The petitioners/accused has been charged for the alleged offences U/s.296(b), 126(2), 115(2), 324(3), 308(2), 351(3) @ 311 of BNS, 2023.

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

4. In the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioners stated that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case; they were arrested and remanded on 03.07.2026; thye are in judicial custody for the past 32 days; 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 the defacto complainant is the push-cart vendor. On the occurrence day at night hours, these petitioners wrongfully restrained the defacto complainant and demanded money. Since he opposed and questioned the same, the accused persons have abused him with filthy words, slapped him, put him into fear by brandishing knife, robbed a sum of Rs.1,200/- from him at knife point, threatened him and fled away. He further submitted that the 2nd petitioner has been detained under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 by the Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai as per the order in No.367/ BBCDEFGISSSV/2026 DATED 31.07.2026. He would also seek some more time for filing the written objection in respect of the 1st petitioner.

6. It is alleged that the petitioners have waylaided, abused and extorted a sum of Rs.1,200/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. It is submitted that the 2nd petitioner has been detained under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 by the Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai as per the order in No.367/ BBCDEFGISSSV/2026 DATED 31.07.2026. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to dismiss the petition in respect of the 2nd petitioner. **Accordingly, the petition in respect of the 2nd petitioner is dismissed. The petition in respect of the 1st petitioner stand posted on 06.08.2026.**

Pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 03rd day of August 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.