

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE AT TIRUVALLUR

Present: Tmt. P. REVATHY, M.A., M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur (i/c)
Thursday, the 23rd day of July, 2026
Crl.M.P.No:2884/2026
(CNR No.TNTR010061002026)

Ajay @ Vella Ajay, S/o Pradhap

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Valasrawakkam Police station
(Crime No: 397/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 15.07.2026 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 M. Gokulraj, and the State / respondent police represented by the learned Public Prosecutor Thiru.N.R. Sreedharan Babu 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 24.05.2026 in Crime No. 397/2026 on the file of Valasaravakkam police station registered for the offence u/s 278, 123, 132 of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, petitioner is innocent, he has been falsely implicated, only for statistical purpose, all the contrabands were already seized, no one is injured or harmed by the tablets, which is not the scheduled drugs, hence, section 123 of BNS is not attracted, petitioner has no bad antecedents, only 20 tablets were seized from the petitioner, he is in custody for 61 days, this is the 2nd 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 is the SI of police, based on the discreet information when the defacto complainant along with police party conducting raid on 24.05.2026 at about 10 AM near Valasaravakkam Pirakasam Salai, Juice corner shop, the petitioner along with another accused found in illegal possession of 50 tablets of tapentadol, weighing 100 mg, based on the complaint, FIR was registered the petitioner was arrested on 24.05.2026, contrabands were already seized, the petitioner is having 4 previous cases 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 As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, petitioner is a local resident. It appears that substantial part of investigation is completed as the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 61 days.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) Nature of offence
- (ii) Long duration of custody of the petitioner for the 61 days
- (iii) it appears that substantial part of investigation is completed,
- (iv) all the contrabands were already seized,
- (v) that as per the representation of the learned Public Prosecutor, it appears that the petitioner is a local resident
- (vi) 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,
- (vii) also 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, Poonamallee and on condition that the petitioners 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 23rd day July, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur(i/c)**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s M. Gokulraj,
Thiru.N.R. Sreedharan Babu, Public Prosecutor for the State
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Poonamallee
The Inspector of police, Valasaravakkam police Station
The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai