

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

Saturday, the 7th day of March , 2026

CrI.M.P.No:828/2026

Purushothaman, S/o Mariyappan

...Petitioners/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Puzhal Police station
(Crime No: 47/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.02.2026 u/s 483 of BNSS praying to enlarge the petitioners on bail

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s D. Padmanabhan, M. Muraliragul, V. Vijayakumar, M. Yogeswaran 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 12.01.2026 in Crime No.47/2026 on the file of Puzhal police station registered for the offence u/s 126(2), 296(b), 309(4), 311, 351(3) of BNS

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated in this case only since the petitioners had wordy quarrel with the police, only since the petitioner was restrained by the police and unnecessarily questioned him, the occurrence happened, only on preventive detention he has falsely implicated due to some previous cases, he is in judicial custody for 55 days, this is the 2nd 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 on 12.01.2026 at about PM, when the defacto complainant was coming near the petitioners came in a two wheeler waylaid him and demanded money, when he refused the accused threatened him with knife and robbed Rs.1850/- at knife point and escaped, based on the complaint, FIR was registered the petitioners were arrested on 12.01.2026 the petitioner is having 8 previous cases 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.

As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, petitioner is a local resident.. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 55 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Nature of offence ,
 - (ii) Long duration of custody of the petitioner for the 55 days
 - (iii) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
 - (iv) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioner is a local resident ,
 - (v) the representation of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner being local resident will cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition,
 - (vi) considering his medical and health condition and other facts and circumstances,
- this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on imposing conditions.

In the result, bail is granted to the Petitioner on execution of a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for the like-sum each to the satisfaction of District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Madhavaram and on condition that the petitioner to sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 AM for 30 days. The sureties shall affix their photographs and shall produce Voter Card or Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book in proof of their identification. 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*). If the petitioner absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 7th day of March , 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

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