

**IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
SALEM.**

Present : Tmt.S.Sumathy, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Salem.

Monday, this the 23rd day of March, 2026.

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION No. 733/2026
(CNR.No.TNSA010014592026)

G. Venkatesh (21),
S/o. Govindan

... Petitioner/Accused

/Versus/

State by: The Inspector of Police,
Yercaud P.S.
Cr.No. 269/2025.

... Respondent/Complainant

This petition is filed on 17.03.2026 u/s.483 of BNSS, to grant bail to the petitioner.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Tr.J.Baskar, Counsel for the petitioner and the Public Prosecutor for the respondent, after perusing the averments, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

Heard both side and records perused. The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.269/2025 of Yercaud P.S. The petitioner who was remanded to judicial custody on 30.12.2025 for the alleged offences punishable u/sec.Woman missing altered into section 103(1) and 238(a) of BNS, has come forward with this petition seeking to release him on bail.

2) The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is

working as a lorry driver; his wife's name is Sumathi; the defacto complainant live in the same house with his wife and his parents; on 23.12.2025, when the complainant was working in Vellimalai near Karumandurai, at around 7.00 p.m., his brother contacted him on his supervisor phone and informed him that his parents had gone to work as usual in the morning and returned home at around 4.00 p.m., and that his wife was missing from the house at that time, and when the complainant called his wife's number, her phone was switched off, and even after searching the neighbourhood, they did not know where she had gone; on 24.12.2025, the complainant came to Maramangalam and searched for his wife in the neighbourhood and inquired with his wife's relatives, but he did not know where his wife had gone; in this situation, on 26.12.2025, the petitioner gave the thali worn by the defacto complainant's wife to the Government bus driver who was coming to Maramangalam and in turn he gave it to one Govindaraj, who runs a petty shop at Maramangalam bus stop, he in turn gave it to the defacto complainant. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent/police. During the investigation, the respondent/police found that the petitioner is the cause for the death of the deceased. Hence, the case.

3) The learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence and he is falsely implicated in this

case and for the past 84 days, he is in judicial custody and prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

4) On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor has reiterated the facts of the case and submitted that initially the case was registered under woman missing, subsequently the section was altered to section 103(1) and 238(a) of BNS; during the investigation, it was revealed that there was illegal intimacy between the deceased and the petitioner, subsequently, due to a dispute arose between them, on the alleged date of occurrence, the petitioner murdered her by strangulating her neck by a shawl. He also submitted that the offence is grave in nature, the investigation is pending and hence he strongly objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

5) In the stated circumstances, considering the facts of the case, the submissions made by both side and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that it is not an appropriate time to enlarge the petitioner on bail and this petition deserves a dismissal.

6) In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 23rd day of March, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Salem.