

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 12th day of March , 2026

CrI.M.P.No:862/2026

1. Ramkumar, S/o Viji
2. Hariharasudhan @ Harisudhan, S/o Yesu

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Pathirivedu Police station
(Crime No:188/2025)

.....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 V. Mano, C. Sathish, D. Magesh, D. Premkumar, D. Udhayakumar, J. Naveenkumar, Y.B. Joe Albert, 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 were remanded on 11.12.2025 in Crime No. 188./2025 on the file of Pathiriedu police station registered for the offence u/s 103(1) of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioners are innocents, they have been falsely implicated only on suspicion, only since they are friends of the co-accused, they have been falsely implicated only based on the confession of prime accused, they are arrayed as A3 and A4, they are in custody for the past 92 days, investigation is completed, petitioners are 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 the mother of the deceased she lodged a complaint stating that her husband is an auto driver and he was having dispute with the accused persons, on 09.12.2025 at about 9 PM, when the defacto complainant's husband was in house, the accused came and called him to have compromise and took him in a car, the accused took him in isolated place, thereafter, when the defacto complainant called her husband, he did not pick up call and when she called the petitioner, he told that there was road accident near Equarpalayam and her husband was admitted in hospital and died, and when she rushed to the hospital found that her husband was died with injuries, based on the complaint, FIR was registered, during the course of investigation found that the petitioners along with other accused took the deceased in isolated place, near Kumaranayakanpetti Easwaran temple, and assaulted him with knife, he died on the spot, accused were arrested on 11.12.2025, and charge sheet has been e-filed before District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Court, Gummidipoondi . The petitioners are each having 3 previous cases.

The petitioners state 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, petitioners are local residents. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioners are in judicial custody for the past 92 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Long duration of custody of the petitioner for the 92 days
 - (ii) it appears that investigation is completed and charge sheet is already filed,
 - (iii) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioners are local residents
 - (iv) 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,
 - (v) 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, Gummidipoondi and on condition that the petitioner to sign before the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Gummidipoondi daily at 10.30 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 12th day of March, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

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