

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

Tuesday, the 10th day of March , 2026

Crl.M.P.No:772/2026

1. Kannan, S/o Chinnaiyan
2. Santhi, W/o Chinnaiyan
3. Ranjith, S/o Chinnaiyan

...Petitioners/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Arambakkam Police station
(Crime No: 31/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 20.02.2026 u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s K. Aswin Balaji, 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 482 of BNSS seeking to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners who apprehend arrest in Crime No.31/2026 on the file of Arambakkam police station registered for the offence u/s 296(b) of BNS r/w 67 of IT Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that, petitioners are innocents, they have been falsely implicated in this case, there was dispute only since there was DP photo of the defacto complainant's daughter. This is the case in counter and there is no injury to anyone during the alleged occurrence, petitioners are all family members, the petitioners have no bad antecedents, this is the 2nd bail petition, now the matter has been compromised and they are only neighbours, petitioners are ready to cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition, therefore prayed for granting the anticipatory bail.

Notice given to concerned police and reply received. The learned Public prosecutor argued that there was quarrel between the defacto complainant and the accused persons herein, since the accused /3rd petitioner herein had morphed the photograph of the defacto complainant's daughter photo along with him and uploaded in the DP of the *whatsapp*, which erupted dispute between the two families and on the date of occurrence, since the marriage alliance for their daughter got cancelled due to the said act of the 3rd petitioner, due to which there was quarrel between two families in which both the members assaulted each other and there was no major injuries to anyone, based on the complaint, FIR was registered u/s 296(b) of BNS r/w 67A of Information Technology Act 2008 and investigation is pending.

The petitioners state in this petition /affidavit 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.

As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, petitioners are local residents and first offenders. There is no serious injuries to anyone. All the offences are punishable with imprisonment only upto 7 years.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) nature of offence, which are punishable with imprisonment only upto 7 years,
 - (ii) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed
 - (iii) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioners are local residents and first offenders,
 - (iv) the representation of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners being local residents will cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition,
 - (v) and also considering other facts and circumstances,
- this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners on imposing conditions.

In the result, Anticipatory bail is granted to petitioners in the event of their arrest and on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Gummidipoondi. The petitioners shall surrender before the said Magistrate within 15 days from today and report and sign before Tiruvallur Taluk police station daily at 10.00 AM for 30 days. The petitioners shall abide the condition as contemplated u/s 482 of BNSS. Any violation of the conditions, the Judicial Magistrate is entitled to take action as per the Judgment of the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala AIR 2005 SCW 5560.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 10th day of March, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s K. Aswin Balaji,
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State
The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Gummidipoondi
The Inspector of police, Arambakkam police Station
The Inspector of police, Tiruvallur Taluk police Station