

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 02nd day of April 2026

Cr.I.M.P.No: 799/2026

Parimala W/o. Kumar

....Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Arambakkam Police Station
(Crime No: 45/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 23/02/2026 u/s 482 of B.N.S.S., praying to grant anticipatory bail to the Petitioner

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s.M.Thamilselvan, S.Karthick, D.Ranesh and the respondent police through the Public Prosecutor and 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 BNSS seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner who apprehends arrest in Cr.No.45/2026 on the file of Arambakkam Police Station for the alleged offences u/s 296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS r/w 4 of TNPWH Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, the petitioner is the mother in law of defacto complainant, there was a quarrel against between the defacto complainant and the petitioner due to family dispute, the petitioners are innocents, no way connected with the alleged offences, no one is injured and hospitalized, the petitioner has no bad antecedents, the petitioner is falsely implicated in this case and is ready to abide any conditions imposed by this court.

Notice given to concerned police. The learned Public prosecutor for the State raised objection to grant bail to the petitioner and argued that, the petitioner's son who is defacto complainant's husband get jewels from the defacto complainant and pledged the jewels. The defacto complainant several time asked him to redeem the jewels, which was not redeemed by the petitioner's son regarding with that on 07.02.2026 at 08.30 a.m., there was a quarrel against between them, the petitioner and his son abused the defacto complainant with filthy language and assaulted the de facto complainant with hands and threatened her with dire consequences, the defacto complainant sustained injuries at nose taken to Stanley Govt hospital admitted for treatment later discharged, based on the complaint FIR was registered and investigation is pending. No previous case as against petitioner.

The petitioner states in his 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.

As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, the petitioner is being a lady and local resident and also first offender. All the offences are punishable with imprisonment only upto 7 years. Thus, it does not appear that custodial interrogation of petitioners would be necessary.

Therefore, on considering

1. substantial part of investigation is completed,
2. that the injured had discharged,
3. the petitioner is being a lady and local resident and also first offender.
4. the representation of the learned counsel for the petitioner is a local resident and also first offender will cooperate for enquiry and will abide by any condition,
5. and also considering other facts and circumstances,

this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on imposing conditions.

In the result, Anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner in the event of his arrest and on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction of District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Gummidipoondi. The petitioner shall surrender before the said Magistrate within 15 days from today and report before the respondent police twice daily by 10.00 AM & 5.00 PM for 30 days. The petitioner shall abide the condition as contemplated u/s 482 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 SCR 5560.

Dictated to the Steno Typist and Pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 2nd day of April 2026.

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to:-

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