

**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:867/2026**

Ariyaraj, S/o Jayaveerapandiyan,

...Petitioner/Accused

**//Versus//**

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,  
Madhuravoyal Police station  
(Crime No: 86/2026 )

.....Respondent/Complainant

**Petition dated: 27.02.2026 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 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 483 of BNSS seeking to release the petitioner who was remanded on 26.02.2026 in Crime No.86/2026 on the file of Madhurvaoyal police station registered for the offence u/s 274, 275, 123 of BNS r/w 24(1) of COTP Act

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated only for statistical purpose, the petitioner was not at all present in the place of occurrence, he has been falsely implicated in this case, all the contrabands were already seized, the petitioner has no bad antecedents, he is in custody for the past 15 days, he has no bad antecedents, 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 26.02.2026 at about 7.00 AM based on the discreet information, when the Sub Inspector of Police, respondent police station was on surveillance near Madhuravoyal Dhanalakshmi Nagar in the Kamatchi Rice shop, the petitioner was found in possession and selling banned tobacco products worth about Rs.8000 /- hence, he was arrested on 26.02.2026 contrabands were seized, and the investigation is still 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 and first offender. Contrabands were already seized. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 25 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Nature of offence
- (ii) duration of custody of the petitioner for the 15 days

- (iii) Contrabands were already seized,
- (iv) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
- (v) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioner is a local resident and first offender
- (vi) 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,
- (vii) 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 Judicial Magistrate No.II, Poonamallee 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 12<sup>th</sup> 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 Judicial Magistrate No.II, Poonamallee  
The Inspector of police, Madhuravoyal police Station  
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai