

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 20th day of July, 2026

Crl.M.P.No:2668/2026

(CNR No.TNTR010057062026)

J. Ramkumar, S/o Jaganathan,

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Tiruvallur Town Police station
(Crime No: 287/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.07.2026 u/s 483 of BNSS praying to enlarge the petitioners on bail

This petition coming on 14.07.2026 for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s A. Thamaraikannan, J. Lokesh, M.G. Muthusamy, and the State / respondent police represented by the learned Public Prosecutor Thiru.P.N. Udhayakumar 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 03.07.2026 in Crime No. 287/2026 on the file of Tiruvallur Town police station registered for the offence u/s 296(b), 308(2), 351(3), 318(3) of BNS r/w 25(1)(a) of Arms Act

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated only for statistical purpose, even according to the FIR, there is no overtact exists as against the petitioner. The petitioner and other accused are all college students, they came to the place to buy vegetables and grocery, the petitioner hail from a respectable family. Even the alleged attempt of transfer of Rs.500/- through g-pay was also not successful, which demonstrates that the entire prosecution case is concocted. The petitioner did not receive any amount. The wordy quarrel arose between them has been converted into a robbery case. As far as the place of occurrence is concerned, it is the public place wherein even the police people were also standing in the much crowded area, hence, there is no possibility of committing robbery at the time of 2.30 PM. No weapon was seized from the petitioner. The prosecution has not identified each of the accused and there is no proof that the petitioner was present at the time of occurrence. The petitioner has no bad antecedents, he is a student, he is in judicial custody for the past 18 days, he 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 on 03.07.2026 at about 2.30 PM, when the defacto complainant who is a vegetable vendor in his vehicle near Tiruvallur Uzhavar Sandhai, the petitioner along with other accused persons came to the shop and asked the petitioner to give Rs.500/- and they will transfer the amount through G-Pay, the accused shown the transfer of amount through g-pay, but the amount was transferred to the number of the defacto complainant, when the defacto complainant told them that he did not receive any amount, all the accused joined and threatened the defacto complainant to give Rs.500/- and robbed the said amount at knife point and escaped, based on the complaint, FIR was registered the petitioner was arrested on 04.07.2026 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, petitioner is a local resident and first offender. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 18 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Nature of offence
 - (ii) Long duration of custody of the petitioner for the 18 days
 - (iii) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
 - (iv) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioner is a local resident and first offender,
 - (v) the representation of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner being local resident will cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition,
 - (vi) 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 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.I, Tiruvallur and on condition that the 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 petitioner absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 20th day of July, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s A. Thamaraikannan
Thiru.P.N. Udhayakumar, Public Prosecutor for the State
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tiruvallur
The Inspector of police, Tiruvallur Town police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai