

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

**CrI.M.P.No:989/2026**

Vinothkumar, S/o Kasi

...Petitioner/Accused

**//Versus//**

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,  
Vengal Police station  
(Crime No: 69/2026)

.....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 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 01.03.2026 in Crime No. 69/2026 on the file of Vengal police station registered for the offence u/s 4 of TNPWH Act r/w 296(b), 331(1), 62, 64, 75(1) of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated only based on the false complaint lodged by the defacto complainant. There was relationship between the defacto complainant and the petitioner's son and daughter and they eloped with and hence to wreck vengeance, a false complaint has been lodged, Even as per the complaint, there was no allegation of forceful assault or offence , thus section 64 of BNS is not attracted, he is in custody for the past 18 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 Public prosecutor argued that the defacto complainant lodged the complaint stating that on 28.02.2026 at about 1.00 PM, when the defacto complainant was in her house situated at Periya Colony, Pagalmedu, the petitioner trespassed into the house and attempted to molest her and also hugged her when she shouted for help, he escaped from the place, based on the complaint, FIR was registered, the petitioner was arrested on 01.03.2026, 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, investigation is 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 still pending
  - (iii) premature stage,
  - (iv) serious accusation of offence as against the petitioner u/s 64 of BNS
  - (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 18<sup>th</sup> 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 Additional Mahila Court, Tiruvallur  
The Inspector of police, Vengal police Station  
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai