

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: 902/2026

Subburaj, S/o Ramamoorthi

....Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station Avadi

(Crime No: 4/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 03.03.2026 u/s 483 of B.N.S.S., 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 M. Kamalahasan, K. Mugunthan, M. Gowthaman, M. Vivek, 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 483 of BNSS seeking to release the petitioner who was remanded on 23.02.2026 in Crime No.4/2026 on the file of All Women police station , Avadi registered for the offence u/s 69, 79 of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated only on the false allegation, both the petitioner and the defacto complainant belong to Police department as working in Battalion Avadi , there was only friendship between them, only since there was dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant, she has lodged a false complaint, he is in custody for the past 16 days, he has no bad antecedents, there is no possibility of absconding, 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 the petitioner and the defacto complainant are working in the police Department, they had love affair and had relationship and under the pretext of marrying her, the petitioner had forcible sexual intercourse with her , since she was bleeding, she was admitted in hospital and later discharged, thereafter, the defacto complainant asked her to marry her, he refused to marry and started to threaten her, based on the complaint, FIR was registered, petitioner was arrested on 23.02.2026, 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, investigation is pending in preliminary stage, and the alleged offence is serious in nature.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) grave nature of offence which is against a woman,
- (ii) investigation is pending
- (iii) premature stage,
- (iv) serious accusation of offence as against the petitioner u/s 79, 69 of BNS
- (v) and also considering other facts and circumstances,

this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, this petition is dismissed.

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 M. Kamalahasan
Thiru. S.Murthy , Public Prosecutor for the State
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Poonamallee
The Inspector of police, All Women police Station, Avadi
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai