

TNMD010017872026



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Present : Thiru. S. SIVAKADATCHAM, B.Sc., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Thursday, this the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

CrI.M.P.No.1083/2026

CNR No.TNMD010017872026

Yuvannaahul, S/o.Ashokan

... Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,

High Court P.S. in Cr.No.02/2026

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.A.K.Azagarsami, Advocate for the petitioner and of Public Prosecutor for the State, this court passed the following:

**Order**

1. Bail application u/s 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

2. Heard both sides.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused would submit that the respondent police has registered a case in Crime No.2/2026 for the offences u/s 331(3) and 305 of BNS and 66(C) and 66(D) of I.T. Act against the petitioner. The respondent police arrested the petitioner and remanded to judicial custody on 17.02.2026 and is in custody for the past 23 days. The petitioner is a student of IV Year Law, studying in School of Excellence, Chennai. First of all, the occurrence should not have taken place. The petitioner has been suffering from mental depression and undergoing treatment for the same. Even after arrest, the petitioner took treatment at jail hospital for 7 days. The petitioner's father is now suffering from heart ailment, he is undergoing treatment and the petitioner has to take care of him. The petitioner has to prepare for the Semester examinations, which are scheduled to be held in the month of April, 2026. Case properties are recovered. Investigation is almost over. There is no chance for tampering the evidence. Further

custodial interrogation of petitioner is not required. The petitioner has not filed similar petition before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court or any other court. The petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this Court and prayed to allow the petition.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that it is a case of single accused, who is the petitioner herein. As per the case of the prosecution, the defacto-complainant is the Office Assistant in Madurai Bench of Madras High Court. On 16.02.2026 the defacto-complainant connected the Apple ipad of the Hon'ble Judge with charger and involved in her work. Between 12.50 p.m. and 02.30 p.m., the petitioner has criminally trespassed into the Chamber of the Hon'ble Judge and stolen the Apple ipad. The petitioner was identified through CCTV footage. Hence the complaint. The petitioner has given confession statement admitting the commission of offence and he also confessed that during the month of December, 2025, he has stolen a laptop from Court Hall No.9 of Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and sold the same to one Manikandan, shop No.221 of Meenakshi Bazaar. Both properties were recovered. The petitioner took treatment at jail hospital for giddiness problem and not for mental depression as stated on the side of petitioner. Investigation is pending and objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioner/accused are u/s 331(3) and 305 of BNS and 66(C) and 66(D) of I.T. Act. The occurrence is said to have taken place on 16.02.2026. As per prosecution, the petitioner/accused criminally trespassed into the Chamber of the Hon'ble Judge in the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stolen the Apple ipad.

6. It is the case of petitioner/accused that first of all, the occurrence should not have taken place, that the petitioner is a student of IV Year Law, studying in School of Excellence, Chennai, that the petitioner has been suffering from mental depression and undergoing treatment for the same and that even after arrest, the petitioner took treatment at jail hospital for 7 days. He further contended that the

petitioner's father is now suffering from heart ailment, he is undergoing treatment and the petitioner has to take care of him and that the petitioner has to prepare for the Semester examinations, which are scheduled to be held in the month of April, 2026. It is further contended that case properties are recovered, investigation is almost over, there is no chance for tampering the evidence, further custodial interrogation of petitioner is not required and prayed to consider his remand period.

7. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor strongly objected stating that the petitioner has given confession statement admitting the present occurrence and he also confessed that during the month of December, 2025, he has stolen a laptop from Court Hall No.9 of Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and sold the same to one Manikandan, shop No.221 of Meenakshi Bazaar. It is further contended that after arrest, on 17.02.2026, the petitioner was produced before the concerned Medical Officer, who certified that the petitioner has "Nil Specific Complaints". Further, the petitioner was taken on police custody on 26.02.2026, he was subjected to medical examination and the concerned Medical Officer has also certified that the petitioner has "Nil Specific Complaints" and that the petitioner took treatment at jail hospital for a week for giddiness problem and not for mental depression and he strongly objected the arguments advanced on the side of petitioner with regard to the mental depression of the petitioner. In support of the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner regarding the petitioner's mental depression/illness, no document is produced.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor vehemently objected stating that the petitioner has stolen ipad from the Chamber of the Hon'ble Judge in the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and also a laptop from Court Hall No.9, which should not be taken lightly and that it is to be further investigated whether any other properties were stolen by the petitioner/accused in the same premises. The petitioner/accused is in custody only for 24 days. Material part of investigation has not been completed. Though stolen properties are recovered, considering the seriousness of offences, the pending stage of investigation and the strong

objections placed on the side of prosecution, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage and accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

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

Principal Sessions Judge,  
Madurai

**Copy to :** The J.M.No.6., Madurai.