

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

PRESENT:Tmt. S. Mohanakumari, M.A., B.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Principal District & Sessions Court,(FAC)
Kancheepuram.

Thursday the 12th day of March 2026

CrI.M.P.No.519/2026

Peddakota Sridevi, aged 37
W/o.Peddakota Bucci Babu
Padali, Hiramandalam Srikakulam,
Andhrapradesh.

...Petitioner/Accused

// Vs //

State: Represented by
The Special Sub Inspector of Police,
Sriperumbudur Police Station,
Kancheepuram District.

Cr.No. 113/2026

... Respondent/Complainant

This petition came up before me for hearing today in the presence of counsels M/s. D. Suriya, S. Sabarinathan, K. Santhanakrishnan, R. Pandiyan, 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 04.03.2026 for commission of alleged offences under Sections 274, 275,123 of BNS r/w 6, 24(1) of TOBACCO ACT has filed the present petition seeking Bail under section.483 of the BNSS, 2023.

The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused would state a false case has been foisted upon the petitioner/accused. He would point out that the petitioner/accused was arrested on 04.03.2026 and she is in custody till date. He would state that no previous case pending against the petitioner/accused herein. He

would point out that the petitioner/accused is a lady and having two children. On these grounds he would pray for grant of bail.

The learned public prosecutor would strongly oppose for the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner/accused was found in possession of Banned Gutka Products. He would state that 152 kgs worth of Banned Tobacco products were seized from the petitioner/accused herein. However, he would point out that there are one previous case pending against the petitioner/accused herein. He would state that the investigation is still pending. Further, he would state that the petitioner/accused is a North Indian, if she enlarged on bail likely to abscond. On these grounds he would oppose for grant of bail.

Heard the parties concerned and perused the relevant records. In this case, considering the nature of the accusation and the quantity of products involved and the pending stage of investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail. Hence, the bail application is dismissed.

In the result, this petition is dismissed.

//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 Thursday the 12th day of March 2026.//

Sd./- S. Mohanakumari
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Principal District and Sessions Court, (FAC)
Kancheepuram.