

IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I AT PERAMBALUR

Present: Tmt. V.C.Thaarini, B.A., B.L.(Hons), M.L.,
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Perambalur.

Wednesday, 3rd day of June 2026

Cr.M.P No.658/2026
(CNR.No.TNPB02-001700-2026)
&
Cr.M.P No.665/2026
(CNR.No.TNPB02-001724-2026)
In
Cr.No.7/2026

Ammulu, (35/2026)
D/o.Gunasekaran W/o.Sambath
Cr.M.P No.658/2026

... Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Perambalur.
Cr.No.7/2026

... Respondent/Complainant
&

Ajithkumar, (24/2026)
S/o.Sekar
Cr.M.P No.665/2026

... Intervener/Defacto Complainant

These petitions came up before me on 03.06.2026 for inquiry in the presence of Thiru.R.Gowtham, Learned Advocate appearing for Petitioner and Learned APP Gr-I appearing for State and Thiru.C.Karuppaiah, Learned Advocate appearing for Intervener and upon heard the both side arguments and perused the material available on records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivers the following,

COMMON ORDER

1. The application for bail in CrI.M.P.No.658 of 2026, filed under Section 480 of BNSS has been filed by the accused in Crime No.7 of 2026 under Sections 318(2) and 318(4) of BNS, on the file of the respondent police. The case of the prosecution is that the accused cheated the de-facto complainant by obtaining a huge sum of money for securing a job for him abroad and later failed to act as promised.

2. According to the counsel for the accused, the accused is innocent and is ready to offer adequate sureties. The prosecution strongly objected to the grant of bail by stating that the investigation is not over and that the other accused persons are yet to be arrested. The de-facto complainant filed a petition in CrI.M.P.No.665 of 2026, objecting to the grant of bail.

3.The counsel for the accused annexed documents along with the bail petition to show that the accused already withdrew a huge sum towards salary claim. Documents not marked as exhibit. The counsel further stated that the de-facto complainant did not perform his job properly and that he can not blame the accused persons for the loss incurred.

4. Heard and records perused. The accused was remanded to judicial custody on 09.05.2016. The investigation is not over. It is seen that the other accused person in the present case has not been arrested as yet. The other accused is none other than the husband of the petitioner. The counsel for the accused stated that he is presently in Singapore for his livelihood. The other accused, the husband of the petitioner, can not comfortably sit elsewhere when his name is involved in the case and when his wife is

in jail. The circumstances are glaringly suspicious. Hence this Court is not inclined to grant bail.

In the result, the petition in Crl.M.P.No.658 of 2026 stands dismissed and the petition in Crl.M.P.No.665 of 2026 stands allowed pertaining to the plea to reject the bail application. The plea to direct the accused to deposit the amount in the Court stands dismissed.

Dictated to Steno-Typist and typed by him in court computer and after taking print out and after carrying out corrections wherever necessary and pronounced by me on 3rd day of June 2026.

Judicial Magistrate No.I
Perambalur.