

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
PERAMBALUR, STATE OF TAMILNADU.

Present: Thiru.V.Padmanabhan, M.A., M.L., D.H.,  
Principal District and Sessions Judge.

Monday, this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026

Crl.M.P.No.260/2026 and Crl.M.P.No.271/2026

(CNR.Nos.TNPB01-000417-2026 and TNPB01-000444-2026)

Crl.M.P.No.260/2026

Santha @ Chandira, 56/2026, (A2),  
W/o. Seeralan.

...Petitioner/Accused.

-vs-

State Rep. by  
the Inspector of Police,  
Kaikalathur P.S.  
In Cr.No.22/2026.

... Respondent/Complainant.

Crl.M.P.No.271/2026

Rajendiran, 44/2026,  
S/o. Nadrajan.

...Petitioner/Intervener.

-vs-

State Rep. by  
the Inspector of police,  
Kaikalathur P.S.  
In Cr. No.22/2026.

... Respondent/Complainant.

Santha @ Chandira.

...Petitioner/Accused.

Petition in Crl.M.P.No.260/2026 dated 04.03.2026 through e-filed U/s.483 of BNSS for seeks bail to the petitioner.

Petition in Crl.M.P.No.271/2026 dated 07.03.2026 for praying for permission to intervene in the bail petition.

This petition coming on this day before me for order in the presence of Thiruvallargal.R. Kannan and D. Arunkumar, Advocates for the petitioner, Thiruvallargal.R.D. Rajavel and A.J. Aruljayan, Advocates for intervener and the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides, this Court has delivered the following...

**ORDER**

Crl.M.P.No.271/2026 filed by the intervener seeking permission to assist the Public Prosecutor is allowed and permission granted.

This petitioner/accused in Crl.M.P.No.260/2026 seeks bail for the alleged offences U/S.296(b), 115(2), 74 and 351(3) of BNS @ 296(b), 115(2), 74, 351(3) and 108 of BNS and Sec. 4 of TNPHW Act.

2. The prosecution case is that civil dispute is pending between the deceased defacto complainant's family and the accused persons. Keeping the same in mind, on 02.02.2026, at about 7.30 a.m., A1 started to cut the tamarind tree in the disputed land. The deceased defacto complainant and her mother went there. When the defacto complainant started to take photo, immediately A1 used filthy language towards her and also snatched the cell phone. He also pushed down her mother and attacked with wooden log on her back. When the defacto complainant interfered, A1 pulled her hair and kicked her and pushed on the earth. At that time, A2 and A3 also uttered obscene words towards her. Both A1 and A2 attacked her and also tore her dress in public view. Further, A1 and A2 by showing wooden log issued death threat. Both the deceased defacto complainant and her mother felt ashamed and on returning to the home, both consumed pesticide and thereafter on 04.02.2026 both died while taking treatment.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused would submit that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 03.02.2026; the petitioner is arrayed as A2; there was only a civil dispute between the defacto complainant's family and the petitioner and false complaint was preferred; that civil suit is pending before the Court; counter case is registered against the defacto complainant's family members; the petitioner also admitted in the hospital after the incident, but no FIR was registered; as per dictum laid by

our Hon'ble Apex Court, if an aged woman who is in sick, she should be released on bail and there was no intention to abet the deceased persons to commit suicide; the petitioner is suffering from health ailments and that she may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor argued that due to previous civil dispute when the A1 was trying to cut the tree in the disputed place, the deceased persons came there and when the defacto complainant started to take photos, immediately all the accused persons uttered filthy languages towards them and attacked them with wooden log and kicked them and tore the defacto complainant's dress in the public place for which she felt ashamed and thereby the accused abetted to commit suicide; that investigation is not completed; there is no change of circumstances; if the petitioner is released on bail, she will abscond and that the petition may be dismissed.

5. It is specifically contended on intervenor side that in the public place the accused persons committed the offence against the woman folk and also tore her dress; the deceased also gave dying declaration before the death by stating cause for the incident; the defacto complainant is not a sensitive person, she has studied B.E. and that petition may be dismissed.

6. Upon hearing both side arguments and as per FIR averments, it is seen that at that time of alleged incident the petitioner along with co-accused persons due to previous enmity not only assaulted the deceased persons, but also tore her dress for which they felt ashamed and thereby instigated them to commit suicide by consuming pesticide. After dismissal of the earlier bail application, there is no change of circumstances.

Considering the nature of offence and manner in which it was allegedly committed, serious objections of the prosecution side, stage of

investigation and in the interest of justice, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court, this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

Principal District & Sessions Judge,  
Perambalur.