



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.32872 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

**CRL OP NO.32872 of 2025
and CRL MP NO.23743 of 2025**

Ravi

... Petitioner/ Accused

Vs

The State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
Maduravoyal Police Station,
Chennai – 600 095.
(Crime No.628 of 2015)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to grant bail to the petitioner/accused in S.C.No.125 of 2020 pending trial on the file of the learned Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. R. Sankarasubbu

For Respondent(s) : Mr. A. Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 24.09.2020 for the offences under Section 302 IPC (2 counts) r/w 201 of IPC in S.C.No.125 of 2020 pending trial on the file of the learned Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur, seeks bail. This is the fifth successive bail application filed by the petitioner herein and the earlier bail application of the petitioner was dismissed by this Court, vide order dated 04.04.2025 in Crl.O.P.No.8415 of 2025 on the following observations:

“8. Considering the nature of the allegations against the petitioner, the stage of the trial and the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to consider the bail petition of the petitioner at this stage. However, considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody from 24.09.2020, he cannot be incarcerated continuously during trial. Hence, the trial Court shall conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible. If the trial is not completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew the bail petition before the Trial Court.”

2. The allegation against the petitioner herein is that, the petitioner is alleged to have murdered his two children, as he had matrimonial differences with his wife. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that



WEB COPY

petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in judicial custody since 24.09.2020; that the earlier bail application of the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.8415 was dismissed by this Court, vide order dated 04.04.2025 with a direction to the Trial Court to complete the trial within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of that order, however the trial has not yet concluded till date, hence the present bail petition is filed; that the petitioner is in judicial custody for more than 5 years; and that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and sought for bail to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent while opposing the bail to the petitioner submitted that, all the witnesses in this case were already been examined and cross examined, however the petitioner herein has consistently making attempt to recall the witnesses in this case for cross examination in order to delay the trial process; that further some of the witnesses were recalled for nearly eight times for cross examination, hence due to non-cooperation of the petitioner herein, the trial could not be concluded within the stipulated period. He also submitted that in the last hearing of the trial on 12.12.2025, P.W.2, P.W.31 and P.W.32 were recalled for cross-examination based on the petition filed by the petitioner herein and the Trial Judge has also taken



Crl.O.P.No.32872 of 2025

cognizance of the attitude of the petitioner herein in delaying the trial process; that though the Trial Court is taking effective steps to conclude the trial at the earliest, the petitioner herein has been attempting several types of delaying tactics to hamper the trial process.

5. Considering the submissions made, facts and circumstances of the case, nature of offence and taking note of the fact that all the witnesses were examined in this case and the trial is likely to be concluded within short span of time, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. However, considering the fact that the petitioner is in judicial custody for more than five years, the Trial Court shall made every endeavour to dispose the trial of this case, at the earliest.

6. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected criminal miscellaneous petition stands ordered.

16.12.2025

stn

To



Crl.O.P.No.32872 of 202

1. The Sessions Judge,
Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court),
Tiruvallur.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Maduravoyal Police Station,
Chennai – 600 095.
(Crime No.628 of 2015)
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

WEB COPY

K. RAJASEKAR, J.

stn



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.32872 of 2025

**CRL OP NO.32872 of 2025
and CRL MP NO.23743 of 2025**

16.12.2025