

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of March , 2026

Crl.M.P.No: 940/2026

Vijay @ Kulla Vijaya, S/o Annadurai

....Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Puzhal Police Station
(Crime No: 50/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 04.03.2026 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 P. Chandrasekar, M. Sathyasai Eswari, 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 13.01.2026 in Crime No.50/2026 on the file of Puzhal police station registered for the offence u/s 126(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 125, 309(4), 311, 351(3) of BNS.

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, he has no bad antecedents, property already recovered, he is in custody for the past 58 days, co-accused was granted bail by this Court in CMP No.336/2026 dated 06.02.2026, 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 13.01.2026 the defacto complainant was coming near Puthagram playground, the petitioners along with other accused waylaid and demanded money, when he refused, at that the petitioner assaulted him with knife and robbed Rs.4000/- at knife point and escaped, based on the complaint, FIR was registered, the petitioners was arrested on 13.01.2026, the petitioner is having 6 previous cases, and the investigation is pending.

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, petitioner is a local resident. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 58 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) nature of offence,
- (ii) long duration of custody of the petitioner for the 58 days

- (iii) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed
- (iv) co-accused were already granted bail by this Court on 06.02.2026,
- (v) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioner is local resident
- (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) and also considering 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 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 SCR 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 11th day of March , 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s P. Chandrasekar
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