

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, KRISHNAGIRI.**Present: Tmt.V.R.Latha, M.A., B.L.,****Principal Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri**Monday, the 16th day of March 2026**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO.893/ 2026.**

A1.Imran

...Petitioner/Accused

/ Versus /

State: The Inspector of Police,

Bargur P.S., Cr.No:62/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition has come up today before this court in the presence of Tr.M.Ragul, Counsel for the petitioner and Tr.M.Visva Bharathi, Public Prosecutor for the respondent police, after hearing both sides, perusing the averments, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

Heard both sides.

This petition has been filed by the petitioner/accused U/S. 483 of BNSS Act, seeking bail. Petitioner were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 27.02.2026 for the alleged offence U/S. 123, 275 of BNS Act and Sec 58, 59 of Food Safety and Standard Act and 7, 24(1) of COTPA Act.

2] The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The respondent/police has falsely implicated the petitioner in this case only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 18 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, the learned counsel for the petitioner prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

3] On the other hand, the learned Public prosecutor vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner by stating that on the occurrence date, when the respondent/police were on their patrol duty, at that time this petitioner is attempting to transport the 39.5 Kg of banned tobacco products and committed the alleged offence. The respondent/police has seized above said banned tobacco products along with the vehicle from the occurrence place and case has been registered against the petitioner. In this case, investigation is at initial stage. At this stage, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will affect the investigation. Accordingly, the learned Public prosecutor opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4] Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5] Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions made by the learned counsels on either side and considering the fact that the investigation is still at an initial stage and the nature and gravity of offence, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail at this stage, if the petitioner is released on bail, there is a likelihood of the petitioner interfering with the investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition deserves dismissal.

In fine, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this, the 16th day of March 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Krishnagiri.

Copy To:

- 1) The Judicial Magistrate No-I, Krishnagiri.
- 2) The Public prosecutor, Principal District Court, Krishnagiri.
- 3) The Inspector of police, Bargur P.S.
- 4) Tr.M.Ragul, Advocate, Krishnagiri.