

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

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

Wednesday the 1st day of April 2026

Crl.M.P.No.614/2026

Prasanna, aged about 23 years,
S/o. Krishnan,
No.3/169, Middle Street,
Manampathy Village
Uthiramerur Taluk.

...Petitioner/Accused

// Vs //

State: Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Perunagar Police Station
Kancheepuram District.
Cr.No.59/2025

. . . Respondent/Complainant

This petition came up before me for final hearing today which was filed by M/s G. Kumar, P. Vasudevan, Counsels appearing for the petitioner and the reply submitted by the police through Mr.E.L. Kannan, the Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent, upon hearing the arguments from the counsels on both sides, upon perusing the entire records of the case, this Court passed the following:-

ORDER

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for alleged offences under section 304(2) of BNS has filed the present petition seeking anticipatory bail.

The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused has filed the present anticipatory bail application on the ground that no offence as stated by the prosecution has taken place and that a false case has been foisted upon him. He would state that the co-accused namely A.1 and A.2 were enlarged on bail in Crl.M.P.No.122/2026 on 16.03.2026. On these grounds he would pray for grant of anticipatory bail.

The learned Public Prosecutor on behalf of the respondent police would strongly oppose to the grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the petitioner/accused along with the other co-accused are said to have snatched a chain of the defacto complainant who is old lady aged about 72 years. He would further state that the stolen chain has not been recovered by the respondent police till date and that the investigation is pending in a preliminary stage and on these grounds he would strongly oppose for grant of anticipatory bail.

Heard the parties concerned and perused the relevant records. Considering the nature of the accusation and the fact that the property has not been recovered, this court finds that the custodial interrogation may be necessary. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail. Hence the anticipatory 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 Wednesday the 1st day of April 2026.//

Sd./- Deepthi Arivunithi

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Principal District and Sessions Court ,
Kancheepuram

// True copy//