



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.RAMESH

CRL OP No. 22952 of 2026

1. Jayakumar
Care of Balamurugan,
No.95/F, Ellaiaimman Kovil Street,
Thiruvottiyur,
Chennai-600019.
2. Jay Saravanan
S/o, Balamurugan,
No.23/24, Srinivasapuram,
Thiruvottiyur,
Chennai-600019.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State rep by the Inspector of Police
G-3, Kilpauk police Station,
Chennai,
Crime No.215 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime
No.215 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent Police.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.M.Iliyas

For Respondent(s):

Mr.M.M.I.Khaleel,
Govt.Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on
22.07.2026 for the alleged offences under Sections 127(2), 140(2), 308(4), 311



and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 in Crime No.215 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with other accused are alleged to have forcefully taken the defacto complainant in a car at knife point and threatened the victim and also had taken 5 sovereign gold chain and also demanded Rs.30 lakhs, resulting in the registration of a case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case and that they had not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that there are no previous case pending against these petitioners and they were arrested and still in judicial custody since 22.07.2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prays for grant of bail to the Petitioners.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the Respondent Police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners had forcefully taken the defacto complainant in a car at knife point and threatened the victim and also had taken 5 sovereign gold chain. The respondent police has recovered 5 sovereign gold chain, four cellphones, three knives and one car from the petitioners. Hence, he opposed



the grant of bail to the Petitioners.

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent Police and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the serious nature of the serious offence and the prima facie material available on record against these petitioners and the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent Police, this Court does not find it a fit case to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction to enlarge the petitioner on bail since there is possibility of these petitioners absconding and indulging in similar kind of offences.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

GV

18-08-2026



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 22952 of 2



N.RAMESH, J.

GV

To

1. The Inspector of Police
G-3, Kilpauk police Station,
Chennai,

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

CRL OP No. 22952 of 2026

18-08-2026