

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

Friday, the 06th day of March, 2026

CrI.M.P.No:918/2026

1.Vijai S/o Arul,

2.Lokesh S/o Muthu

.....Petitioners/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,

Ponneri Police Station,

(Crime No:32/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated:03.03.2026 u/s.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 petitioner Counsel M/s.M.Thiyagarajan, J.Karthick 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 petitioners who were remanded on 10.02.2026 in Crime No. 32/2026 on the file of Ponneri police station registered for the offence u/s 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 309(4), 311, 351(3) of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioners are innocents, this is 2nd bail petition, they have been falsely implicated only for statistical purpose, they have been falsely implicated in this case, property already recovered, they are in custody for the past 25 days, 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 on 03.02.2026 at about 7.15 AM, when the defacto complainant was coming near Pulikulam Railway subway, near Ponneri the petitioners waylaid and demanded money, for which when he refused the petitioners assaulted him with knife and robbed Rs.1200/- and a VIVO Mobile phone at knife point and escaped, based on the complaint, FIR was registered, the petitioners were arrested on 10.02.2026, cell phone recovered, and the investigation is pending. There is one previous case as against the petitioner A1. No previous case as against the petitioner A2.

The learned counsel for the petitioners filed memo stating that he is withdrawing this petition in respect of the 1st petitioner (Vijai S/o Arul)

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 representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, the 2nd petitioner is a local resident and first time offender, It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the 2nd petitioner is in custody for 25 days,

Therefore, on considering

1. nature of offence,
2. long duration of custody of the 2nd petitioner for the past 25 days,
3. substantial part of investigation would be completed,
4. that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the 2nd petitioner is local resident and first time offender,
5. the representation of the learned counsel for the 2nd petitioner that the petitioner being local resident will cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition,
6. and also considering other facts and circumstances,

this Court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner on imposing conditions.

In the result, bail is granted to the 2nd 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.I, Ponneri and on condition that the 2nd petitioner to sign before the respondent police daily by 10.00 a.m 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 abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

This petition in respect of the 1st petitioner is dismissed as notpressed.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 06th day of March 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to:-

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s.M.Thiyagarajan,
Thiru.S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State,
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ponneri,
The Inspector of Police, Ponneri Police Station.
The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Ponneri.