

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE AT TIRUVALLUR**

**Present: Dr. J. JULIET PUSHPA, Ph.D. (Law)**

Principal District and Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur

**Thursday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March , 2026**

**CrI.M.P.No:762/2026**

Balaji, S/o Gunaseelan,

...Petitioner/Accused

**//Versus//**

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,  
Podhaturpet Police station  
(Crime No: 203/2025)

.....Respondent/Complainant

**Petition dated: 20.02.2026 u/s 483 of BNSS praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail**

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s R. Fathima, Shaikh Mehrunisa, T. Pradeep, the respondent police through the Public Prosecutor, and upon hearing the arguments of both sides, perusing the reply of the Public Prosecutor for the State/Respondent and perusing the records and material and hearing both sides, this court made the following:-

**ORDER**

Heard arguments of both side. Records perused. Petition filed u/s 483 of BNSS seeking to release the petitioner who was remanded on 20.12.2025 in Crime No.203/2025 on the file of Podhaturpet police station registered for the offence u/s 194 of BNSS @0020103(1), 238 of BNS r/w 61(2) of BNS

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent and he is no way connected with the alleged offence, the petitioner is arrayed A1, who is no way connected with the alleged offence, only since he is known to A4 and A5 who are the sons of the deceased, the petitioner has been falsely implicated as A1. He had no knowledge about the alleged commission of offence by other accused, The petitioner is completely not aware any of the details of the alleged conspirators in commission of offence, the petitioner was arrested only based on the confession of the co-accused on 20.12.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 83 days, this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> bail petition, petitioner is ready to cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition, therefore prayed for granting the bail.

Notice given to concerned police and reply received. The learned Public prosecutor argued that the defacto complainant is A5 in this case who is the son of the deceased in this case. The deceased Ganesan was working in the Government school at Podhaturpet and on 17.09.2025, he met with an accident at Manavala Nagar, and thereafter undergone surgery and was bedridden and was under medical treatment in his house on 22.10.2025, at about 5.30 AM, a snake was bitten , he was admitted in hospital he was pronounce dead, based on the complaint FIR was registered in Crime No.203/2025 u/s 194 of bnss, thereafter, during the course of investigation on 30.11.2025 , enquiring the wife of the deceased, she suspected the elder son, thereupon, on investigating the call details, on 21.10.2025 to 22.10.2025, he talked to some accused persons, and on 19.12.2025, enquiring the accused, the accused, who are the sons of the deceased admitted that they had murdered their father for getting the death benefit of his father and also insurance amount and Government job, thus, by snake bite by engaging other accused including the petitioner/A1 in this case, committed the murder, thus, section was altered to 103 (1), 238, 61(2) of BNS and the investigation is pending. The petitioner was arrested on 20.12.2025 and cellphone was seized, and the investigation is pending.

The petitioner states in this petition that there is no similar bail petition is pending before any other Court including Hon'ble High Court, Madras and the respondent has also not stated as to pending of any bail petition before Hon'ble High Court, Madras in this case. Hence, this Court considers that there is no impediment to entertain this petition and pass orders on merits.

Though the counsel for the petitioner argued that there is no overtact as against the petitioner, only the investigation will reveal the same, which is pending in preliminary stage. As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, investigation is still pending the alleged offence is serious in nature.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) grave nature of offence
- (ii) investigation is still pending
- (iii) premature stage
- (iv) serious accusation of offence as against the petitioners u/s 103 (1) of BNS
- (v) there is no change in circumstances,
- (v) and also considering other facts and circumstances,

this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,  
Tiruvallur**

**Copy to**

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s R. Fathima,  
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State  
The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Pallipattu  
The Inspector of police, Podhaturpet police Station  
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai