



CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 10.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026

Balasubramani

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul Town North Police Station,
Dindigul District
(Crime No. 70 of 2026)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Ramjith
For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamy
Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Cr.No.70 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.



CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY The petitioner / A4, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.03.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 331(6), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 74, 76, 77, 311, 308(2), 351(3) of BNS and Section 66E of Information Technology Act @ 332(a), 310(4), 310(5), 310(6), 127(2), 296(b), 74, 76, 77, 311, 308(2), 351(3) of BNS and Section 66E of Information Technology Act in Crime No.70 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 10.2.2026 the accused persons trespassed into the house of the Mallika and pushed three ladies into the bed room, abused them in filthy languages, slapped them with hands and threatened them to remove their dresses, thereafter they have took video through their cell phones of their nude positions and at knife point, one of the accused threatened them and robbed 2 sovereigns of golden chain, 2 gram Thali chain, 1 gram diamond ring and cash of Rs.2000/- from the defacto complainant and 3 gram stud one pair, 2 gram ear chain one pair, and cash of Rs.5000/- from Saranya and then one of the accused himself voluntarily transferred Rs.18000/- from the defacto complainant's Gpay account and Rs.4800/- from Saranya Phone Pe account to one mobile

2/7



CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026

number 9994600339 and threatened them if they have not to pay Rs.50000/-

over night, they will upload the nude videos through internet and fled away, hence the case.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondent police has registered a false case against the petitioner and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.03.2026.. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent would submit that the accused persons entered into the house of the defacto complainant abused the ladies in the house and also took video through their cell phones of their nude positions and at knife point robbed money and gold jewels and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.



CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on


either side and also the considering the fact that the petitioner is not a named accused in the First Information Report and the fact that A6 and A7 were released on bail by the Sessions Court and also the fact that though the petitioner was having previous case under NDPS Act he was granted bail in that case and also taking into consideration the period of incarceration suffered by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II,Dindigul and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he is suspected;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026

investigation or trial;


[e] the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

(P D B J)
10.04.2026

aav



CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II,Dindigul
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul Town North Police Station,
Dindigul District
3. The Superintendent, District Jail, Dindigul
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.7274 of 2026
P. DHANABAL, J

aav

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 7274 of 2026

Date : 10.04.2026