

BEFORE THE II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT,
ARAKKONAM, RANIPET DISTRICT.

Present: Tmt.K.S.Jayamangalam, M.L.,

II Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Arakkonam.

Thursday the 12th day of March 2026.

CrI.M.P.No.44/2026 in S.C.No.4/2026

M.G.Ramachandiran

S/o Ganapathy

No.2/48 Road Street,

Keezhveeram, Sholinghur Taluk.

...Petitioner/A2

/vs/

The State represented by

Inspector of Police,

Banavaram P.S.

Cr.No.179/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming before me for hearing today in the presence of Thiru.P.Jayasankar & R.Sitaraman Learned counsel for the Petitioner and the Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent and considering that after hearing both sides, this court delivered the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the 2nd accused filed this petition under section 483 of BNSS to enlarge him on bail.

2. Brief of petition:-

The petitioner is arrayed as A2 in the above case for the alleged offences u/s 126(2), 296(b), 103(1), 61(2) and 49 of BNS Act. The petitioner/A2 was remanded by the respondent police on 28.06.2025. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not identified during identification parade. The petitioner's mother-in-law died on 06.03.2026 and the co-accused A5 to A7 were already released on bail. The petitioner/A2 is innocent and he is ready to furnish solvent sureties as directed by this court.

3. Objections filed by the prosecution:-

The respondent/police filed a detailed report stating that the petitioner/A2 on 21.06.2025 at about 4.00 P.M when the deceased Balakrishnan was returning to his house in his two wheeler, the petitioner/A2 and the other three persons way laid him and murdered him. The deceased wife Vennila gave a complaint on that basis Cr.No.179/2025 was registered u/s 126(2), 296(b), 103(1), 61(2) and 49 of BNS Act. The A1 and his wife Kalaiselvi are living separately. The A1's wife Kalaiselvi is living along with her children at her mother's place and after coming to know about this the accused A5 Karthick and the villagers called A1 and his wife and tried to compromise between them. Thereafter A1 called A5 and

told that because of the deceased Balakrishnan his family was ruined therefore they have decided to do away the life of Balakrishnan and accordingly they sought the help from the petitioner/A2 namely M.G.Ramachandiran who had already involved in many murder cases through him they would kill the Balakrishnan for which A1 has spent Rs.20 Lakhs. The A1 has agreed to pay Rs.19 lakhs out of which Rs.10 Lakhs was handed over near the Purakoil, Banavaram and the balance Rs.9 lakhs was transferred to A5's account on 28.10.2024 and Rs.4 lakhs was transferred on 28.10.2024 and Rs.3 lakhs on 29.10.2024. Further on 03.04.2025 through the assistance of A1 namely Manju's account a sum of Rs.2 lakhs was transferred to A5's account thereby totally Rs.19 lakhs was transferred to the account of A5. The amount received from A1 by A5 was handed over to A2 Ramachandiran. The petitioner/A2 approached one Murugesan and Appu @ Aravind who are all the habitual offenders decided to do away the life of Balakrishnan. Accordingly, all the three persons joined together on 21.06.2025 at about 5.00 P.M while the deceased Balakrishnan was coming in his two wheeler after his avocation bearing Electric Bike No. TN 73 BZ 5406 white colour at that time the accused murdered him through the knife and informed the same to A5 and ran away from the scene of occurrence. The petitioner/A2 was arrested on 26.06.2025. On 19.09.2025 after completing the investigation the final report was laid and the case is posted to 13.03.2026 for engaging counsel by A3. The petitioner/A2 filed C.M.P.1439/2025 on 17.10.2025 and the same was dismissed. Thereafter, he moved CrI.O.P.29743/2025 and CrI.O.P.34488/2025 and CrI.O.P.No.5784/2026 before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras all these petitions were dismissed on 06.03.2026. While so, if the petitioner/A2 is

enlarged on bail the security for the de-facto complainant is doubtful and there are chances to create law and order issue and the petitioner/A2 would try to tamper the witnesses and the petitioner/A2 would abscond from the local jurisdiction of this court. Further more the petitioner/A2 is an habitual offender and committed many similar type of offences therefore the respondent's side vehemently opposed the present petition.

4. The Learned counsel for the petitioner/A2 has argued that the petitioner/A2 is an innocent and based on the confession of the co-accused he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner/A2 has not committed any offence. His mother-in-law was passed recently at that time he was in jail. The petitioner/A2 is ready to furnish solvent sureties hence prayed to allow the present Petition.

5. The Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has argued that the petitioner/A2 and co-accused alleged to have committed the offences u/s 126(2), 296(b), 103(1), 61(2) and 49 of BNS Act. As against the petitioner/A2 Non-Bailable Warrant was issued. Moreover the petitioner/A2 is an History Sheeted Rowdy. The A1 and his wife are living separately for which the A1 thought that the deceased Balakrishnan was the cause for him. Hence the A1 approached A5 through him he paid Rs.19 Lakhs to A2 and after receiving the said amount while the deceased was returning home in his two wheeler on 21.06.2025 at about 5.00 P.M the petitioner/A2 and one Appu @ Aravind and Murugesan attacked the deceased with the help of knife and after murdering him they ran away from the scene of occurrence. The petitioner/A2 was arrested on 26.06.2025 and sent to judicial custody. The bail application filed by the petitioner/A2 before the Hon'ble High

Court of Madras in CrI.O.P.No.5784/2026 was dismissed on 06.03.2026. If he is enlarged on bail there are chances to commit similar type of offences in future hence prayed to dismiss the above petition.

6. After hearing the arguments of both sides, the petitioner is arrayed as A2. There are totally 7 accused out of which the petitioner is arrayed as A2. The accused A1 to A4 are in judicial custody and the accused A5 to A7 are on bail. The case of the prosecution is that the accused joined together and murdered Balakrishnan thinking that because of him A1 and his wife are living separately. The A1 approached A5 through him Rs.19 Lakhs was paid to A2 to execute their plan. The A1 transferred a sum of Rs.19 Lakhs to the account of A5 on various dates. The said amount was handed over to A2. The A2 with the help of A3 and A4 murdered the deceased Balakrishnan on 21.06.2025 while he was returning home. The deceased wife Vennila gave a complaint and now they are facing the charges. The accused A1 to A4 have been in judicial custody and out of the 7 accused A5 to A7 alone were granted bail. The petitioner's side argued that A2 has been added as an accused in this case based on the confession of the co-accused. Except the confession statement no other material is available to connect the petitioner/A2 with the alleged crime. The petitioner/A2 is no way connected with the offence and he is ready to furnish solvent sureties to the satisfaction of this court. Hence, this petition may be ordered. The respondent's side vehemently opposed the bail application and argued that as against the petitioner/A2 already 3 cases are pending in Cr.No.132/2022 on the file of Banavaram P.S u/s 147, 148, 294(b), 342, 324, 307, 506(ii) r/w 34 of IPC, Cr.No.137/2022 on the file of the Banavaram P.S u/ss 364, 302, 201 IPC @

147, 148, 120(B), 364, 302, 201 IPC and 3(2)(vA) of SC/ST Act and Cr.No.23/2023 on the file of Andhra Pradesh Chinthapalli Police station under section NDPS Act. The case is posted for engaging counsel by A2 and A3. The A1 to A4 were produced on 22.01.2026 through Video-conferencing. A5 to A7 appeared in person at request of all the accused the case was adjourned to 05.02.2026. On 05.02.2026 again A1 to A4 were produced through Video-conferencing A5 to A7 present and for engaging counsel by the accused re-posted to 19.02.2026. On 19.02.2026, for A5, A6 and A7 Vakalath filed by their counsels and for engaging counsel by A2 to A4 adjourned to 05.03.2026. On 05.03.2026, A1 to A4 were produced through Video conferencing, A1 and A5 engaged their counsel, A5 to A7 appeared in person. Even after giving sufficient opportunities A2 and A3 sought time to engage their counsel. Considering their request the case is re-posted to 13.03.2026. This court has carefully gone through the material records placed by the prosecution. On perusal of the same, the petitioner/A2 has played a major role in executing their plan along with A3 and A4. The case is posted for engaging their counsel and already A1, A4 to A7 have engaged their counsel and A2 and A3 alone are yet to engage their counsel hence it stood adjourned to 13.03.2026. After engaging their counsels by A2 and A3 this court will hear both sides and charges will be framed as against the accused. Therefore, at this stage, if the petitioner/A2 is enlarged on bail he may not appear before this court and it is very difficult to secure him to proceed further. It is pertinent to note that the bail application filed by the petitioner/A2 before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras was dismissed on 06.03.2026 in CrI.M.P.5784/2026. It is alleged that the petitioner/A2 is an habitual offender and he has committed similar type of offences while so, if

he is released on bail there are every chance to commit the offences as alleged by the prosecution and Law and Order problem would arise. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/A2 at this stage, accordingly the present petition is dismissed.

In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Dictated by me to the Steno-Typist, typed by her directly to my dictation in computer and print taken out and corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 12th day of March 2026.

II Additional District & Sessions Judge,
Arakkonam.