

**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 30th day of July 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.2495 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-004951-2026)

H.Samson Shalom, aged 29 years,
S/o.Barbansingh Premkumar, .. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
T-20, Kanathur Police Station
Cr. No.119 of 2026 .. Respondent/Complainant
U/s.77, 85, 86, 351(2) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.67 of
Information Technology Act, 2000.

// and //

Sweety Paul, W/o. Samson Shalom, .. Intervenor/defacto complainant
in CMP No.2651 of 2021

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.R.Venkat Raman, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused, M/s.V.Krishnamoorthy, the learned Public Prosecutor is appearing for the respondent/complainant and M/s.M.Varadhan, the learned counsel is appearing for intervenor/defacto complainant, upon hearing respective sides and upon perusal of records, this Court made the following

O R D E R

The petition in Crl.M.P. No.2495 of 2026 is filed by the petitioner/accused U/s.483 of BNSS 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail, whereas, the Crl.M.P. No.2651 of 2021 has been filed by the intervenor/defacto complainant, in order to object to grant bail to the petitioner.

2. The petitioner/accused is facing charges for the alleged offences punishable U/s.77, 85, 86, 351(2) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.67 of Information Technology Act, 2000.

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

4. The case of the prosecution as projected in the FIR is that, the marriage between the petitioner with the defacto complainant was solemnized during the year 2021. At that time of marriage, the petitioner stated that he was doing business at Coimbatore, however, he did not do any business as stated. Further, the petitioner spent most of his time in playing video games. The defacto complainant had obtained money from his father for her day to day expenses. Thereafter, her father-in-law set-up a separate living for them. Even thereafter, there is no change in his lifestyle, but he himself addicted for drugs and liquors. When the victim questioned the same, he used to beaten her and also demanded more money. That apart, he created the morphed photographs of the defacto complainant and her family members in a Pendrive and also used to threaten her to circulated the same through internet thereby, committed cruelty against her. Thereby, on receipt of complaint, FIR has been registered in Cr. No.119 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police station.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was arrested and remanded on 13.07.2026 and he is under judicial custody for the past 18 days; as a matter of fact, the petitioner is doing resort business in the name and style of 'Villa Luna' at ECR Nemili; he never received any money from his father-in-law; due to the matrimonial dispute which arose between the petitioner and the defacto complainant,

this false case been foisted against him; it is the defacto complainant, she herself invited her Gym Trainer to the matrimonial home during mid night hours on 28.02.2026 and made ugly scenes before the neighbours. Due to that the petitioner lodged complaint by calling 100 and a CSR has been registered; when her illicit relationship with the said Gym Trainer was came to known to the petitioner, the defacto complainant never stopped her activities, due to which, the petitioner sought for legal advice to sent divorce notice to the defacto complainant; while the facts are being so, in order to obtained wrongful money from the petitioner, the defacto complainant foisted this false complaint; the dispute is purely matrimonial dispute and hence further custody of the petitioner is not necessary; 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.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, made his submissions by reiterating the prosecution version. He would further submitted that the investigation is not yet completed. If the petitioner is released on bail at this stage, he will tamper the evidences and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

7. The learned counsel who is appearing for the intervenor/defacto complainant made his vehement arguments in length, in consonance with the complaint averments. During his arguments he would state that the petitioner has stored more number of morphed photographs of ladies in his pendrive. That apart, the petitioner had exchanged morphed photographs of his wife to others and hence he strongly objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. It is submitted by the learned Public Prosecutor that the investigation is not yet completed. The apprehension made by the prosecution is that if the petitioner is released on bail at this stage, he will tamper the evidences. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, conduct of the petitioner/ accused, the investigation seemed to be not yet completed, possibility of tampering the evidences and threat the witness as stated by the prosecution, the strong objection raised by the learned Public Prosecutor and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, at this stage. **Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.**

9. In the result, the bail application in Crl.M.P. No.2495 of 2026 is dismissed. The Intervenor application in Crl.M.P. No.2651 of 2021 is closed, accordingly.

Pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 30th day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.