

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 8th day of June, 2026

Crl.M.P.No:1939/2026

1. Bharath @ Pallu Bharath, S/o Sugumar
2. Dinesh, S/o Mukesh

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Ennore Police station
(Crime No: 205/2026)

.....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 G. Karthikeyan, R. Kamesh, C. Shalini, D. Kali, 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 04.05.2026 in Crime No.205/2026 on the file of Ennore police station registered for the offence u/s 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 296(b), 118(1), 109, 351(3) of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that, petitioners are innocent, they have been falsely implicated only due to previous enmity a false complaint was lodged, only since the petitioners are friends of prime accused, they have been falsely implicated only based on the confession of the co-accused , petitioner was not at all present in the place of occurrence, co-accused was granted bail by vacation court in CMP No. 1799/2026 dated 27.05.2026, petitioner is in custody for 35 days, investigation is completed , 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 there was previous enmity between A1 and the defacto complainant's son, due to which on 04.05.2026 at about 12.10 AM in the midnight , when the defacto complainant's son along with his family was in his house situated at Tsunami quarters, Ernavur, the petitioner along with other accused formed into an unlawful assembly and trespassed into the house of defacto complainant and abused him in filthy language and assaulted him with knife, he sustained injuries, admitted in hospital, and later discharged, based on the complaint, FIR was registered u/s 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 296(b), 118(1), 109, 351(3) of BNS, the petitioners were arrested on 05.05.2026 , the 1st petitioner is having 4 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 2 previous cases 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.

The learned counsel for the petitioners endorsed that he is not pressing this petition in respect of the 1st petitioner (Bharath @ Pallu Bharath)

As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, 2nd petitioner is a local resident and first offender. The Injured person is already discharged. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the 2nd petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 35 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Nature of offence
- (ii) Long duration of custody of the 2nd petitioner for the 35 days
- (iii) That the injured person is already discharged,
- (iv) Co-accused was already granted bail by this Court
- (v) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
- (vi) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the 2nd petitioner is a local resident and first offender,
- (vii) the representation of the learned counsel for the 2nd petitioner that the petitioner being local resident will cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition,
- (viii) 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 2nd 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 , Thiruvottiyur and on condition that the 2nd 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 2nd petitioner absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

This petition in respect of the 1st petitioner is dismissed as not pressed.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 8th day of June , 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s G. Karthikeyan,
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State
The Judicial Magistrate Thiruvottiyur
The Inspector of police, Ennore police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai