

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 17th day of March , 2026

Crl.M.P.No:982/2026

Lakshmipathy, S/o Karumban

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Vengal Police station
(Crime No: 57/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 07.03..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 D. Lemuvel, C. Murugan, R. Hariharan, 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 17.02.2026 in Crime No. 57/2026 on the file of Vengal police station registered for the offence u/s 126(2), 296(b), 351(3) of BNS r/w 7(1)(a) of CLA Act r/w 25(1-A) of Arms Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated in this case. Only due to wordy quarrel with the respondent police, he has been falsely implicated, there is no injury to anyone, the mere possession of knife does not constitute the offence under Arms Act. Only since the police unnecessarily implicated the petitioner, there was wordy quarrel, The petitioner has no antecedents, he is in custody for the past 29 days, this is the 2nd bail petition 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 17.02.2026 at about 8.00 AM when the respondent police was on surveillance near the Velliyur Ambedkar statue, the petitioner was in possession of sword and threatening and abusing the public, when the police tried to restrain them, he threatened the police and abused them in filthy language, and threatened the defacto complainant thus, he was arrested and based on the complaint, FIR was registered, the petitioner is having one previous case 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. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioner is in 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) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
- (iv) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioner is a local resident
- (v) 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,
- (vi) 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 Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tiruvallur 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 17th day of March, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s D. Lemuvel
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tiruvallur
The Inspector of police Vengal police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai