

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS  
JUDGE, KANCHEEPURAM  
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT,  
KANCHEEPURAM.

PRESENT: Tmt. Deepthi Arivunithi, M.L.,  
Principal District and Sessions Judge,  
Principal District & Sessions Court ,  
Kancheepuram.

Tuesday the 24th day of March 2026

**CrI.M.P.No.484/2026**

Sadamhussain, M/ 35 years  
S/o. Abdulaleem,  
No.553, Vallalarnagar,  
Madambakkam  
Chengalpattu Taluk,  
Chengalpattu District.

...Petitioner/Accused

**// Vs //**

State: Represented by  
The Sub Inspector of Police,  
Oragadam Police Station,  
Kancheepuram District.  
Cr.No.40/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition came up before me for hearing today in the presence of counsels M/s. B.Hariharan, D. Kaviyarasu, appearing for the petitioner/Accused and Thiru. E.L.Kannan, the Public Prosecutor for the respondent/Prosecution, on perusal of reply submitted by Prosecution and upon hearing the arguments from the counsels on both side, upon perusing the entire records of the case, this Court passed the following:-

**ORDER**

The petitioner who was arrested on 01.03.2026 for commission of alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 351(3), 75(2) of

BNS @ Sec. 4 of TNPHW Act, 296(b), 351(3), 75(2) of BNS has filed the present petition seeking Bail under s.483 of the BNSS, 2023.

The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused has filed the present bail application on the ground that no offence as stated by the prosecution has taken place and a false case has been foisted upon him. He would state that the petitioner/accused was not arrested in the place of occurrence as stated in the remand report. He would state that the petitioner/accused arrested from his house. He is also produced the CCTV and Pen drive before this court in order to show the same. He would state that the petitioner/accused has been implicated based on the past offence registered against him. On these grounds he would pray for grant of bail.

The learned Public Prosecutor on behalf of the respondent police would strongly oppose for the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner/accused is said to have given lift to the defacto complainant on 10.02.2026 at about 7.45 a.m. and to drop her the bus stand. However, at knife point he has misbehaved and sexually harassed the defacto complainant due to which the present case came to be registered. He would state that there are previous cases of similar nature pending against the petitioner/accused herein and that the investigation is still pending. On these grounds he would strongly oppose for grant of bail.

Heard the parties concerned and perused the relevant records. Upon

persual of records, it is seen that the petitioner/accused is in custody since 01.03.2026. There are three previous cases pending against the petitioner/accused herein which are registered in the year 2022. It is seen that the petitioner/accused has been in custody for more than twenty days as on date. The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused would state that he is ready to co-operate with the investigation agency. Though the offences of serious nature , considering the period of incarceration and the material part of the investigation might have been completed by now. Hence, considering the facts and circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail on condition.

Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate,Sriperumbudur and on further condition that

- (a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate concerned may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to confirm their identity.
- (b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police on everyday at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.
- (c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence/hamper investigation and shall not influence the witness(es) in any manner either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, the prosecution shall be at liberty to register a fresh FIR under Section 269 of BNS.

//This order has been dictated by me to the Stenographer, typed by her in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Court on this Tuesday the 24th day of March 2026.//

Sd./- Deepthi Arivunithi  
Principal District and Sessions Judge,  
Principal District and Sessions Court,  
Kancheepuram.

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur
2. The Sub Inspector of Police, Oragadam Police Station
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal
4. The Public Prosecutor.
5. The Counsel for petitioner.

// True copy//



