

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE.NO.II, SANKARI

Present : Thiru. D. Sivakumar, B.Sc., M.I.B., L.L.B., P.G.D.C.A.,

Judicial Magistrate.No.II, Sankari.

Saturday the 06th day of June 2026

Crl.M.P.No. 161/2026

in

Cr.No. 133/2026 of Magudanchavadi Police Station

1. Aravinth (aged about 27 years),
S/o. Kulanthaivel,
8/1657A, Thirunagar,
Neruperichal,
Tiruppur north taluk,
Tiruppur.

... Petitioner / Accused no.1

2. Pandiyan (aged about 25 years),
S/o. Ramesh,
3/127(1), Serapattu mani road,
Luckynayakkanpatti,
Vanapuram taluk,
Kallakurichi.

... Petitioner / Accused no.2

...Vs...

State of Tamil Nadu Rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
Magudanchavadi Police Station.
Cr.No.133/2026.

..Respondent / Complainant

ORDER

1). The Petitioners / accused no.1 and 2 has filed this bail application under section 480 of B.N.S.S for the alleged offence U/s. 304(2) of B.N.S. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners / accused no.1 and 2 stated that, the accused no.1 and 2 were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2026 the accused no.1 and 2 have not committed the offence and they will not abscond. If the accused no.1 and 2 are enlarged on bail they are ready and willing to abide by any condition imposed by this Court. Hence, the present petition for bail.

2). The Respondent / Police, had filed their objections stating that, the accused no.1 is a habitual offender and he has been implicated in nine criminal cases and the accused no.2 has no previous criminal case and they may commit similar kind

of offences. If the bail petition is allowed they also may abscond and may not cooperate with the trial of the case and may threaten the witnesses. Hence, the Respondent / Police Strongly objected to enlarge the petitioners / accused no.1 and 2 on bail.

3). Heard through video conferencing. Records perused. On perusal of records, it is learnt that, the petitioners / accused no.1 and 2 were remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2026 for the alleged offence U/s.304(2) of B.N.S. Accused no.1 and 2 have been allegedly involved in snatching gold chain from the Victim / Defecto Complainant. The accused no.1 and 2 being in custody for the past 15 days, the respondent / Police has not filed any final report in this case. It is pertinent to state that the investigation of the case has not been completed and the Respondent / Police has not filed any application to take the custody of the accused no.1 and 2 for investigation purpose. As per records furnished by the Respondent / Police, it is learnt that the accused no.1 has been implicated in nine criminal cases and accused no.2 has no previous criminal case as on 04.06.2026.

4). This Court is of the view that there are chances that the accused no.1 and 2 may abscond and may involve in similar kind of offences if they are enlarged on bail. Hence, this Court is satisfied with the objection filed by the Respondent / Police that the petitioners / Accused no.1 and 2 should not be granted bail at this stage. Thus, the petition has no merits and is liable to be dismissed.

5). Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the present bail petition is dismissed accordingly.

Directly dictated to the typist, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, this 06th day of June 2026.

Judicial Magistrate No.II,
Sankari.

Copy to:

1.The Superintendent, Sub Jail, Sankari.

Order uploaded online on : 06.06.2026.