

In the court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Tiruppur.

Present: Thiru. N.Muralidharan, B.A., B.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge, Tiruppur.

Wednesday, the 9th day of September, 2026

Cr.M.P. No.1777 / 2026 (CNR No.TNTI18 003808 2026)

1. Udhayakumar aged 22 years
S/o.Radhakrishnan

2. Ajay Anbarasu, aged 29 years
S/o. Micheal Amirtha Pani ... Petitioners / Accused
.Vs.

State of Tamilnadu Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Avinashipalayam Police Station,
Tiruppur.
(Cr.No.163/2026)

... Respondent/Complainant

This petition came for hearing on this day in the presence of Thiru. S.Martin, Counsel for the petitioners and Thiru.A.Sachignanandakumar, Public Prosecutor for the State / respondent, after hearing both sides and on perusing the reply submitted by the respondent in writing and the records, this Court delivers the following:

ORDER

The Petitioners have filed the application U/s.483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking bail for the offence u/s.304 of BNS in Cr.No.163/2026 of the respondent police.

Dated:09.09.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Tiruppur

It is the case of the prosecution that, on the date of occurrence, the petitioners threatened the defacto complainant, snatched his cell phone, got his G pay password and transferred a sum of Rs.52,000/- in total from his two accounts to someone's account and the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 10.08.2026.

The learned petitioner Counsel argued that, there is no mention in the complaint as to whom the amount was transferred from the account of the defacto complainant, the petitioner has no chance to go to the occurrence place at the time of occurrence as claimed by the prosecution and so the petitioner may be granted bail.

The learned Public Prosecutor per contra argued that, a call log report of the petitioners reveals that they were present in the place of occurrence at the time of occurrence, bank statement was also produced to show that the amount was transferred to the friend of the petitioners and then transferred to their account and so, he has strong objection in granting bail to the petitioner.

The above rival contention of both sides are considered and records are perused. The offence involved in this case is u/s.304 of BNS. The case of the prosecution is that on 11.05.2026 at 08.20 p. m., these petitioners threatened to do away with the defacto complainant and snatched cellphone and also had further threatened the defacto complainant to tell the passwords of two bank account linked with G-Pay and had transferred Rs.20,000/- and another Rs.32,000/- and the contention of the learned petitioner counsel that the first petitioner was not present at the place of

occurrence is not acceptable, since as per the contention of the learned public prosecutor call details record establishes the presense of the first petitioner in the place of occurrence and further as per contention of the learned public prosecutor both the said amounts were in turn credited back to the accounts of the petitioners and so the offence is very serious in nature and investigation is pending and so at the investigation stage of this case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

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

Dictated to the steno-typist, typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me and uploaded in Case Information System on this 9th day of September, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Tiruppur.

Copy to:

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court, Palladam.
2. The Public Prosecutor, Tiruppur.
3. The Inspector of Police, Avinashipalayam Police Station, Tiruppur.
4. Counsel for the Petitioners.
5. The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Tiruppur.
through e-mail.