

**IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KANGAYAM**

**PRESENT : Miss. D. Thenmozhi, B.A., B.L., L.L.M.,**

Judicial Magistrate, Kangeyam

**Dated : Monday, the 09<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026,**

**E.Cr.I.M.P.No: 107/2026**

**in**

**Crime No: 04 of 2026 Kangeyam AWPS.,**

Saravanakumar,  
S/o. Sakthivel,

...Petitioner/Accused

/Vs/

State Rep. By

The Inspector of Police,

Kangeyam AWPS,

Cr.No. 04 of 2026,

U/s. 77, 79, 351(3)BNS

... Respondent/Complainant

This petition has come up on 09.03.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Adv.R. Madhesh B.A.,LL.B., learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and the Learned APP for the respondent and upon hearing both side and upon perusal of the records, this court delivers the following:

**ORDER**

The petition is filed by the petitioner/Accused for bail of the offences U/s. 77, 79, 351(3)BNS

2. The accused was remanded to judicial custody on 18.02.2026 and continues to be in custody till date. The petitioner/accused had submitted a bail application on 02.03.2026. The petitioner/accused had previously filed a bail petition before this Hon'ble Court (CrImp. No. 89/2026), which was dismissed by

an order dated 23.02.2026. This is the second bail petition. In this petition, the petitioner/accused states that he is an innocent person and has not committed any offence as alleged by the complainant. The petitioner/accused is a law-abiding citizen and assures that he will not abscond from his residence or tamper with any witnesses. The petitioner/accused is not likely to abscond or interfere with the investigation. He is also ready to furnish substantial sureties, should he be granted bail. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner/accused be released on bail.

3) In this petition reply is received from the prosecution. In reply the prosecution has strongly objected to enlarge the accused on bail by stating that the petitioner/accused is a habitual offender where he may be abscond. Also it was objected by the prosecution that the petitioner/accused might involve in the commission of similar type of offences. Hence strongly objected to enlarge the petitioner/accused on bail.

4) The defacto complainant has filed the present intervention petition opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner/accused. It is contended that the allegations are serious in nature and that release of the accused on bail would prejudice the investigation and may result in intimidation of witnesses and tampering with evidence.

5) Heard both side. Records perused it is the case of the petitioner/accused that he is in judicial custody. Since 18.02.2026 thus the

accused is in judicial custody. Learned APP objected this bail application on the ground and if the accused released on bail he may be abscond and causing. The same offences repeatedly and causing loss to the society and produce the accused is difficult and investigation also pending.

6) However, this court also takes notes of the apprehension of the prosecution that the accused will tamper evidence, and commit similar offence. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence alleged against the accused being heinous and non bailable. The possibility of the accused to commit similar type of offences causing threat to the peace and security of the society. The likelihood of the accused tamper the evidence and abscond from trial. The period of custody, the need of the accused for investigation and trial this court is not inclined to enlarge the accused on bail and this bail application deserves he more is accordingly this petition is dismissed.

**In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.**

This order is pronounced in open Court on this 09<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.

Judicial Magistrate,  
Kangayam.