

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHILA COURT, PERAMBALUR.**

**Present: Tmt.P. Indhirani, B.L.,  
Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court,  
Perambalur.**

**Tuesday, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026**

**Crl.M.P.No.259/2026.**

**IN**

**Spl.S.C.No.12/2026**

Muthu, Aged 52/2026,  
S/o.Kuppusamy.

... Petitioner/Accused

-vs-

State Rep. by  
Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station,  
Perambalur.  
Cr.No.67/2025.

... Respondent/Complainant.

offences punishable u/s. 5(n), 5(l), 5(j)(ii), 6 of POCSO Act and 296(b),  
115(2), 351(2) of BNS Act.

\* \* \* \* \*

This petition coming on this day before me for order in the presence of Thiru. T. Senthil counsel for the petitioner and of the Special Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides, perusing the petition and other relevant records, this Court has delivered the following...

**ORDER**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner to release on bail u/S.483 of BNSS for the offences punishable u/s.5(n), 5(l), 5(j)(ii), 6 of POCSO Act and 296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS Act on the file of the respondent.

1. On service of notice through Investigation officer, the defacto complainant was present and her written objection and she stated that she has no objection to release the accused on bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner argued that alleged occurrence took place on 03.09.2021 and the FIR was registered on 15.12.2025 and the accused is remanded

on 16.12.2025 and he is not committed an such offece and he is falsely implicated in the above case and the victim girl, the daughter of the accused, used to chat with many men on WhatsApp and Instagram using the accused's cell phone number 7305187746 when she was studying in 10th standard and when the accused's son Sanjeevan saw this and reprimanded the victim girl, he said that he would not do anything to her anymore and that a boy studying in Arumbavur called the accused's cell number on the above cell phone number and said that he had come alone at night. Hearing this, Sanjeevan beat the person who called the victim girl, and the police officers who had filed a complaint against Sanjeevan at the Arumbavur police station came to her house and took her away. Therefore, the accused said that the victim girl should not go to school anymore, he will buy you a goat and a cow, and he reprimanded the victim girl by snatching her cell phone and saying that she had been angry with her father for the past few months. Due to the previous enmity, the victim girl filed a false complaint against the accused and he is in judicial custody for past 77 days and the charge sheet filed and that the earlier bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.183/2026 dated 24.02.2026 and this case was taken on the file in Spl.S.C.No.12/2026 and the hearing date on 16.03.2026 and no similar petition filed Hon'be High Court, Chennai.

3. The Special Public Prosecutor submitted IO reply and stated that that the accused arrested and in judicial custody and that the final report has been prepared and if he released on bail he will threaten the victim and victim mother and victim brother and tamper the witnesses and the learned Public Prosecutor has made an endorsement to the effect that in this case, that the accused is the father of the victim and accused is released on bail he will commit the same offence and he strongly objected to release the accused on bail.

4. Both sides heard. Records perused. Considering the age of the victim girl and alleged offence u/s. 5(n), 5(l), 5(j)(ii), 6 of POCSO Act and 296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS Act against the accused. On perusal of records and as per the objections made by learned Special Public Prosecutor and IO, it came to know that the investigation is pending. But IO has filed charge sheet even on 27.01.2026 and

the same was taken onfile on 27.01.2026 in Spl.S.C.12/2012 and the stage of this case is for production of L.W.2 victim and L.W.1 DFC which shows that IO's reply is not related to the fact of this case and hence the objection of IO has to be ignored. Considered the period of remand of this petitioner and the earlier bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.183/2026 dated 24.02.2026 this Court considered that the alleged offences are grave in nature thereby the petitioner may be released on bail with following stringent conditions as follows:-

(a) that the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousands only) with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of this Court and one of the surety should be a blood related person or parents

(b) that the petitioner shall appear before this Court, daily once at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner should produce proof for his permanent address.

(d) that the petitioner shall not threaten the victim or their family and that the petitioner shall not tamper the witnesses

(e) that the petitioner shall not hamper the investigation.

(f) that the petitioner should not leave India without intimation to this Court.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court, Perambalur