

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

Present: Dr.L.S.Sathiyamurthy, M.A., M.L., Ph.D.,
Principal District & Sessions Judge, Perambalur.

Friday, this the 5th day of June, 2026.

Crl.M.P.No.506/2026

(CNR.No.TNPB00-000861-2026)

1. Perumal, 52/2026, (A1),
S/o.Pichai.

2. Elavarasan, 51/2026, (A2),
S/o.Vellaiyan.

... Petitioners/Accused.

-vs-

State Rep by
the Inspector of Police,
Perambalur P.S.,
in Cr.No.254/2026.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This is a petition U/S.482 of BNSS filed through online/e-filing mode for pre-arrest bail.

This petition came up today before this Court in the presence of Thiruvalargal.M.Selvarasu and M.Nesa Manohar, Advocates for the petitioners and Thiru.P.Senthilnathan, the Public Prosecutor for the State and after careful consideration of the materials available on record and upon the submissions made on behalf of the parties, this Court has delivered the following...

ORDER

The petitioners/accused persons prayed for anticipatory bail as a case has been registered against them for the alleged offences punishable U/S. 296(b), 74 and 138 of BNS.

2. Heard, the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners/accused submitted that the petitioners have not involved in this case as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioners are innocent persons. There was a family dispute between the parties and false complaint was preferred. A1 is a father of the defacto complainant and A2 is a friend of A1. Nobody is hospitalized. Co-accused were already released on bail. This is a 3rd anticipatory bail application and that if they are released on anticipatory bail they will abide by the conditions of this Court and that they may be released on anticipatory bail.


4. The learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed stating that due to family dispute between the A1 and the defacto complainant's mother. A2 is a friend of A1. As per the case of the prosecution that, A1 and his wife had a dispute over the money he earned at abroad and sent to her. But, his wife left him and started to live with her daughter namely the defacto complainant. On 27.04.2026 at about 8.30 p.m., when the defacto complainant was not at home, A1 came to the house along with other accused persons and used obscene words towards his wife and outraged her modesty and forcibly kidnapped in a car, which was driven by A4. Investigation is pending. There is no change of circumstances and that if they are released on anticipatory bail, they will abscond, they will tamper the witnesses and that the petitions may be dismissed.

5. This Court carefully considered the submissions made by either side. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police in the case registered against them in Cr.No.254/2026 and filed this application for pre arrest bail. The first petitioner is none other than the husband of the person who has allegedly kidnapped the victim woman and the 2nd petitioner is his friend. The defacto complainant is the daughter of A1 and the victim woman. The owner and driver of the vehicle which is used for the purpose of

kidnapping have already enlarged on bail and also on anticipatory bail respectively, but considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is finds that the complaint was lodged on the basis of CCTV footage, which reveals the involvement of the petitioners and kidnapping of one Selvarani. Investigation is in preliminary stage and the presence of the petitioners are necessary for the purpose of completion of the investigation at the case. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage.

5. In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court, this the 5th day of June, 2026.


Principal District & Sessions Judge, 5/6/26
Perambalur.

