

**IN THE COURT OF II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
TIRUVALLUR AT POONAMALLEE.**

**Present: Tmt. G. Bhuvaneswari, B.L
II Additional District and Sessions Judge
Tiruvallur at Poonamallee.**

On this Tuesday, the 9th day of June 2026

Crl. M.P. No.11 /2026

in

Sessions Case No.81/2026

Dhanasekar, aged 29 years,
S/o. Ganehsan,
No.5, Bajanai Kovil Street,
Lakshmi Nagar, Chinna Porur,
Chennai - 600 116.

...Petitioner / Accused

/Versus/

State represented by,
Inspector of Police,
R-11, Ramanadhapuram Police Station,
Koyambedu, Chennai.
(Crime No.312 of 2025)

..Respondent/Complainant

This Bail Petition came up before this court for final hearing before me on 09.06.2026, M/s. C. Vignesh and A. Prasanth, learned counsel for the Petitioner/Accused and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor Tr.K.P.Purachidasan, appeared for the Respondent/Complainant and upon hearing the arguments of both sides and upon perusing the records and material

papers, this court delivered the following :

O R D E R

The counsel for the Petitioner / Accused filed a bail application u/s.483 of BNSS to enlarge the Petitioner / Accused on bail.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner/Accused was arrested and remanded by the Respondent Police for alleged offences under Sections 126 (2), 296(b), 125, 324 (2), 351 (3) and 309 (4) r/w 311 of BNS Act. The prosecution alleges that the petitioner was arrested on 22.10.2025 and remanded to judicial custody in connection with the above crime registered for offences under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 125, 324(2), 351(3), and 309(4) read with Section 311 of the BNS Act. The prosecution alleges that on 21.10.2025, the petitioner consumed food at the defacto complainant Nagarajan's roadside tiffin shop, refused to pay the bill, abused and threatened the complainant, brandished a knife, and forcibly took Rs.500/- from the cash box. It is further alleged that when the complainant and the public attempted to apprehend him, he threw stones and glass bottles, causing public disturbance and property damage, and thereafter escaped from the scene. The petitioner contends that he is innocent, has been falsely implicated in the case, and has no connection with the alleged occurrence. This is his first bail

application, and no similar petition is pending before any other court, including the High Court. Hence, he seeks to be enlarged on bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the detention order under the Goondas Act bearing No.918/BCDEFGISSSV/2025 dated 10.11.2025 was passed against the accused by the Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai, and the accused is presently under preventive detention pursuant to the said order. Further, H.C.P. No. 62 of 2026 filed on behalf of the accused is pending before the Hon'ble High Court. If the accused is released on bail from judicial custody, there is a likelihood that he may continue to indulge in similar criminal activities and may also intimidate and influence the witnesses. Therefore, strong objection is raised to the grant of bail to the accused.

4. Now, the point for consideration is that whether the Petitioner / Accused can be released on bail or not ?

5. **POINT :**

Heard both sides. Records are carefully perused.

6. Upon considering the submissions of both sides, it is seen that the Petitioner/Accused was arrested and remanded to judicial custody by the Respondent police for the alleged offences under Sections 126 (2), 296(b), 125, 324 (2), 351 (3) and 309 (4) r/w 311 of BNS Act. The case was committed to

this Court and taken on file on 03.04.2026.

7. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, if the petitioner is released on bail, the further progress of the case would be hampered. Hence, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor has strongly opposed the grant of bail.

8. In view of the above circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is a strong likelihood of his absconding and thereby stalling the further proceedings of the case. Taking into account these facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

9. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Dictated by me to the Steno-typist, typed by her in the Computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open court on the 9th day of June 2026.

**II Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur at Poonamallee.**

Order

Crl.MP No.11/2026

in S.C. No.81/2026

Date : 09.06.2026.

II A.D.S.C., Poonamallee.