

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

Monday, the 30th day of March, 2026

CrI.M.P.No:928/2026

Dineshkumar, S/o Settu

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Periyapalayam Police station
(Crime No: 74./2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 04.03.2026 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.N. Suresh, E. Ramkumr, 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 02.03.2026 in Crime No. 74/2026 on the file of Periyapalayam police station registered for the offence u/s 296(b), 126, 132, 351(3) of BNS r/w 7(1)(a) of CLA act r/w 25(a) of Arms Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated only for statistical purpose, the petitioner is working a driver and only since the petitioner refused to come to police station for enquiry, the police came to the place of petitioner and took him for enquiry, and foisted a false case, he is in custody for the past 29 days, only due to some previous cases, he has been falsely implicated in this case, 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 02.03.2026, when the defacto complainant the S.I. of Police was on patrol near Periyapalayam Bhavaniamman temple, found that the petitioner in possession of knife was threatening the public, when the respondent police intercepted and warned the accused, the accused abused them in filthy language and tried to assault them and also threatened the police, thus based on the complaint, FIR was registered u/s 296(b), 126(2), 132, 351(3) of BNS r/w 7(1)(a) of CLA act r/w 25(1-A) of Arms Act., the petitioner was arrested on 02.03.2026 petitioner is having 2 previous cases 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, petitioner is a local resident. The injured person is already discharged. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 29 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Nature of offence ,
- (ii) Long duration of custody of the petitioner for the 29 days
- (iii) That the injured person is already discharged.
- (iv) Co-accused were already granted bail by this Court
- (v) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
- (vi) there is no injury to anyone during the alleged occurrence,
- (vii) 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,
- (viii) 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, Uthukkottai 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 30th day of March , 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

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