

**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 17<sup>th</sup> day of March , 2026**

**CrI.M.P.No:999/2026**

Ayyappan @ Sabari @ Sabarivel, S/o Palanisamy

...Petitioner/Accused

**//Versus//**

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,  
Pathirivedu Police station  
(Crime No: 42/2026 )

.....Respondent/Complainant

**Petition dated: 09.03.2026 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 M.R. Sugumar, R. Narayanan, S.G. Mahaveer Manikanda Prabhu, the respondent police through the Special Public Prosecutor, and in the presence of victim / defacto complainant and M/s G. Kaviyarasu, S.Nalinakumar, G. Thiyagarajan, D. Anbukarasi, N. Samundeeswari, S.B. Priyadarshini, Nisha, counsel for the defacto complainant/victim, upon hearing the arguments of both sides, perusing the reply of the Special Public Prosecutor for the State/Respondent and in the presence of defacto complainant/victim, 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 25.02.2026 in Crime No. 42/2026 the file of Pathirivedu police station registered for the offence u/s 75(2), 79 of BNS r/w 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated, he has been falsely implicated due some wordy quarrel between the petitioner and the defacto complainant, she lodged a false complaint , the petitioner does not even know the caste of the defacto complainant, there is no injury to anyone, the defacto complainant is in the habit of lodging complaints one after another against various persons, the petitioner has no bad antecedents, and one such complaint was lodged in Crime No. 177/2025 before the same respondent police, he is in custody for the past 21 days, this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Special Public prosecutor argued that the defacto complainant is a news reader in media and also running a Magi Beauty Academy near Madharpakkam Bazaar, the petitioner propagated rumours about her character with the intention to defame her went to her shop and proposed with her and tried to misbehave and suddenly he closed the door and called her for sexual relationship, when she refused , he abused her in filthy language with caste based remarks and with the intention to outrage her modesty, the petitioner uploaded caste based remarks video and audio in the social medias, thus she approached police and based on the complaint, FIR was registered u/s 75(2), 79 of BNS r/w r/w 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act and the investigation is pending.

Notice u/s 15-A of SC/ST Act was issued to the defacto complainant and objected this petition. The learned counsel for the intervener submitted that the petitioner belong to same village, there is no connection between the complaint previously lodged by the defacto complainant against another person which has no relevance in this case, further, knowing very well that the defacto complainant is a divorce person and also belong to SC/ST community, the petitioner has attempted sexual assault on her only with the intention to humiliate her, hence, if granted bail, he would again indulge in similar activities and also threaten the defacto complainant , hence prayed to dismiss this petition.

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 still 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,
- (i) serious accusation of offence as against the petitioner u/s 75(2), 79(2) of BNS and also the offence u/s 3(2)(va) of SC/ ST Act
- (ii) there is no change in circumstances,
- (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 17<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,  
Tiruvallur**

**Copy to**

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s M.R. Sugumar  
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State  
The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Gummidipoondi  
The Inspector of police, Pathirivedu police Station  
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai  
The Intervener's Advocate M/s G. Kaviyarasu