

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

Thursday, the 11th day of June, 2026

Crl.M.P.No:2055/2026

1. Yogesh, @ Lokesh, S/o Ramesh
2. Praveen Kumar, S/o Ragupathy

...Petitioners/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Kadambathur Police station
(Crime No: 91/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 03.06.2026 u/s 483 of BNSS praying to enlarge the petitioners on bail

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s R. Rajaprakash, P. Chandrasekar, A. Vishnuventhan, S. Senthamizh selvi, S. Sathishkumar, 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 petitioners who were remanded on 22.05.2026 in Crime No. 91/2026 on the file of Kadambathur police station registered for the offence u/s 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3), 109 of BNS. .

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioners are innocents, they have been falsely implicated only due to previous enmity and quarrel happened during playing of cricket, the occurrence happened, only since the petitioner is a friend of prime accused, they have been falsely implicated only based on the confession of the co-accused, petitioners were not at all present in the place of occurrence, injured person was already discharged, he is in custody for 21 days, investigation is completed , petitioners 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 on 21.05.2026 at about 11. AM, when the defacto complainant's brother was walking near his house, due to previous enmity, the accused persons waylaid and assaulted him with beer bottle he sustained injuries over forehead and hands, admitted in hospital, and later discharged, based on the complaint, FIR was registered u/s 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3), 109 of BNS, the petitioners were arrested on 22.05.2026 , the petitioner is having 3 previous cases and there is a proposal to detain the 1st petitioner under Act 14 of 1982 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.

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

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 21 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Nature of offence
- (ii) Long duration of custody of the 2nd petitioner for the 21 days
- (iii) That the injured person is already discharged,
- (iv) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
- (v) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the 2nd petitioner is a local resident and first offender,
- (vi) the representation of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioner being permanent residents will cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition,
- (vii) also considering other facts and circumstances,

this Court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd 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 No.II, Tiruvallur and on condition that the 2nd petitioner to sign before the respondent police daily twice at 10.00 AM and 5.30 PM 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 11th day June , 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

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