

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

Friday, the 12th day of June, 2026

Crl.M.P.No:1959/2026

1. Kanniappan , S/o Karnan
2. Sevendharraj @ Sindhujan, S/o Sinnarasa,

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Puzhal Police station
(Crime No: 401/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 01.06.2026 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 S. Seethalakshmi, M. Suman, R. Seetha, B. Parithika, 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 enlarge the petitioners on bail who were remanded into judicial custody on 19.05.2026 , in Crime No. 401/2026 on the file of Puzhal police station registered for the offence u/s 319, 115(2), 309(4), 311, 351(3), 3(5) of BNS r/w 3(2)(a), 4(1), 5(1)(a) of the Immoral Traffic (prevention) Act 1956

The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that, petitioners are innocents, they have been falsely implicated only for statistical purpose, the defacto complainant had relationship with the A1 Kalaivani, for long time, and only since the A1 demanded some money for his relationship, he has lodged a false complaint, in fact, the petitioners are no way connected with the alleged offence, only since the petitioners are known to A1, they have been falsely implicated in this case, there was nothing to be seized from the petitioner, the entire allegation is against A1, petitioners are arrayed only as A2 and A3, they are in custody for 25 days and are 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 had long time relationship with the A1 Kalaivani and they had physical relationship , and he used to the house of the A1 and on 18.05.2026 at about 1.30 PM, the A1 called the defacto complainant and informed that she arranged some other woman for him and called him to come down to the house , when the defacto complainant went there, there was some other girl, who had called the other accused, petitioners herein , and the petitioners came there pretending to be the police people other accused and they all threatened and demanded money, and threatened and by using his QR code, transferred Rs.2000/- from his mobile and laptop and escaped from the place, he called 100 Emergency, only thereafter, the defacto complainant realized that the petitioners are not police , hence, he approached police, based on the complaint, FIR was registered the petitioners were arrested on 19.05.2026 , custody petition is about to be filed, 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, the investigation is still pending in preliminary stage

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Grave nature of offence,
 - (ii) Investigation is pending,
 - (iii) Premature stage,
 - (iv) Value of the properties allegedly involved,
 - (v) Serious accusation of offence as against the petitioners u/s 311 of BNS and ITP Act,
 - (vi) 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 12th day June , 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s S. Seethalakshmi,
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