

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, KRISHNAGIRI.****Present: Tmt.V.R.Latha, M.A., B.L.,****Principal Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri**Thursday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO.856/ 2026.**

1.Chinnaraj ... Petitioner/ Accused

/Versus/

State: The Inspector of Police,

Shoolagiri P.S., Cr.No: 114/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition has come up today before this court in the presence of Tr.C.A.Ravichandiran, Chief Legal Aid Defence counsel for the petitioner and Tr.M.Visva Bharathi, Public Prosecutor for the respondent. After perusing the petition averments, upon hearing both side arguments, this Court pronounces the following:

**ORDER**

This petition has been filed by the petitioners/accused U/S. 483 of BNSS Act, seeking bail. Petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 12.01.2026 for the alleged offence U/S. 103(1), 238, 326(g), 305 of BNS Act.

2] The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed the alleged offence. The defacto complainant gave a false complainant against the petitioner with false allegations and the respondent police has falsely implicated the petitioner in this case only on suspicion basis. The

petitioners are in judicial custody for the past 60 days. The petitioner is a law abiding citizen and he is only breadwinner of his family and he is ready to abide the condition if any to be imposed by this court. Accordingly, prayed to release the petitioner on bail.

3] On the other hand, the learned Public prosecutor vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioners by stating that the petitioner, in his confession statement, stated that the petitioner and the deceased were neighbors and that there existed prior enmity between them. Owing to such enmity, the petitioner allegedly went to the house of the deceased, cut her throat with a knife, set the house on fire, and thereby committed the alleged offence. It was further submitted that the investigation has revealed prima facie material against the petitioner, and that the offence is grave and serious in nature. It was further argued that release of the petitioner on bail at this stage may hamper the investigation and there is a likelihood of influencing witnesses. Accordingly, the learned Public prosecutor opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner and he further submitted that except the present case, 2 previous case is pending against the petitioner.

4] In view of the submissions made by both sides and on perusal of the materials placed on record, this Court finds that the respondent police have specifically pinpointed the involvement of the accused in the alleged offence. At this stage, the materials collected during the course of investigation disclose the role of the accused in the commission of the offence and therefore, the involvement of the accused cannot be ruled out. Further, it is seen that apart from the present case, one more murder case is pending against the petitioner. Considering the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, if he is released on bail, there is a

likelihood that he may again indulge in similar kinds of offences. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition deserves to be dismissed.

In fine, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,  
Krishnagiri.

Copy To: 1) The Judicial Magistrate, No-I, Hosur.  
2) The Public prosecutor, Principal District Court, Krishnagiri.  
3) The Inspector of police, Shoolagiri P.S.  
4) Tr.C.A.Ravichandiran, Chief Legal Aid Defence counsel , Krishnagiri.