

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
CHEY YUR

Present: **Tmt. C.M.Amaravathi, M.L.,**

District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur.

Dated : 20.07.2026

CrI.MP.No.204/2026

A1 . Saran, aged (21/2026)

S/o.Sankar

...Petitioner/Accused

-Vs-

State of Tamilnadu,

Rep. By Inspector of Police,

Chithamur PS (Cr.No.118/2026)

U/s.309(4) BNS.

...Respondent/Complainant..

This petition is coming on this day for final hearing before this court in the presence of Mr.M.Sathish, Mr.K.Tamizharasu, Mr.S.Manikandan, Mr.N.Jayakumar and Mr.J.Mathavan, Advocates for the Petitioner/Accused and Assistant Public Prosecutor Grade - I represented for state, upon perusing the petition before this court and upon hearing both side argument, this court Pronounced the following.

ORDER

This petition was filed by the Petitioner seeking Bail U/s.480 BNSS Act for the alleged offence U/s.309(4) BNS.

1. Brief averments in the FIR:

On perusal of the FIR it reveals that the police registered a case against the accused Crime No.118/2026, U/s.309(4) BNS. As per FIR on 28.05.2026 at about 11.30

A.M. had committed the robbery of the 1 sovereign gold chain, 1/2 sovereign stud, 1 sovereign gold chain and 40 gram silver. Hence the case was registered against the Petitioner/Accused under section 309(4) BNS.

2. Brief averments in the petition:

The Petitioner states that the Petitioner/Accused was charged for an alleged offence under section U/s.309(4) BNS. The Petitioner/Accused was remanded to judicial custody on 16.06.2026. He further states that he is innocent and he would not commit similar offences and he is prepared to furnish substantial sureties for his due appearance. Hence, this petition has to be allowed on condition.

3. Brief averments of Reply:-

The Petitioner/Accused side sufficient chance given. No enquiry made on Accused/Petitioner side. Hence posted for orders today.

4. Per contra, the prosecution filed its reply raising objection to granting of bail to the Petitioner/Accused stating that the investigation is still pending. Further, if the accused is released on bail, he may again involve in similar offences and would interfere with the investigation, tampering witnesses. Further it is stated that several other cases are pending against the petitioner. The respondent police taking steps to taken the petitioner in police custody and to investigation further.

5. Heard, All the documents and records perused. Upon perusal of records this Court finds that the accused has been produced and remanded to judicial custody on

16.06.2026 in this crime number and continues to be in custody till today. He is under judicial custody for 35 days. This Court is of the considered view that considering the nature of the offence, the serious objections raised by the Prosecution regarding tampering evidence appears to be reasonable. More over the respondent police stated in reply that they are taking steps to take this petitioner in police custody and for further investigation, at this juncture if this petition is allowed that will vitiate the investigation.

6. The Police had given reply in which, stating that, already Goonda proceedings initiated against the accused by the District Magistrate, Chengalpattu as contemplated U/s.2(f) of Tamil Nadu Preventive Detention Act 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982). Further Petitioner/Accused enquiry had not produce before this court. Hence this court is not inclined to allow this petition.

7. In the result this petition is dismissed.

Dictated to the typist, typed by her directly in the computer, printed, corrected and pronounced by me on this the 20th day of July, 2026.

Sd/-Tmt.C.M.Amaravathi
District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Cheyyur