

**IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE COURT NO.II
CHENGALPATTU**

**Present: Tmt. S. SAHAANA, M.A., M.L., M.A.,
Judicial Magistrate – II Chengalpattu
Thursday, the 11th day of June 2026
CMP.No.1179/2026 in Cr.No.179/2026**

1. Parthiban, aged about 24 years,
s/o. Ravi.

2. Sakthivel, aged about 23 years,
s/o. Narayanan.

3. Vasanth, aged about 23 years,
s/o. Ganabalan.

... Petitioners/Accused

Vs

State Represented by,
Sub Inspector of Police,
Guduvancherry Police Station.

...Respondent/Complainant

This Petition came up for final hearing before me in the presence of M/s. G. Kannan, C. Jagadesan, R. Boobalan, learned Counsels for Petitioners and learned Assistant Public Prosecutor Grade II for Respondent. Upon hearing both side arguments and upon perusal of available records this Court made the following:

ORDER

1. The Bail Application is filed under Section 480 BNSS.

2. Brief averment of the Petition:

The Petitioners/accused were arrested by Respondent Police for an alleged offences under Section 126(2), 296(b), 308(4), 351(3) of BNS and remanded to judicial custody on 27.05.2026. The Petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated and they have not committed any offence. The Petitioners are ready to offer solvent sureties to the satisfaction of the Court. Hence, the accused may be enlarged on bail.

3. Brief averment of the Reply by the Police / Prosecution:

This is the first bail application filed by the petitioner. The investigation is in the

preliminary stage. If the petitioners/accused released on bail, they further indulgence in similar such crime and malicious intentional acts could not be curtailed. Hence, this Petition may be dismissed.

4. Point for determination:

Whether the Bail Application can be allowed or not?

5. Discussion:

Heard both sides. Records perused. On perusal of records, it reveals that the Petitioners/accused namely 1. Parthiban, aged about 24 years, s/o. Ravi; 2. Sakthivel, aged about 23 years, s/o. Narayanan; 3. Vasanth, aged about 23 years, s/o. Ganabalan was arrested in Cr. No. 179/2026, offences u/s. 126(2), 296(b), 308(4), 351(3) and they were remanded to judicial custody on 27.05.2026, now they are under judicial custody.

6. The Petitioners counsel argued that it is a false case and hence, the Petitioners may be enlarged on bail.

7. On perusal of records, it reveals that the investigation is only on preliminary stage. Further, it reveals that the Petitioners alleged to have extorted a sum of Rs. 1,050/- from the defacto complainant. Hence, on considering modus operandi, stage of investigation, strong objection of the respondent police, if the accused persons are released on bail, they are likely to abscond, likely to tamper the evidence and hamper the investigation and likely to commit same or similar kind of offence. Hence, on considering above and in the interest of justice, this Bail Application is dismissed.

8. In the result, the bail application is dismissed.

Dictated to the Typist, directly typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me on this 11th day of June 2026.

Judicial Magistrate No.II,
Chengalpattu.