

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 110/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000165-2026)

1. Thangadurai S/o. Chinna Nadar (A2)
 2. Gracy @ Novil Jaculin Gracy (A3)
W/o. Thangadurai
 3. Thiyagarajan S/o. Chinna Nadar (A4)
 4. Subash @ Rethina Subash S/o. Thiyagarajan (A5)
 5. Ponkumar S/o. Manimuthu (A6) .. Petitioners
- /Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Anjugramam Police Station,
Crime No.113/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru V. Chenthilkumar, u/s
482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 189(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 07.05.2026 at about 4.00 P.M., during temple festival held at Siva Sudalaimadaswamy Temple, Mettukuriyiruppu, the accused persons jointly attacked the informant and abused him in filthy language and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the informant was under intoxication beat A4 brutally in temple premises and got grievous injury and he was admitted in the Government Medical College Hospital, Asaripallam as in patient from 07.05.2026 and the case in Crime No.114/2026 has been registered against the informant and two others and the petitioners are innocent and they never indulged in any crime as stated in the FIR and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that a civil suit is pending between the parties in respect of the administration of the temple and that there exists longstanding rivalry between the two groups concerned with the temple affairs. According to the prosecution, on 07.05.2026, the petitioner and the other accused abused the

defacto complainant and demanded that he stop the conduct of the temple festival. During the course of the quarrel, the first accused allegedly attacked the defacto complainant with a blade and caused cut injuries on his hand and stomach, while the other accused assaulted him with hands and legs and also criminally intimidated him. It is further submitted that the injured was subsequently discharged from the hospital. The learned Public Prosecutor would contend that, in view of the group rivalry and the nature of the allegations, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary for effective investigation. He therefore prayed that the petition be dismissed. Alternatively, it was submitted that, if this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail, appropriate conditions may be imposed directing the petitioners to comply with the reporting conditions in a different district so as to avoid further law and order issues between the rival groups.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor objected the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly essential. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab*** reported as ***AIR 1980 SC 1632***, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and

(iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

7. In the present case, considering the nature of the offence and the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor, it would be appropriate to adopt the said approach of Hon'ble Supreme Court, so that both the rights referred above are balanced. As such, this petition deserves to be allowed with conditions.

8. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

i. The petitioners shall surrender before the SHO, Anjugramam Police

Station on 26.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which they shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.113/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which they shall be released from custody.

ii. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within fifteen days from today without fail.

iii. After release, the petitioners 1, 3 to 5 shall stay at Madurai, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and the 2nd petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily twice at 10.00 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.

iv. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.

v. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

vi. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in his discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions

Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in

P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:51:05 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai.

The Inspector of Police, Anjugramam Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioners.

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 64/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்	22.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	சுகுமாரன் (எ) சுள்ளான் சுகுமாரன்(எ 3) த/பெ ஐயப்பன்
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:04:16 +0530

(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

தீர்ப்புரை/உத்தரவு நகல் வழங்கும் நபரின்
பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம் தேதியுடன்.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.64/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000053-2026)

Sukumaran @ Sullan Sukumaran (A3)
S/o. Iyyappan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kottar Police Station,
Crime No.387/2025 of Kottar Police Station,
(SC No.25/2026 of Addl. District Court, Nagercoil)
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru K. Thillainathan, u/s
483 of BNSS praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 126(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 103 of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 05.10.2025 at about 11.30 P.M., the husband of the defacto complainant who is the deceased met the 1st accused regarding the money dispute and quarrel was arose between them and the 1st accused and his friends assaulted the deceased with an intention to kill him. When the defacto complainant shouted loudly, they were escaped and her husband was admitted in Intensive Care Unit in Government Medical College Hospital, Asaripallam for medical treatment and subsequently, he was admitted in KIMS Hospital at Chunkankadaai, but he died on 06.10.2025 at 4.04 A.M. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the petitioner was arrested on 06.10.2025 and he has been in judicial custody for the past 7 months and now the case is pending before the Additional District Court at Nagercoil in SC No.25/2026 and all the co-accused/A1, A2 and A4 were granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 01.12.2025, 07.02.2026 and 04.02.2026 in CrI.M.P. Nos.4540/2025, 443/2026 and 385/2026 respectively and already the petitioner was detained under Goondas Act and now the period of detention is completed and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 05.10.2025 at about 10.30 P.M the son of the deceased namely Nithinkumar and his friends quarreled with the brother of 1st accused and so the 1st accused questioned Nithinkumar and threatened him and then the 1st accused met A2 to A4 who are the close associates of 1st accused and all the accused conspired together to commit the murder of Nithinkumar and they were watching in the place of occurrence to assault Nithinkumar and at that time, the deceased who is the father of Nithinkumar came there and so all the accused abused him and the 1st accused pushed down him, and sustained injuries on his back of head and then all the accused kicked him with leg repeatedly on his chest and they escaped from the scene of occurrence in a car and so he was taken to hospital and subsequently, he died and so this case was registered and on 06.10.2025 this petitioner was arrested by the police and this petitioner is a rowdy element in that locality and he has twenty previous cases and he has been detained under Goondas Act in PD No.37/2025 and the co-accused were granted bail and now the case has been charge sheeted and taken on file as SC No.25/2026 and the same is pending before the Additional District and Sessions Court, Nagercoil and the case stands posted for 10.06.2026.\

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that this Court has jurisdiction to entertain and consider the present bail application notwithstanding the fact that the petitioner is presently under preventive detention pursuant to the order passed by the Detaining Authority, namely, the District Collector, Kanniyakumari District. In support of the said contention, the learned counsel placed reliance upon the decision of the Hon'ble High Court in Mohammed Tharik Anvar v. State of Tamil Nadu reported in (2025) 1 MLJ (Cr1.), wherein it has been held that pendency of a detention order would not bar consideration of a regular bail application in the substantive criminal case. The learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner is arrayed as A3 in the present case and that A1, A2 and A4 have already been enlarged on bail by separate orders passed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil. Therefore, according to the learned counsel, the petitioner is also entitled to claim parity and denial of similar relief would amount to unequal treatment.

7. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor produced the criminal antecedents of the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner is involved in as many as 20(twenty) criminal cases and that the offences attributed to him are grave and serious in nature. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. Though the

petitioner seeks parity with the co-accused who have already been enlarged on bail, the antecedents of the present petitioner stand on a different footing. The materials placed before this Court disclose that the petitioner is involved in several criminal cases involving serious offences. Having regard to the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, the gravity of the offences alleged, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to exercise the discretionary relief of bail in favour of the petitioner.

8. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:04:30 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000013-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000045-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000125-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 93/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000149-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000215-2026)

R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan

S/o. Ramasamy

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026

Sunitha,

W/o R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026

1. Iyyappan,

S/o Arumugam

2. M. Yogeshwaran

S/o Murugan

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026

T. Arikandan (A3)

S/o. A. Thangadurai

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026

C. Lingaraja (A2)

S/o. Chandran

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.149/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No.44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 71/2026 and 93/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru K. Pon Muthu Pandian, Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Krishna Sreethar and Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Suresh Thangam, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in all petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These five petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number,

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 61(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 324(2) and 109 of BNS.

4. The case of the prosecution is that on 03.04.2026, A2 asked the defacto complainant to come to Nanguranpilavilai for a compromise in Crime No.42/2025 and A1 arrived in a Honda City Car, took the defacto complainant to a coconut grove, where other accused were present and all the accused assaulted the defacto complainant with deadly weapons. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 3/2026 would contend that in the year 2015, the petitioner was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and his wife lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, the petitioner appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested the petitioner to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against the petitioner in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime

No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 71/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and in the year 2015, her husband was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and her husband

lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, this petitioner and her husband appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested her husband to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against her husband in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner's husband was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and her husband and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and she has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this

court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.77/2026 would contend that the petitioners are not arrayed as an accused in the FIR, but now the respondent is trying to arrest and array them as an accused and the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and no such incident had happened as alleged and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and there is no specific overt act has been attributed against him and only allegation against the petitioner is that he is a friend of A1 and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and he has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioner and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.3/2026 is the President of the Hindu Thamilar Katchi. The defacto complainant is a member of the party. So they are known to each other. There is also money dispute between them. Last year, the 1st accused quarrelled with the defacto complainant and abused the wife of the defacto complainant by degrading her caste. So a case was registered by Eraniel Police in Crime No.42/2025. So the 1st accused used to demand the defacto complainant to withdraw the earlier case. On 03.04.2026 the 2nd accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 called the defacto complainant over phone and invited him to Nangrooanpilaviali. Subsequently, the 1st accused called him. So the defacto complainant went there. Then A1 and A2 took the defacto

complainant to a coconut garden wherein 3rd, 4th and other accused were already present there. Then A1, A2 and A3/Arikandan, who is the petitioner in Crl.M.p.No.93/2026 assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod all over his body. So he sustained fracture injury on his both legs and both hands. Other accused assaulted him with hand and leg. Then the accused took him into a bush and escaped from the scene of occurrence. Now the injured was discharged from the hospital. The 1st accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.3/2026 is concerned, he has ten previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.4/2023 of Asaripallam police Station and the 2nd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 149/206 is concerned, he has fourteen previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.273/2011 of Eathamozhy police Station and the 3rd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 93/206 is concerned, he has seven previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.301/2012 of Rajakkamangalam police Station and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 71/2026 and 77/2026 have no previous cases and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

11. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The prosecution allegation is that, pursuant to a prior dispute arising out of Crime No.42 of

2025, the defacto complainant was called by A2 to Nanguranpilavilai on the pretext of compromise talks and thereafter was allegedly taken by A1 and A2 to a coconut grove where the other accused were already present and assaulted with deadly weapons, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and legs. The petitioners, on the other hand, would contend that they have been falsely implicated due to previous enmity with certain police officials against whom proceedings are pending before the State Human Rights Commission. It is their specific case that several false cases have been foisted against them after refusal to withdraw the Human Rights complaints. It is also contended that in some of the earlier cases, the concerned witnesses themselves had disowned the prosecution version and that one of the criminal proceedings has already been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. As regards the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, this Court finds that they are not attributed with any specific overt act involving the use of deadly weapons and admittedly they do not have any criminal antecedents. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Therefore, this Court is of the view that their custodial interrogation may not be necessary and their presence for investigation can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions.

12. However, insofar as the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 are concerned, the prosecution has specifically attributed overt acts against them in relation to the assault on the defacto complainant with iron rods, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures. The materials available at this stage also disclose the existence of prior enmity and motive for the occurrence. Further, the prosecution has specifically pointed out that the said petitioners are history sheeters having several previous criminal cases against them. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific overt acts attributed to A1 to A3, the criminal antecedents attributed to them, and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 appears necessary for effective investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in their favour. At the same time, considering the role attributed to the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, the absence of criminal antecedents, and the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them, subject to stringent condition

13. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.71/2026 and the

petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer

is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Accordingly, Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 93/2026 and 149/2026 are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:49:49 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Eathamozhy Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026

and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.74/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000081-2026)

Stalin Bensam S/o. George

...Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Eraniel Police Station,
Crime No. 179/2026 of Eraniel Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru C. V. Arun, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 118(1), 329(4) of BNS and Sec. 4 of TNPHW
Act.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil, on 17.04.2026 in
Crl.M.P.No.1180/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign
before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai, daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00

P.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 28.04.2026 onwards and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. Report received from the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai through g-mail. A perusal of report shows that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 28.04.2026 to 08.05.2026 at 10.00 A.M.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:16:10 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode)

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai.

The Sub Inspector of Police, Eraniel Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000013-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000045-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000125-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 93/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000149-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000215-2026)

R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan

S/o. Ramasamy

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026

Sunitha,

W/o R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026

1. Iyyappan,

S/o Arumugam

2. M. Yogeshwaran

S/o Murugan

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026

T. Arikandan (A3)

S/o. A. Thangadurai

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026

C. Lingaraja (A2)

S/o. Chandran

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.149/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No.44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 71/2026 and 93/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru K. Pon Muthu Pandian, Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Krishna Sreethar and Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Suresh Thangam, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in all petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These five petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number,

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 61(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 324(2) and 109 of BNS.

4. The case of the prosecution is that on 03.04.2026, A2 asked the defacto complainant to come to Nanguranpilavilai for a compromise in Crime No.42/2025 and A1 arrived in a Honda City Car, took the defacto complainant to a coconut grove, where other accused were present and all the accused assaulted the defacto complainant with deadly weapons. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 3/2026 would contend that in the year 2015, the petitioner was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and his wife lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, the petitioner appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested the petitioner to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against the petitioner in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime

No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 71/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and in the year 2015, her husband was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and her husband

lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, this petitioner and her husband appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested her husband to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against her husband in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner's husband was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and her husband and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and she has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this

court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.77/2026 would contend that the petitioners are not arrayed as an accused in the FIR, but now the respondent is trying to arrest and array them as an accused and the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and no such incident had happened as alleged and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and there is no specific overt act has been attributed against him and only allegation against the petitioner is that he is a friend of A1 and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and he has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioner and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.3/2026 is the President of the Hindu Thamilar Katchi. The defacto complainant is a member of the party. So they are known to each other. There is also money dispute between them. Last year, the 1st accused quarrelled with the defacto complainant and abused the wife of the defacto complainant by degrading her caste. So a case was registered by Eraniel Police in Crime No.42/2025. So the 1st accused used to demand the defacto complainant to withdraw the earlier case. On 03.04.2026 the 2nd accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 called the defacto complainant over phone and invited him to Nangrooanpilaviali. Subsequently, the 1st accused called him. So the defacto complainant went there. Then A1 and A2 took the defacto

complainant to a coconut garden wherein 3rd, 4th and other accused were already present there. Then A1, A2 and A3/Arikandan, who is the petitioner in Crl.M.p.No.93/2026 assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod all over his body. So he sustained fracture injury on his both legs and both hands. Other accused assaulted him with hand and leg. Then the accused took him into a bush and escaped from the scene of occurrence. Now the injured was discharged from the hospital. The 1st accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.3/2026 is concerned, he has ten previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.4/2023 of Asaripallam police Station and the 2nd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 149/206 is concerned, he has fourteen previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.273/2011 of Eathamozhy police Station and the 3rd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 93/206 is concerned, he has seven previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.301/2012 of Rajakkamangalam police Station and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 71/2026 and 77/2026 have no previous cases and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

11. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The prosecution allegation is that, pursuant to a prior dispute arising out of Crime No.42 of

2025, the defacto complainant was called by A2 to Nanguranpilavilai on the pretext of compromise talks and thereafter was allegedly taken by A1 and A2 to a coconut grove where the other accused were already present and assaulted with deadly weapons, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and legs. The petitioners, on the other hand, would contend that they have been falsely implicated due to previous enmity with certain police officials against whom proceedings are pending before the State Human Rights Commission. It is their specific case that several false cases have been foisted against them after refusal to withdraw the Human Rights complaints. It is also contended that in some of the earlier cases, the concerned witnesses themselves had disowned the prosecution version and that one of the criminal proceedings has already been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. As regards the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, this Court finds that they are not attributed with any specific overt act involving the use of deadly weapons and admittedly they do not have any criminal antecedents. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Therefore, this Court is of the view that their custodial interrogation may not be necessary and their presence for investigation can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions.

12. However, insofar as the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 are concerned, the prosecution has specifically attributed overt acts against them in relation to the assault on the defacto complainant with iron rods, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures. The materials available at this stage also disclose the existence of prior enmity and motive for the occurrence. Further, the prosecution has specifically pointed out that the said petitioners are history sheeters having several previous criminal cases against them. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific overt acts attributed to A1 to A3, the criminal antecedents attributed to them, and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 appears necessary for effective investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in their favour. At the same time, considering the role attributed to the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, the absence of criminal antecedents, and the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them, subject to stringent condition

13. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.71/2026 and the

petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer

is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Accordingly, Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 93/2026 and 149/2026 are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:49:49 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Eathamozhy Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026

and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivados, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 121/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000120-2026)

Arockiya Raj S/o. Rajappan (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No.144/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Varatharajan, u/s 483
of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 49, 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1) and
351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 24.04.2026 at about 3.00 P.M., while the informant and one Renganathan were going in their two wheeler near Thengamputhur Murugan Temple, the accused persons waylaid them and caused cut injury near left ear of the informant and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offence against him and he is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and the overt act of the petitioner is concerned, he caused injury near the ear of the informant and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 08.05.2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are six accused in this case. The 1st accused is running a hotel. Two days prior to the occurrence, the defacto complainant went to the hotel of 1st accused and there was a wordy quarrel between them regarding the supply of gravy. So there is a previous enmity between the defacto complainant and 1st accused. Then A1 and A2 to A6 conspired together to do away the defacto complainant. On 24.04.2026, A1 to A6 were waiting for defacto complainant with deadly weapon. The defacto complainant came to the spot and A1 identified him to other accused and

escaped from there. Then accused Prabhu inflicted cut injury with aruval on the head of the defacto complainant and then this petitioner/A3 inflicted cut injury with aruval and then the accused Ashik Shiam assaulted the friend of the defacto complainant with stone. A2 to A4 instigated the other accused to assault the defacto complainant and the injured were discharged from the hospital and this petitioner was arrested on 08.05.2026 and he has three previous cases and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the fact that the injured were discharged from the hospital and also considering the period of incarceration of the petitioner/accused i.e for the past 14 days, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused with conditions.

7. In the result, the petitioner/accused is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil and after release the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is allowed.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer

is with in his discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.**

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22 19:52:47
+0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-Mode)

The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil,
(through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The Superintendent, District Jail, Nagercoil.(through e-mode)

The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.112/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000161-2026)

A. Anas S/o. Abdul Rahim (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

C.S.C.I.D. Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Crime No. 247/2024 of C.S.C.I.D. Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate of Thiru N. Babu Rajan, u/s
482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s 6(4) of TNSC (RDCS) Order 7(i)(a)(ii) of E.C. Act of 1955.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 28.10.2024, the
respondent police conducted vehicle check up near Thazhachanvillai in

morning hours and they found that the accused persons illegally transported 15 tons of PDS rice in a lorry bearing Reg. No. KL 57 4C 770. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is the former RC owner of the vehicle and he is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and all the other co-accused were already released on bail and the vehicle along with contraband was seized by the respondent police and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 27.10.2024, A1 to A3 illegally transported 15,000 Kgs of PDS rice in a lorry bearing Reg. No. KL74 C 0770. So the Kaliyakkavilai police party intercepted the vehicle and when the lorry was stopped, A3 Ramesh escaped from the scene of occurrence. A1 Rejikumar, A2 Sameer were secured by the police and A1 Rejikumar was interrogated by the Kaliyakkavilai Police and he stated in his confession that he and A3 Ramesh are having rice Godown at Vanniyacode near Parasalai and A6 to A13 are native of Tirunelveli and Tuticorin District and they are collecting PDS rice from door by door and kept the rice in their Godown. A4 Gavaskar and A5 Jeayakumar @ Ravindran Nair are native of Kerala State and they used to purchase the rice from A1 Rejikumar and A3 Ramesh. So, on

25.10.2024 A4 Gavaskar sent a lorry bearing Reg. No. KL74 C 0770 to Tirunelveli District. The said lorry was driven by A2 Sameer. A5 Jayakumar @ Ravindran Nair is the owner of the lorry. A1 and A3 collected rice from A6 to A13. A6 Sarjin, A7 Muthu Selvan, A8 Jayaraj, A9 Muthuvel, A11 Ajith, A12 Kittu and A13 Periyasamy each gave 2000 Kgs of PDS rice to A1 to A3 and A10 Sankar gave 15,000 Kgs of PDS rice to A1 and they illegally transported the same in a lorry bearing Reg. No. KL74 C 0770. When they reached near Kaliyakkavilai, the Inspector of Police, Kaliyakkavilai Police Station intercepted the vehicle and arrested A1 and A2. Then the police party went to the Godown of A1 to A3 near Vanniyacode at Parasalai in Kerala State and seized 2,700 Kgs of PDS rice and handed over to the respondent police and this case is registered by the respondent police against the accused. Some of the arrested accused granted bail and one of the accused approach the Hon'ble High Court for anticipatory bail and the Hon'ble High Court directed that the case is to be investigated by the Superintendent of Police. All the accused A1 to A13 were granted bail and anticipatory bail by this court and the Hon'ble High Court. This petitioner is the owner of the lorry and now he is arrayed as A3 in this case.

6. Considering the nature of the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/Accused and also considering the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor that all the other co-accused were granted bail

and anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court and this court and also considering the fact that the occurrence was happened on 28.10.2024 and by this time, the major portion of the investigation would have been completed, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/Accused with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i) The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii) After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii) The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv) The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v) The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in his discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:49:15 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, C.S.C.I.D Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil.
(through court cell e-mode)
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000013-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000045-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000125-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 93/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000149-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000215-2026)

R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan

S/o. Ramasamy

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026

Sunitha,

W/o R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026

1. Iyyappan,

S/o Arumugam

2. M. Yogeshwaran

S/o Murugan

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026

T. Arikandan (A3)

S/o. A. Thangadurai

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026

C. Lingaraja (A2)

S/o. Chandran

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.149/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No.44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 71/2026 and 93/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru K. Pon Muthu Pandian, Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Krishna Sreethar and Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Suresh Thangam, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in all petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These five petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number,

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 61(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 324(2) and 109 of BNS.

4. The case of the prosecution is that on 03.04.2026, A2 asked the defacto complainant to come to Nanguranpilavilai for a compromise in Crime No.42/2025 and A1 arrived in a Honda City Car, took the defacto complainant to a coconut grove, where other accused were present and all the accused assaulted the defacto complainant with deadly weapons. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 3/2026 would contend that in the year 2015, the petitioner was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and his wife lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, the petitioner appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested the petitioner to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against the petitioner in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime

No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 71/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and in the year 2015, her husband was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and her husband

lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, this petitioner and her husband appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested her husband to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against her husband in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner's husband was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and her husband and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and she has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this

court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.77/2026 would contend that the petitioners are not arrayed as an accused in the FIR, but now the respondent is trying to arrest and array them as an accused and the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and no such incident had happened as alleged and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and there is no specific overt act has been attributed against him and only allegation against the petitioner is that he is a friend of A1 and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and he has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioner and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.3/2026 is the President of the Hindu Thamilar Katchi. The defacto complainant is a member of the party. So they are known to each other. There is also money dispute between them. Last year, the 1st accused quarrelled with the defacto complainant and abused the wife of the defacto complainant by degrading her caste. So a case was registered by Eraniel Police in Crime No.42/2025. So the 1st accused used to demand the defacto complainant to withdraw the earlier case. On 03.04.2026 the 2nd accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 called the defacto complainant over phone and invited him to Nangrooanpilaviali. Subsequently, the 1st accused called him. So the defacto complainant went there. Then A1 and A2 took the defacto

complainant to a coconut garden wherein 3rd, 4th and other accused were already present there. Then A1, A2 and A3/Arikandan, who is the petitioner in Crl.M.p.No.93/2026 assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod all over his body. So he sustained fracture injury on his both legs and both hands. Other accused assaulted him with hand and leg. Then the accused took him into a bush and escaped from the scene of occurrence. Now the injured was discharged from the hospital. The 1st accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.3/2026 is concerned, he has ten previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.4/2023 of Asaripallam police Station and the 2nd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 149/206 is concerned, he has fourteen previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.273/2011 of Eathamozhy police Station and the 3rd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 93/206 is concerned, he has seven previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.301/2012 of Rajakkamangalam police Station and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 71/2026 and 77/2026 have no previous cases and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

11. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The prosecution allegation is that, pursuant to a prior dispute arising out of Crime No.42 of

2025, the defacto complainant was called by A2 to Nanguranpilavilai on the pretext of compromise talks and thereafter was allegedly taken by A1 and A2 to a coconut grove where the other accused were already present and assaulted with deadly weapons, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and legs. The petitioners, on the other hand, would contend that they have been falsely implicated due to previous enmity with certain police officials against whom proceedings are pending before the State Human Rights Commission. It is their specific case that several false cases have been foisted against them after refusal to withdraw the Human Rights complaints. It is also contended that in some of the earlier cases, the concerned witnesses themselves had disowned the prosecution version and that one of the criminal proceedings has already been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. As regards the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, this Court finds that they are not attributed with any specific overt act involving the use of deadly weapons and admittedly they do not have any criminal antecedents. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Therefore, this Court is of the view that their custodial interrogation may not be necessary and their presence for investigation can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions.

12. However, insofar as the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 are concerned, the prosecution has specifically attributed overt acts against them in relation to the assault on the defacto complainant with iron rods, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures. The materials available at this stage also disclose the existence of prior enmity and motive for the occurrence. Further, the prosecution has specifically pointed out that the said petitioners are history sheeters having several previous criminal cases against them. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific overt acts attributed to A1 to A3, the criminal antecedents attributed to them, and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 appears necessary for effective investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in their favour. At the same time, considering the role attributed to the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, the absence of criminal antecedents, and the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them, subject to stringent condition

13. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.71/2026 and the

petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer

is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Accordingly, Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 93/2026 and 149/2026 are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:49:49 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Eathamozhy Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026

and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000013-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000045-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000125-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 93/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000149-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000215-2026)

R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan

S/o. Ramasamy

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026

Sunitha,

W/o R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026

1. Iyyappan,

S/o Arumugam

2. M. Yogeshwaran

S/o Murugan

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026

T. Arikandan (A3)

S/o. A. Thangadurai

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026

C. Lingaraja (A2)

S/o. Chandran

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.149/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No.44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 71/2026 and 93/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru K. Pon Muthu Pandian, Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Krishna Sreethar and Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Suresh Thangam, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in all petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These five petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number,

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 61(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 324(2) and 109 of BNS.

4. The case of the prosecution is that on 03.04.2026, A2 asked the defacto complainant to come to Nanguranpilavilai for a compromise in Crime No.42/2025 and A1 arrived in a Honda City Car, took the defacto complainant to a coconut grove, where other accused were present and all the accused assaulted the defacto complainant with deadly weapons. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 3/2026 would contend that in the year 2015, the petitioner was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and his wife lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, the petitioner appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested the petitioner to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against the petitioner in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime

No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 71/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and in the year 2015, her husband was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and her husband

lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, this petitioner and her husband appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested her husband to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against her husband in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner's husband was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and her husband and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and she has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this

court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.77/2026 would contend that the petitioners are not arrayed as an accused in the FIR, but now the respondent is trying to arrest and array them as an accused and the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and no such incident had happened as alleged and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and there is no specific overt act has been attributed against him and only allegation against the petitioner is that he is a friend of A1 and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and he has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioner and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.3/2026 is the President of the Hindu Thamilar Katchi. The defacto complainant is a member of the party. So they are known to each other. There is also money dispute between them. Last year, the 1st accused quarrelled with the defacto complainant and abused the wife of the defacto complainant by degrading her caste. So a case was registered by Eraniel Police in Crime No.42/2025. So the 1st accused used to demand the defacto complainant to withdraw the earlier case. On 03.04.2026 the 2nd accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 called the defacto complainant over phone and invited him to Nangrooanpilaviali. Subsequently, the 1st accused called him. So the defacto complainant went there. Then A1 and A2 took the defacto

complainant to a coconut garden wherein 3rd, 4th and other accused were already present there. Then A1, A2 and A3/Arikandan, who is the petitioner in Crl.M.p.No.93/2026 assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod all over his body. So he sustained fracture injury on his both legs and both hands. Other accused assaulted him with hand and leg. Then the accused took him into a bush and escaped from the scene of occurrence. Now the injured was discharged from the hospital. The 1st accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.3/2026 is concerned, he has ten previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.4/2023 of Asaripallam police Station and the 2nd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 149/206 is concerned, he has fourteen previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.273/2011 of Eathamozhy police Station and the 3rd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 93/206 is concerned, he has seven previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.301/2012 of Rajakkamangalam police Station and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 71/2026 and 77/2026 have no previous cases and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

11. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The prosecution allegation is that, pursuant to a prior dispute arising out of Crime No.42 of

2025, the defacto complainant was called by A2 to Nanguranpilavilai on the pretext of compromise talks and thereafter was allegedly taken by A1 and A2 to a coconut grove where the other accused were already present and assaulted with deadly weapons, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and legs. The petitioners, on the other hand, would contend that they have been falsely implicated due to previous enmity with certain police officials against whom proceedings are pending before the State Human Rights Commission. It is their specific case that several false cases have been foisted against them after refusal to withdraw the Human Rights complaints. It is also contended that in some of the earlier cases, the concerned witnesses themselves had disowned the prosecution version and that one of the criminal proceedings has already been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. As regards the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, this Court finds that they are not attributed with any specific overt act involving the use of deadly weapons and admittedly they do not have any criminal antecedents. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Therefore, this Court is of the view that their custodial interrogation may not be necessary and their presence for investigation can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions.

12. However, insofar as the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 are concerned, the prosecution has specifically attributed overt acts against them in relation to the assault on the defacto complainant with iron rods, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures. The materials available at this stage also disclose the existence of prior enmity and motive for the occurrence. Further, the prosecution has specifically pointed out that the said petitioners are history sheeters having several previous criminal cases against them. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific overt acts attributed to A1 to A3, the criminal antecedents attributed to them, and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 appears necessary for effective investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in their favour. At the same time, considering the role attributed to the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, the absence of criminal antecedents, and the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them, subject to stringent condition

13. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.71/2026 and the

petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer

is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Accordingly, Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 93/2026 and 149/2026 are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:49:49 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Eathamozhy Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026

and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 52/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000063-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 114/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000164-2026)

Vishnu @ Vishnunath (A1)
S/o. Viswanathan

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.52/2026

Vasanth @ Thanga Vasanth (A2),
S/o. Suyambulingam,

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.114/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No.144/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. S. Varatharajan
and R. Senthil Kumar respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant
anticipatory bail to the petitioner in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These two petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number.

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 49, 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

4. Crl.M.P.No.52 of 2026 has been filed by A1 and Crl.M.P.No.114 of 2026 has been filed by A2 seeking for anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that the petitioner is running a parotta stall at Nainaputhur and on 22.04.2026, the informant Vivekanandan went to the Parotta stall of this petitioner and had a quarrel with this petitioner for want of salna for parotta and then on 24.04.2026 at 3.00 P.M., while the informant and one Renanathan were going near Thempanthur Murugan Temple, the accused persons came there in two wheelers and assaulted the informant and another person with aruval and hand on the instigation of this petitioner and criminally intimidated them. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.52/2026 submitted that the petitioner is the owner of the parotta stall and

he is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and he has been falsely implicated in this case, due to previous enmity and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.114/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the informant already had enmity over him and other accused regarding the property, so that, this false case has been registered against the petitioner and other accused and the petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and he has no previous cases and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are six accused in this case. The 1st accused is running a hotel. Two days prior to the occurrence, the defacto complainant went to the hotel of 1st accused and there was a wordy quarrel between them regarding the supply of gravy. So there is a previous enmity between the defacto complainant and 1st accused. Then A1 and A2 to A6 conspired together to do away the defacto complainant. On 24.04.2026, A1 to A6 were waiting for defacto complainant with deadly weapon. The defacto

complainant came to the spot and A1 identified him to other accused and escaped from there. Then accused Prabhu inflicted cut injury with aruval on the head of the defacto complainant and then the 3rd accused inflicted cut injury with aruval and then the accused Ashik Shiam assaulted the friend of the defacto complainant with stone. A2 to A4 instigated the other accused to assault the defacto complainant and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the 3rd accused was arrested on 08.05.2026 and the overt act of this petitioner/A2 in CrI.M.P. No. 114/2026 is concerned, he was present in the occurrence place and he instigated the other accused to assault the defacto complainant and the petitioner/A1 in CrI.M.P. No.52/2026 is concerned, he is the hotel owner and the weapon and one motor cycle were recovered from the 3rd accused and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions and the petitions may be dismissed.

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab* reported as *AIR 1980 SC 1632*, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set

out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

10. In the present case, considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused, this court finds that it would be appropriate to adopt the said approach of Hon'ble Supreme Court, so that both the rights referred above are balanced. Moreover, the injured were discharged from the hospital. As such, both petitions deserve to be allowed with conditions.

11. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate III, Nagercoil

subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner/A1 in CrI.M.P. No. 52/2026 shall surrender before the SHO, Suchindrum Police Station, on 26.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.144/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which he shall be released from custody.
- ii. The petitioners in both petition shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- iii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iv. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- v. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- vi. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial

Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:50:10 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.132/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000099 -2026)

1. Saranya D/o. Jothimari

2. Jothimari S/o. Kollappa Pillai

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No.NIL,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Tmt G. Velam, u/s 482 of
BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would
contend that the police has registered a case in Crime No.151/2026 of
Suchindrum Police Station against the husband of 1st petitioner and son-in-

law of 2nd petitioner Perumal Pillai with the strength of complaint given by the 1st petitioner. Now, the petitioners came to know that the said Perumal Pillai also lodged a false complaint against the petitioners before the respondent police. The 1st petitioner has one male child and one female child and the petitioners are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

3. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant is the husband of the 1st petitioner. On 25.04.2026 the petitioners and four other accused trespassed into the house of the complainant and abused him and assaulted him. So he filed a petition before the respondent police in CSR No.515/2026 and the injured was discharged from the hospital and so far no FIR has been registered and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

4. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions. Taking into account the nature of the allegations, the fact that the first petitioner is the wife of the defacto complainant and the second petitioner is her father, and that the dispute appears to have arisen out of matrimonial discord between the spouses, coupled with the fact that no FIR has yet been registered against the petitioners, this Court is of the view that the

petitioners are entitled to relief of anticipatory bail, subject to stringent conditions.

5. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the Court concerned, the petitioners shall be enlarged on anticipatory bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Judicial Magistrate Court No.III, Nagercoil, subject to the following conditions:-

i. The petitioners shall appear before the Court concerned within fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order without fail.

ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

iii. The petitioners shall make themselves available before the respondent police as and when required for the purpose of enquiry and investigation.

iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with witnesses or in any manner interfere with or obstruct the smooth progress of investigation.

v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional limits of the respondent police without prior permission from the Investigating Officer or the Court concerned.

This order shall apply only in respect of the present case and shall not enure to the benefit of the petitioners in connection with any other case.

In case of violation of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Investigating Officer is at liberty to approach the jurisdictional Magistrate for cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that the bail has been granted by the Sessions Court, in the light of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala.

Since the dispute appears to be matrimonial in nature, the petitioners and the defacto complainant are directed to appear before the Mediation Centre, Nagercoil on 04.06.2026 at 11.30 a.m. and thereafter on such subsequent dates as may be fixed by the learned Mediators for the purpose of mediation proceedings.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:51:22 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode).
The Mediation Centre. Nagercoil (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 52/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000063-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 114/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000164-2026)

Vishnu @ Vishnunath (A1)
S/o. Viswanathan

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.52/2026

Vasanth @ Thanga Vasanth (A2),
S/o. Suyambulingam,

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.114/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No.144/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. S. Varatharajan
and R. Senthil Kumar respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant
anticipatory bail to the petitioner in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These two petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number.

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 49, 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

4. Crl.M.P.No.52 of 2026 has been filed by A1 and Crl.M.P.No.114 of 2026 has been filed by A2 seeking for anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that the petitioner is running a parotta stall at Nainaputhur and on 22.04.2026, the informant Vivekanandan went to the Parotta stall of this petitioner and had a quarrel with this petitioner for want of salna for parotta and then on 24.04.2026 at 3.00 P.M., while the informant and one Renanathan were going near Thempanthur Murugan Temple, the accused persons came there in two wheelers and assaulted the informant and another person with aruval and hand on the instigation of this petitioner and criminally intimidated them. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.52/2026 submitted that the petitioner is the owner of the parotta stall and

he is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and he has been falsely implicated in this case, due to previous enmity and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.114/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the informant already had enmity over him and other accused regarding the property, so that, this false case has been registered against the petitioner and other accused and the petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and he has no previous cases and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are six accused in this case. The 1st accused is running a hotel. Two days prior to the occurrence, the defacto complainant went to the hotel of 1st accused and there was a wordy quarrel between them regarding the supply of gravy. So there is a previous enmity between the defacto complainant and 1st accused. Then A1 and A2 to A6 conspired together to do away the defacto complainant. On 24.04.2026, A1 to A6 were waiting for defacto complainant with deadly weapon. The defacto

complainant came to the spot and A1 identified him to other accused and escaped from there. Then accused Prabhu inflicted cut injury with aruval on the head of the defacto complainant and then the 3rd accused inflicted cut injury with aruval and then the accused Ashik Shiam assaulted the friend of the defacto complainant with stone. A2 to A4 instigated the other accused to assault the defacto complainant and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the 3rd accused was arrested on 08.05.2026 and the overt act of this petitioner/A2 in CrI.M.P. No. 114/2026 is concerned, he was present in the occurrence place and he instigated the other accused to assault the defacto complainant and the petitioner/A1 in CrI.M.P. No.52/2026 is concerned, he is the hotel owner and the weapon and one motor cycle were recovered from the 3rd accused and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions and the petitions may be dismissed.

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab* reported as *AIR 1980 SC 1632*, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set

out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

10. In the present case, considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused, this court finds that it would be appropriate to adopt the said approach of Hon'ble Supreme Court, so that both the rights referred above are balanced. Moreover, the injured were discharged from the hospital. As such, both petitions deserve to be allowed with conditions.

11. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate III, Nagercoil

subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner/A1 in CrI.M.P. No. 52/2026 shall surrender before the SHO, Suchindrum Police Station, on 26.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.144/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which he shall be released from custody.
- ii. The petitioners in both petition shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- iii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iv. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- v. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- vi. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial

Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:50:10 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 139/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	22.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	ஸ்டாலின் குமார், த/பெ ஆரிஸ்
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:53:40 +0530

(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

தீர்ப்புரை/உத்தரவு நகல் வழங்கும் நபரின்
பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம் தேதியுடன்.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 139/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000145-2026)

Stalin Kumar, S/o. Aris

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu
Through the Inspector of Police,
Palugal Police Station,
Crime No. 81/2026 of Palugal Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. David, u/s 483 of BNSS,
praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offences
u/s 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS and Sec. 75 and 77 of J J Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 29.04.2026 at about 9.00 P.M., the
accused along with his friend one Monikandan, who is the husband of the defacto
complainant gave brandy to the minor child of the defacto complainant and when the
defacto complainant questioned them, the husband of the defacto complainant

assaulted the defacto complainant and her minor child. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioner and he has been falsely implicated in this case with some bad motive and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 07.05.2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner. The allegations against the petitioner are that he is a close associate of the first accused, who is the husband of the defacto complainant, and that on 29.04.2026, the first accused forcibly administered liquor to the minor child. When the defacto complainant questioned the said act, the first accused along with the present petitioner allegedly assaulted the defacto complainant.

5. This Court cannot lose sight of the seriousness of the allegation that a minor child was allegedly intoxicated by forcibly administering liquor. Such an allegation, if true, would disclose an act of extreme irresponsibility and cruelty affecting the physical and mental well-being of the child. The materials placed before this Court prima facie disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the occurrence.

6. Further, it is brought to the notice of this Court by the learned Public Prosecutor that the injured child is still undergoing treatment in the hospital and that the investigation is still in its initial stage. Having regard to the gravity and nature of the accusations, the vulnerability of the child victim, the stage of investigation, and the fact that the injured is still hospitalised, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition deserves

to be dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:53:54 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 134/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்	22.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	J. அனிஷ், த/பெ ஜோஸ் இன்பராஜன்
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:53:09 +0530

(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

தீர்ப்புரை/உத்தரவு நகல் வழங்கும் நபரின்
பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம் தேதியுடன்.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.134/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000156-2026)

J. Anish S/o. Jose Inbarajan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

CSCID, Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Crime No.76/2026 of CSCID, Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru K. Selvakumar, u/s 483
of BNSS praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 6(4) of TNSC (RDCS) Order 1989 7(i)a(ii) of EC Act, 1955.

3. The case of prosecution is that the accused illegally

transported 1100 kg. of PDS rice. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has no way connected with the alleged occurrence and no such occurrence had happened as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner was arrested and is in judicial custody from 02.05.2026 and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No.874/2026 filed by the petitioner was dismissed by the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil on 11.05.2026 and the property i.e. 1100 kg. of PDS rice with a value of Rs.6,125/- was recovered by the police and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 02.05.2026 the petitioner illegally possessed 1100 Kgs. of PDS rice and on the seeing the police, he attempted to escape from the scene of occurrence and the petitioner was arrested by the police. This petitioner has three previous cases under Essential Commodities Act. The Superintendent of Police, Kanyakumari District sent a proposal to the District Collector to detain the petitioner under Goondas Act and the matter is pending before the District Collector and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. It is the specific case of the prosecution that about 1100 kilograms of rice meant exclusively for distribution under the Public Distribution System were recovered in connection with the present occurrence. Though the quantity seized may not by itself be the sole determining factor for refusal of bail, the objection raised by the learned Public Prosecutor assumes significance, particularly in view of the submission that the Superintendent of Police, Kanyakumari District, has already as already forwarded a proposal to the District Collector seeking initiation of proceedings against the petitioner under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982), and the same is pending consideration before the District Collector for passing appropriate orders. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the quantity of contraband allegedly seized, the stage of investigation, and the pendency of preventive detention proceedings against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant relief of bail in favour of the petitioner at this stage.

7. Considering the serious nature of the allegations, the larger public interest involved in protecting commodities intended for the Public Distribution System, the stage of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused at this stage. Accordingly, this petition deserves to be dismissed.

8. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:53:18 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 140/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000174-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No. 204/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000271-2026)

T. Perumal Pillai

S/o. Thanumalayan

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.140/2026

/Vs./

Saranya,

D/o Jothimari

.. Intervening Petitioner/
Defacto Complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No. 151/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P.No. 140/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Sreekumar, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.204/2026 is filed by Advocate Tmt G. Velam, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petition in Crl.M.P. No. 140/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 296(b), 115(2), 324(4) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 25.04.2026 at 7.30 P.M., the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy words, assaulted him, damaged the household articles worth about Rs.20,000/- and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as alleged by the prosecution and the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as CrI.M.P.No.204/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant and there is some misunderstanding between them and she is living in her parents house with her children and on 25.04.2026 at 7.30 A.M. the accused came to her house and created problem to send her first son with him, but the defacto complainant refused to send her son with him, so he abused her in filthy language and damaged the household articles such as cupboard, dining table, chair and vessels and the value of the property is Rs.1 Lakh and assaulted the defacto complainant with broken glass pieces and she was admitted in the Government Hospital, Asaripallam. Further, she would contend that if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, he will create problem and the investigation of the case is not yet over and prayed that the anticipatory bail petition may be dismissed and if the petition is allowed, the petitioner may be directed to deposit some amount and the matter may be referred to mediation.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant is the wife of the petitioner and there

is some misunderstanding between them and they are living separately. On 25.04.2026 this petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, abused her and assaulted her with leg. Then the parents of the defacto complainant questioned the petitioner. So the petitioner assaulted them and damaged the household articles such as almirah and dining table and thereafter, the petitioner assaulted the mother of the defacto complainant and caused injury on her head with broken glass and subsequently, the petitioner caused cut injury on the defacto complainant with broken glass and then the petitioner assaulted the father of the defacto complainant on his right hand with pipe and totally there are three injured persons in this case and all the injured have been discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly essential and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and it is a matrimonial dispute between the parties and the matter may be referred to mediation.

8. The defacto complainant is the wife of the petitioner made complaint as against the petitioner that there is some matrimonial dispute between the husband and wife and the petitioner caused damages to the household articles worth of Rs.1 Lakh and also he has inflicted cut injuries over her body and her parents and due to the injury caused by the said

accused, she along with her parents were undergone treatment for substantial period and now they were discharged from the hospital. With regard to the intervening petition is concerned, it seems that there is a counter complaint which has also been lodged by the accused in the present case and the investigation has no progress. Further with regard to the said complaint and there is no proof of the CSR filed along with the petition, but it is even on the side of the prosecution, it has been stated that the defacto complainant and her parents were taking treatment for more than a week and now they are being discharged. Since the matter involves family dispute, the matter is referred to mediation.

9. The learned Public Prosecutor objected the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly essential. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab*** reported as ***AIR 1980 SC 1632***, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender

himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

10. In the present case, considering the nature of the offence and the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor, it would be appropriate to adopt the said approach of Hon'ble Supreme Court, so that both the rights referred above are balanced. As such, this petition deserves to be allowed with conditions.

11. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

i. The petitioner shall surrender before the SHO, Suchindrum Police Station on 26.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the

custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.151/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which he shall be released from custody.

ii. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail and also he is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) before the court concerned.

iii) After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

iv) The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.

v) The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

vi) The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in *P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.*

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:48:13 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.137/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000188 -2026)

Ramanathan S/o. Sri Ragavan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Eathamozhy Police Station,
Crime No. 26/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru N. Ragavan, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1),
351(3) and 303(2)(NP) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 07.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1128/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 17.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 17.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:11:51 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Eathamozhy Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 138/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000197-2026)

Mahesh, S/o. Thanupillai

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Aralvaimozhy Police Station,
Crime No. 162/2026 of Aralvaimozhy Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Manivannan, u/s
482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 115(2) and 118(1) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity
between the accused and the defacto complainant regarding selling of

flowers, the accused assaulted the defacto complainant with scissors. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 10.05.2026 the petitioner stabbed on the back of the defacto complainant with scissor and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and though the learned Public Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/accused with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a

likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:45:26 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Aralvaimozhy P.S. (through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 144/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000193-2026)

Lingeshwaran S/o. Rethinasamy

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kottar Police Station,

Crime No. 74/2026 of Kottar Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Sree Kumar, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 02.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.664/2026 with condition
that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at
10.00 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by
the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 28.03.2026 in

Crl.M.P. No. 1031/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e, on every Monday at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition from 30.03.2026 onwards and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition only from 30.03.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:16:33 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil. (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kottar Police Station.
(through court cell e- Mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.141/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000147-2026)

J. Sujin S/o. Jeyachandran (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Marthandam Police Station,
Crime No. 84/2026 of Marthandam Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Mahesh, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 318(4) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 20.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.712/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the

respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 31.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 31.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:12:05 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Marthandam Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.145/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000190-2026)

1. M. Vijil S/o. T. Moni (A 1)
 2. M. Vimalkumar S/o. T. Moni (A 2)
 3. T. Moni S/o. Thangayan (A 3) ... Petitioners
- /Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Mandaikadu Police Station,
Crime No.17/2026 of Mandaikadu Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Sree Kumar, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 115(2), 118(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 24.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1277/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the
respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition from 28.04.2026 and the 1st petitioner did not comply the condition on 02.05.2026, 04.05.2026 and 10.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition only from 28.04.2026 and the 1st petitioner did not comply the condition on 02.05.2026, 04.05.2026 and 10.05. 2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified in respect of the petitioners 2 and 3, and they shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and in respect of 1st petitioner/A1, this petition is dismissed and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:18:03 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Mandaikadu Police Station.(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 146/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000191-2026)

M. Vijil S/o. T. Moni (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Mandaikadu Police Station,

Crime No. 17/2026 of Mandaikadu Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Sree Kumar
praying to condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioner on
02.05.2026, 04.05.2026 and 10.05.2026.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 115(2), 118(2) and 351(3) of
BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 24.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1277/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign

before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 28.04.2026 and due to his illness, he was not able to comply the condition on 02.05.2026, 04.05.2026 and 10.05.2026. and prayed that the non compliance of condition by the petitioner may be condoned.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has not complied the condition on 02.05.2026, 04.05.2026 and 10.05.2026.

6. Considering the reason stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner/accused, this court is inclined to condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioner on 02.05.2026, 04.05.2026 and 10.05.2026.

7. In the result, non compliance of condition by the petitioner on 02.05.2026, 04.05.2026 and 10.05.2026 is condoned and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:11:40 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Mandaikadu Police Station.
(through court cell e- Mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 147/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000211-2026)

Kamaraj,

S/o Muthaiyan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No. 102/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Ariharan, u/s 482 of
BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 296(b), 115(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that there is a property dispute between the defacto complainant and the accused and on 15.05.2026 at about 7.00 AM, the accused had erected the boundary stone, when the defacto complainant attempted remove the same and on 25.04.2026 at 7.30 P.M., the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy words, assaulted him, and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and a counter complaint was registered against the defacto complainant as per CSR No.309/2026 of respondent police and the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the husband of the defacto complainant and the petitioner are brothers. The husband of the defacto complainant is no more. On 15.05.2026, this petitioner planted some survey stones in the property of

the defacto complainant, which was questioned by her. So the petitioner strangulated her neck with hand and abused her and assaulted on her stomach with leg and then the petitioner lifted his lungi and outraged her modesty and then he tore her nighty and also assaulted the son of the defacto complainant and the the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and it is a heinous crime committed by the petitioner and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly essential and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and either this petition may be dismissed or if the petition is allowed the petitioner may be directed to comply the condition in some other district.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor objected the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly essential. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab*** reported as ***AIR 1980 SC 1632***, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition

to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

7. In the present case, this Court is conscious of the fact that the defacto complainant is a woman and also a widow, and the allegations disclose acts affecting her bodily integrity and dignity. Therefore, while considering the claim of the petitioner for anticipatory bail, this Court is required to ensure that adequate safeguards are put in place so as to protect the victim from any form of intimidation, harassment or interference during the course of investigation. At the same time, the right of the petitioner to personal liberty cannot be ignored and a balance has to be maintained between the competing interests.

8. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the relationship between the parties, the stage of investigation and the submissions made by the learned Public Prosecutor, this Court is of the view that the interests of justice would be sufficiently safeguarded by imposing stringent conditions. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail subject to the condition that the petitioner shall fully cooperate with the investigation and shall make himself available for custodial interrogation, if required for the limited purpose of recovery or discovery under Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023. Further, the petitioner shall not in any manner contact, threaten, induce or harass the defacto complainant or her family members, shall not enter into the residence of the defacto complainant except for lawful purposes connected with the investigation or legal proceedings, and shall not tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses. These safeguards, in the considered view of this Court, would adequately protect the interests of the victim while preserving the petitioner's right to liberty pending investigation.

9. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram

subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the SHO, Kulasekharam Police Station on 26.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.102/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which he shall be released from custody.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within fifteen days from today without fail.
- iii. After release, the petitioner shall stay at Karambakkudi, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karambakkudi, Pudukkottai District daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.
- iv. The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.
- v. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- vi. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial

Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:48:29 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).

The cJudicial Magistrate, Karambakkudi, Pudukkottai District.

The Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.143/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000192-2026)

Anish S/o. Surendran (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

CSCID, Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Crime No. 42/2026 of CSCID, Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Jegan, praying to relax the
condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 6(4) of TNSC (RDCS) and 7(i)(a)(ii) of
Essential Commodities Act, 1955.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 17.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1209/2026 with

condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 01.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 01.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:12:27 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, CSCID, Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.142/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000150 -2026)

Nazar S/o. Alikan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil,

Crime No. 58/2024 of Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru J. Bergin Jeba Kumar, praying
to relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 420 of IPC and Sec. 66 D of Information
Technology.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 23.01.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.161/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 13.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 13.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:11:09 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.150/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000214 -2026)

Christin S/o. Sundaresan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Marthandam Police Station,
Crime No. 118/2026 of Marthandam Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P. Hentlin Jude, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 318(4) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 01.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1077/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the

respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 05.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:12:42 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode)

The Sub Inspector of Police, Marthandam Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000013-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000045-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000125-2026)

Crl.M.P. No. 93/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000149-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000215-2026)

R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan

S/o. Ramasamy

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 3/2026

Sunitha,

W/o R. Rajan @ Chanthai Rajan .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 71/2026

1. Iyyappan,

S/o Arumugam

2. M. Yogeshwaran

S/o Murugan

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026

T. Arikandan (A3)

S/o. A. Thangadurai

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026

C. Lingaraja (A2)

S/o. Chandran

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.149/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No.44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 71/2026 and 93/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru K. Pon Muthu Pandian, Crl.M.P. No. 77/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Krishna Sreethar and Crl.M.P. No. 149/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Suresh Thangam, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in all petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These five petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number,

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 61(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 324(2) and 109 of BNS.

4. The case of the prosecution is that on 03.04.2026, A2 asked the defacto complainant to come to Nanguranpilavilai for a compromise in Crime No.42/2025 and A1 arrived in a Honda City Car, took the defacto complainant to a coconut grove, where other accused were present and all the accused assaulted the defacto complainant with deadly weapons. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 3/2026 would contend that in the year 2015, the petitioner was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and his wife lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, the petitioner appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested the petitioner to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against the petitioner in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime

No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 71/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and in the year 2015, her husband was illegally detained by the police in connection with a false case, during which his leg was broken and the said police officials namely Samson Jebadhas, Vijayan and others were involved in the said incident. Aggrieved by the same, this petitioner and her husband

lodged complaints before the State Human Rights Commission, which were taken on file in SHRC No.5757/2017 and SHRC 449/2016 and the same are now pending for trial. On 13.12.2024, summon was issued by the SHRC, Madurai and accordingly, this petitioner and her husband appeared before the Commission. At that time, the said police officials requested her husband to withdraw the complaints, but he refused. Thereafter, the said Vijayan threatened that he would foist multiple cases against him. Subsequently, several false cases were registered against her husband in the year 2025 and one such case is Crime No.42/2025, wherein the defacto complainant's wife herself appeared before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and stated that the case was falsely foisted. Another case in Crime No.28/2025 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station has been stayed by High Court. Similarly, in Crime No.211/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station, even the defacto complainant admitted during enquiry that the petitioner's husband was not connected with the alleged crime. Due to previous enmity, the respondent police have falsely a case against the petitioner and her husband and the alleged injuries are not on any vital parts of the body, which clearly falsifies the allegation of a brutal attack and the petitioner is innocent and she has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this

court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.77/2026 would contend that the petitioners are not arrayed as an accused in the FIR, but now the respondent is trying to arrest and array them as an accused and the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and no such incident had happened as alleged and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.93/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and there is no specific overt act has been attributed against him and only allegation against the petitioner is that he is a friend of A1 and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and he has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioner and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.78/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.3/2026 is the President of the Hindu Thamilar Katchi. The defacto complainant is a member of the party. So they are known to each other. There is also money dispute between them. Last year, the 1st accused quarrelled with the defacto complainant and abused the wife of the defacto complainant by degrading her caste. So a case was registered by Eraniel Police in Crime No.42/2025. So the 1st accused used to demand the defacto complainant to withdraw the earlier case. On 03.04.2026 the 2nd accused/petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.149/2026 called the defacto complainant over phone and invited him to Nangrooanpilaviali. Subsequently, the 1st accused called him. So the defacto complainant went there. Then A1 and A2 took the defacto

complainant to a coconut garden wherein 3rd, 4th and other accused were already present there. Then A1, A2 and A3/Arikandan, who is the petitioner in Crl.M.p.No.93/2026 assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod all over his body. So he sustained fracture injury on his both legs and both hands. Other accused assaulted him with hand and leg. Then the accused took him into a bush and escaped from the scene of occurrence. Now the injured was discharged from the hospital. The 1st accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.3/2026 is concerned, he has ten previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.4/2023 of Asaripallam police Station and the 2nd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 149/206 is concerned, he has fourteen previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.273/2011 of Eathamozhy police Station and the 3rd accused/petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 93/206 is concerned, he has seven previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.301/2012 of Rajakkamangalam police Station and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 71/2026 and 77/2026 have no previous cases and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

11. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The prosecution allegation is that, pursuant to a prior dispute arising out of Crime No.42 of

2025, the defacto complainant was called by A2 to Nanguranpilavilai on the pretext of compromise talks and thereafter was allegedly taken by A1 and A2 to a coconut grove where the other accused were already present and assaulted with deadly weapons, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and legs. The petitioners, on the other hand, would contend that they have been falsely implicated due to previous enmity with certain police officials against whom proceedings are pending before the State Human Rights Commission. It is their specific case that several false cases have been foisted against them after refusal to withdraw the Human Rights complaints. It is also contended that in some of the earlier cases, the concerned witnesses themselves had disowned the prosecution version and that one of the criminal proceedings has already been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. As regards the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, this Court finds that they are not attributed with any specific overt act involving the use of deadly weapons and admittedly they do not have any criminal antecedents. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Therefore, this Court is of the view that their custodial interrogation may not be necessary and their presence for investigation can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions.

12. However, insofar as the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 are concerned, the prosecution has specifically attributed overt acts against them in relation to the assault on the defacto complainant with iron rods, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures. The materials available at this stage also disclose the existence of prior enmity and motive for the occurrence. Further, the prosecution has specifically pointed out that the said petitioners are history sheeters having several previous criminal cases against them. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific overt acts attributed to A1 to A3, the criminal antecedents attributed to them, and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.3 of 2026, 93 of 2026 and 149 of 2026 appears necessary for effective investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in their favour. At the same time, considering the role attributed to the petitioners in CrI.M.P.Nos.71 of 2026 and 77 of 2026, the absence of criminal antecedents, and the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them, subject to stringent condition

13. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.71/2026 and the

petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026 shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer

is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Accordingly, Crl.M.P. Nos. 3/2026, 93/2026 and 149/2026 are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:49:49 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Eathamozhy Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.71/2026

and the petitioners in Crl.M.P. Nos. 77/2026

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 151/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000216-2026)

Vimal S/o. Thankaiyan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Thiruvattar Police Station,

Crime No. 54/2026 of Thiruvattar Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru T. Bala Murali, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 13.03.2026 in
Crl.M.P.No.772/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign
before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders and
subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court,

Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 18.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1242/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e, on every Monday at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition from 20.04.2026 onwards and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition only from 20.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:16:45 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanbhapuram. (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Thiruvattar Police Station.
(through court cell e- Mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 155/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000226-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 184/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000245-2026)

Jaya Ganesh J (A1)

C/o. Jebamoni

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.155/2026

1. Jepamani (A3)

S/o. Thangaiyan Nadar

2. Jenish, S/o Jebamani (A4)

3. Jeniba, W/o Vaikundamani (A5) .. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.184/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station, Marthandam,

Crime No. 24/2026 of AWPS, Marthandam,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. Prasath .V and G. Lal respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These two petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number.

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 85, 316(2), 115(2) and 351(1) of BNS and Section 3(1), 4 and 6 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. Crl.M.P. No.155/2026 has been filed by A1 and Crl.M.P.No.184/2026 has been filed by A3 to A5 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of the prosecution is that the 1st accused is the husband of the defacto complainant and the accused 2 to 5 are relatives of A1 and the marriage between the 1st accused and the defacto complainant was solemnized on 24.11.2019. Subsequent to the marriage, the 1st accused abused the defacto complainant and demanded additional dowry. Due to that, the defacto complainant gave Rs.8 Lakhs from her parents to 1st accused. The other accused also demanded extra money, for which the

defacto complainant gave 16 sovereigns of gold ornament to them. They were continuously demanding money from the defacto complainant and demanded her to sell her gold jewellery for all their personal needs. On 06.10.2025, A2 to A4 abused the defacto complainant and A2 and A5 assaulted the defacto complainant by using hands and A3 assaulted her with stick and criminally intimidated her. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.155/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he is the husband of the defacto complainant and he is working in abroad and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as stated in the FIR and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.184/2026 would contend that the 1st petitioner is the father, 2nd petitioner is the brother and the 4th petitioner is the sister of the defacto complainant and the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the respondent police has registered this case mechanically without conducting any preliminary enquiry. Further it would be contended that this FIR has been lodged only as a counter blast to the earlier complaint initiated by the

2nd petitioner against the defacto complainant regarding the theft/ misappropriation of jewels and money belonging to their family and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioners and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as stated in the FIR and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that A1 is the husband of the defacto complainant and A2 is the mother, A3 is the father and A4 is the brother and A5 is the sister of A1. The accused persons demanded additional dowry of Rs.10 lakhs and in connection that, the parents of the defacto complainant gave Rs.8 Lakhs. So, on 06.10.2025, A2, A3 and A5 abused the defacto complainant and A2 slapped on both side of her face with hand and assaulted on her with leg, A3 assaulted her with stick on her hand and A5 also assaulted on her stomach and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is not yet over and it is a matrimonial dispute and the matter may be referred to mediation.

9. The FIR arises out of dispute between husband and wife who are the 1st accused and defacto complainant and other accused are relatives of A1. There are allegations of dowry demand and harassment.

The learned Public Prosecutor would state that the injured was discharged from the hospital and in the event of considering this application, the matter may be referred to mediation. Taking note of the above, this court is of the view that it is not a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner might be necessary. In such circumstances, both petitions deserve to be allowed.

10. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:44:48 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.
(through court cell e-mode)
The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 148/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000200-2026)

1. V. Subinraj (A1)

S/o. Vanaraj

2. M. Krishna Moorthi (A2)

S/o. Muthaiah

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Vadasery Police Station,

Crime No. 170/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P.G.I. Thanu, u/s 482 of
BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 127(2), 296 (b), 115 (2), 118(1) and 351 (3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the husband of the 1st accused's own sister and there was some problem between their matrimonial life. So, the wife of the defacto complainant came out from her matrimonial house with her child. So, on 16.05.2026 the defacto complainant came to my home, at that time, the accused persons wrongfully restrained the defacto complainant, abused him in filthy language, assaulted him with weapon, caused injuries and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the petitioners have no previous cases and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st petitioner is the brother in law of the defacto complainant and there is a matrimonial dispute between the defacto complainant and his wife and on 16.05.2026, the defacto complainant went to the house of his wife to see his new born child, at that time the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with aruval and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and either

this petition may be dismissed or if the petition is allowed, the petitioners may be directed to comply the condition in some other district.

6. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and though the learned Public Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall stay at Sivagiri, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri, Tenkasi District daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner

interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

- v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in *P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560*.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:51:34 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No. II, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri, Tenkasi District.
The Inspector of Police, Vadasery Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 162/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000225-2026)

Siva Chandra Bose S/o. Nagaretinam

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No. 78/2026 of Marthandam Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Bino Vins Kumar, praying to
extend the time to appear before the court concerned.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the Petition.

2. Offence alleged u/s 296(b), 324(4), 109 and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions
Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 18.02.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.523/2026 with
condition that the petitioner should appear before the court concerned within 15 days
from the date of order.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that due to his

illness, he could not able to surrender before the court concerned within the stipulated time and prayed for extension of time to appear.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that he leaves to the court.

6. Considering the reason stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner and also considering the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor that he has no serious objection, this court is inclined to extend one week time.

7. In the result, this court directs the petitioner to surrender before the court concerned within one week from today on condition that the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.3000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) before the Mediation Centre, Nagercoil and accordingly, this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:04:59 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge.
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Marthandam Police Station. (through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.152/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000212-2026)

Sekar S/o. Backiya Nathan (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Eraniel Police Station,
Crime No. 184/2026 of Eraniel Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru G.S. Ramesh, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 351(2) of BNS and Sec. 4 of TNPHW
Act.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 16.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1219/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 23.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 23.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

7. In the result, condition is totally relaxed and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:13:01 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Eraniel Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.161/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000223-2026)

Shaji S/o. Chelladurai (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No. 102/2026 of Marthandam Police Station

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Paul Raj, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS and Sec. 21(1) of Mines and
Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 07.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.881/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 09.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 09.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:13:15 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Marthandam Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 164/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000194-2026)

Pravin Raj S/o. Sundar Raj(A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Puthukadai Police Station,

Crime No. 429/2017 of Puthukadai Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru G. Lal, praying to relax the
condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 420 of IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil, on 12.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.752/2026 with
condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate
No.II, Kuzhithurai daily at 10.30 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the
condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at

Nagercoil on 17.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1156/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.30 A.M. until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 20.04.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. Report received from the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai through g-mail. A perusal of report shows that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 20.04.2026 to 18.05.2026.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.30 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:17:01 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Puthukadai P.S. (through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 160/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000222-2026)

1. Titus, S/o. Simeon (A1)
2. Marimuthu, S/o. Lakshmanan (A2)
3. Suba, D/o Nasayan .. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Puthukadai Police Station,
Crime No.153/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil. .. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Paul Raj, u/s 482 of
BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 303(2) of BNS r/w 21(1) of MMDR Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that 07.05.2026 at about 8.30 A.M. the Sub Inspector of Police and his subordinates were conducting vehicle check up near Marayapuram four Way Attru Palam, at that time the 1st accused drove the Bharat Benz 16 wheel tipper bearing Reg. No. TN75 AY 1445, 2nd accused drove the TATA Signa 16 wheel tipper bearing Reg. No. TN75 AV 2066 and other accused persons drove the vehicles bearing Reg. Nos. TN75 AL 9018, TN75 BC 0032, TN75 BD 0565, TN75 BE 4226 and TN75 AV 1878 and the respondent police stopped the vehicle and conducting enquiry, at that time, the accused persons ran away from the occurrence place. Thereafter, the respondent police found that the 1st accused transporting 32 tons of M.Sand using with transit pass No. TSPS04495871 and the 2nd accused transporting 33 tons of M.Sand using with transit pass No. TSPS04495875, but the accused 1 and 2 did not went to the mentioned place in the transit pass and trying to illegally transported the minerals to sell them in Kerala for higher price. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as alleged in the FIR and the co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court on 20.05.2026 in Crl.OP (MD) No.9483/2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 07.05.2026, the petitioners and other accused illegally transported minerals from Tamil Nadu to Kerala in 7 lorries. They had obtained transit pass to transport mineral within Kanyakumari District, but they violated the condition laid down in the transit pass and illegally transported Kerala State. So, on seeing the police party, the drivers stopped the lorry and escaped from the scene of occurrence. Totally 7 vehicles in this case bearing Regn. Nos. TN 75AY 1445, TN75 AV 2066, TN75 AL 9018, TN75 BC 0032, TN75 BD 0565, TN75 BE 4226 and TN75 AV 1878 and A1 and A2 are the drivers of the vehicle and A3 is the owner of the two lorries bearing Regn. Nos. TN 75 AY 1445 and TN 75AV 2066 and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and both the petitions may be dismissed.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that similarly placed co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. It is further submitted that, while granting such relief, the Hon'ble High Court directed deposit of certain amounts before the District Mines Foundation Trust concerned. The learned Public Prosecutor, however, submitted that there is uncertainty as to whether the District Mines Foundation Trust account has been operationalised in the Nagercoil District and, therefore, clarification/modification in mutatis

mutandis is required regarding the mode of deposit directed by the Hon'ble High Court.

7. Considering the submissions made on either side and taking note of the fact that the co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners also, subject to appropriate conditions, including a modified condition regarding deposit of the amount through the Assistant Director of Mines, Nagercoil.

8. In the result, in the event of arrest or on the petitioners surrendering before the Court concerned within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, the petitioners shall be released on bail on each of them executing 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, Kuzhithurai, subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioners shall appear before the Court concerned within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

ii. The Assistant Director of Mines, Nagercoil, shall issue necessary challan to the third petitioner/A3 for remittance of a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) into the appropriate Government Treasury account and the receipt evidencing such deposit shall be produced before the Court concerned at the time of execution of bond.

iii. The petitioners shall cooperate with the investigation and appear

before the respondent police as and when required for enquiry.

iv. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

v. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.

vi. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

vii. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

viii. If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:50:33 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, Puthukadai Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

The Assistant Director of Mines, Nagercoil.

The counsel for the petitioners.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 159/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000221-2026)

Parameshwari W/o. Navaladi (A2)

...Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Aralvoimozhy Police Station,
Crime No. 760/2025 of Aralvoimozhy Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Paul Raj, u/s 482 of
BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s. 294(b), 420 and 506(i) of IPC.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant was asked getting teacher job for five lakhs and received a sum of Rs.2,00,000/-, but the defacto complainant was permitted job for one year and failed to give salary for that and thereafter, the defacto complainant was threatened, while she asked to return back the amount and in the meantime, a portion of amount Rs.50,000/- was returned back by the 1st accused. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the 1st accused had direct contact with the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant gave donation to the Trust for the appointment of her as Teacher in the Government school and receipt also provided in that connection. Since the defacto complainant stopped to go to school, A1 settled a part of amount to the defacto complainant assured to settle the remaining amount within a short period, which was endorsed in the complaint. In the FIR, the defacto complainant alleged that Rs.1,00,000/- to A2, but she produced no document and the petitioner did not get any amount as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged and he has been falsely implicated in this case and nothing had happened as alleged and this is the 4th application and the earlier applications in CrI.M.P. Nos.848/2026, 1234/2026 and 1420/2026

were dismissed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 18.03.2026, 21.04.2026 and 30.04.2026 respectively and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that this petitioner and the 1st accused promised the defacto complainant that they can arrange Teacher post to the defacto complainant in the Government school and on believing the words of the petitioner and A1, the defacto complainant paid Rs.1,00,000/- to A1 and Rs.1,00,000/- to the petitioner on 21.12.2022 and 22.12.2022 respectively. Subsequently, the defacto complainant was appointed as a temporary teacher in the Government Adhi Thiravidar Higher Secondary School, Vazhayathuvayal. Subsequently, the petitioner and the 1st demanded another Rs.5 Lakhs to make the post as permanent one. The petitioner came to know that the petitioner and the 1st accused cheated the defacto complainant. So this case has been registered and the investigation is in the preliminary stage and notice under Section 35(3) of BNSS issued to the petitioner to appear before the Investigation Officer on 17.03.2026 at 10.00 A.M. but the petitioner did not appear before the Investigation Officer and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly essential and already this petitioner moved before

this court for anticipatory bail in CrI.M.P. Nos.848/2026, 1234/2026 and 1420/2026 and the same were dismissed and there is no change in circumstances and the petitioner may be taken into custody and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The allegation against the petitioner is that, on the promise of securing appointment as a Teacher in a Government School, the defacto complainant was induced to part with a sum of Rs.2,00,000/-. The records further disclose that the defacto complainant was subsequently appointed temporarily in a Government Adi Dravidar Higher Secondary School and that a portion of the amount is stated to have been repaid by the first accused. The truth or otherwise of the allegations are matters to be ascertained during the course of investigation. It is also seen that summons under Section 35(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 have already been issued to the petitioner by the Investigating Officer requiring her appearance for enquiry. The issuance of such summons would indicate that substantial progress has been made in the investigation and that the presence of the petitioner can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions. Though the learned Public

Prosecutor opposed the application on the ground that custodial interrogation is necessary and that the earlier anticipatory bail applications were dismissed, this Court is of the view that the apprehension of the prosecution can be adequately safeguarded by imposing stringent conditions to ensure the petitioner's cooperation with the investigation.

Considering the nature of the allegations, the stage of investigation, the issuance of summons by the Investigating Officer, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on her appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail and also she is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- (Rupees One Lakh Fifty Thousand only) before the court concerned.
- ii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

- iii. The petitioner shall also make herself available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner shall duly respond to all summons/notices issued by the Investigating Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects and make herself available for interrogation as and when required.
- v. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- vi. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:45:12 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Aralvoimozhy Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 168/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000234-2026)

1. Anish S/o. Antony (A1)
2. Arockia Sachin Prasad (A2)

S/o. Joseph Gnanaprakasam

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

South Thamaraiikulam Police Station,

Crime No. 84/2026 of South Thamaraiikulam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Krishnan, u/s 482 of
BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 296(b), 324(4), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 08.05.2026 while the
defacto complainant was drinking tea at Ezhil Hotel, the accused went there

and abused the defacto complainant in filthy words and attacked him with metal rods and iron ring, caused injuries and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 08.05.2026, the accused persons abused the defacto complainant and assaulted him with iron rod and the 2nd petitioner stabbed the defacto complainant on his face with iron ring and A3 assaulted him with stick and caused injury on his face and one tooth broken and A4 assaulted him with stick and now the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed and in the event of considering this application, stringent condition may be imposed.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that the injured was discharged from the hospital. The learned Public Prosecutor would state that though the injured has been discharged

from the hospital, considering the heinous crime committed by the petitioners, stringent condition may be imposed. In these circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall stay at Pudukkottai, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Pudukkottai daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:51:53 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Pudukkottai.
The Inspector of Police, South Thamaraikulam Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 158/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000213-2026)

Arul, S/o Ramachandiran

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Wing, Nagercoil,
Crime No. 28/2025 of Cyber Crime Wing, Nagercoil,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru V. Manikandan, u/s 482
of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 299, 302 and 352 of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto
complainant has been using the facebook page – Anish Govindh and also on

11.06.2025 at 6.00 P.M. while scrolling the facebook page, he saw a post dated: 07.05.2025 from the facebook id, Kolaru Thanga Vel (URL ID: <https://www.facebook.com/kolaruthangavel/>) that 600 people had travelling towards Allah to pray for 72 virgins for you and a photo with a muslim woman holding pork in her hand with a statement eat pork and celebrate and on 20.05.2025 a post that the pig will give birth to many young pigs, with a comparing statement pointing out the increasing number of Islamic places of worship in Germany for put bomb, such comments will make people think that muslims are terrorists and also he published defamatory statement against their head Haji and he has deliberately posted this statement to hurt Islamic religious sentiments. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and nothing had happened as alleged in the FIR and the respondent police had falsely implicated the petitioner in this case and this is the 4th anticipatory bail application and the earlier applications in Crl.M.P. Nos.681/2026, 773/2026 and 936/2026 were dismissed by this court on 26.02.2026, 12.03.2026 and 24.03.2026 respectively and the petitioner has no previous cases and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant is working as a constable of Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil. On 07.05.2025, 20.05.2025 and 26.05.2025, the petitioner published defamatory statements in his facebook against Muslim community. He compared the Muslims with pig as “பன்றி பல குட்டி போடும், எதுக்கு? வேற எதுக்கு.....பாம் வைக்க தான்.”. Moreover, Head Haji of Government of Tamil Nadu expired recently. The petitioner published defamatory statements in his facebook that “துலுக்கன்னாலே காஜி தான், அதனால் தான் அவனுங்களுக்கு தலைமை காஜி இருக்கு, அதிலும் இவரு அரசாங்க காஜி.”. The petitioner published the statements with the intention of outraging the religious feelings of Muslim people and to provoke the breach of public peace. So this case is registered and the investigation of the case is not yet over. The petitioner created fake id in facebook and published the defamatory statements. So the prosecution agency obtained data from the facebook company and found that the petitioner published defamatory statements on several occasions and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No.936/2026 was dismissed only on 24.03.2026 and there is no change in circumstances and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that this is the 4th application and the earlier application was dismissed on 24.03.2026 and the occurrence had happened in the year 2025. The learned Public Prosecutor would contend that the earlier application was dismissed only on 24.03.2026 and there is no change in circumstances. After hearing elaborate arguments, the earlier petition was dismissed on the ground that there is no change in circumstances and again, the present petition has been filed by the petitioner without any change in circumstances. Considering the above, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/accused at this stage.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:49:29 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 169/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000195-2026)

1. R. Nanthagopal (A1)

S/o. Rajaboopathy

2. A. Cross Sarathi (A2)

S/o. Annai Mariyan

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No. 45/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru J. Glitus John, u/s 482
of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 296(b), 115(2), 304(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity between the accused and the defacto complainant, on 09.04.2026 the accused wrongfully restrained the defacto complainant, abused him in filthy words and assaulted him, caused injuries and snatched the defacto complainant's mobile phone and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and al and the petitioners have no previous cases and they are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally 4 accused in this case and the petitioners are A1 and A2. On 09.04.2026, while the defacto complainant was travelling in a bike towards Pozhikarai, A1 got lift and asked him to go beach resort road, but the defacto complainant refused to go that road and immediately, A1 abused the defacto complainant and took aruval and kept near the neck of the defacto complainant and asked him to stop the vehicle. The defacto complainant stopped the vehicle and immediately, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with coconut stalk on his hip and back and snatched the cell phone and flew away from there with other accused waited them in

bike and A1 is having 2 previous case and A2 is having 13 previous cases and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there are totally four accused in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A1 and A2. According to the prosecution, on 09.04.2026, while the defacto complainant was proceeding on a motorcycle towards Pozhikarai, the first petitioner/A1 obtained a lift from him and requested that he be taken through the Beach Resort Road. Since the defacto complainant refused, A1 allegedly abused him in filthy language, took an aruval and placed it near the neck of the defacto complainant and compelled him to stop the vehicle. Thereafter, the petitioners are alleged to have assaulted the defacto complainant with a coconut stalk on his hip and back, snatched away his mobile phone and fled from the place with the assistance of the other accused who were waiting nearby on a motorcycle. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that A1 is involved in two previous criminal cases and A2 is involved in thirteen previous criminal cases. Though the injured has been discharged from the hospital, the investigation is still in progress and, therefore, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor specifically pointed out the criminal antecedents of the petitioners, namely that the first petitioner/A1 is involved in two previous cases and the second petitioner/A2 is involved in as many as thirteen previous criminal cases. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the manner of occurrence, the use of a deadly weapon during the commission of the offence and the criminal antecedents attributed to the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to exercise the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioners at this stage. Hence, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

8. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:52:16 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 170/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000247-2026)

Nishanth, S/o. Ponnu Thangam

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

C.S.C.I.D. Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Crime No.79/2026 of C.S.C.I.D. Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate of Thiru N. Babu Rajan, u/s
482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s 6(4) of TNSC (RDCS) Order 7(i)(a)(ii) of E.C. Act of 1955.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 12.05.2026, while the respondent police conducted vehicle check up near Bala Garden, Konam area in the morning hours, the accused person illegally transported 2000 kgs. of PDS rice in a Tata Ace vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN74 BJ 2297. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is the former owner of the vehicle and that he has not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint and the petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and that the entire case has been falsely foisted against him and the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the investigation and abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, the learned counsel prayed for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application and submitted that on 12.05.2026, this petitioner illegally transported 2000 kilograms of PDS rice in a Tempo and on noticing the police party, the petitioner allegedly abandoned the vehicle at the spot and fled from the scene of occurrence in order to evade arrest. The vehicle along with the contraband articles was seized by the respondent police and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and prayed that the petition may be

dismissed.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor would further contend that if anticipatory bail is granted at this stage, there is every possibility of the petitioner absconding, tampering with evidence, influencing witnesses, or alerting the other members of the suspected network, thereby seriously hampering the ongoing investigation. Since the investigation is still at a crucial stage and the police are attempting to unravel the wider ramifications of the organised illegal activity, the learned Public Prosecutor raised serious objection to granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in various decisions including *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, while balancing the individual's right to personal liberty and the investigational rights of the police, observed that while granting anticipatory bail, conditions contemplated under Section 438(2)(i), (ii), and (iii) of the Cr.P.C. (now Section 482(2)(i), (ii), and (iii) of the BNSS) may be imposed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had also observed in several cases that the accused may be directed to surrender before the police for a brief period he may be deemed to have surrendered himself for such custodial investigation. Thus, even while granting anticipatory bail, the Hon'ble Supreme Court recognised the necessity of permitting limited custody of the accused for facilitating

investigation and recovery, so as to balance both the personal liberty of the individual and the investigational rights of the police.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the vehicle along with contraband was seized by the respondent police. Considering the nature of the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, this Court finds it appropriate to adopt the approach indicated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court so as to balance the personal liberty of the petitioner as well as the investigational rights of the police. Accordingly, this petition deserves to be allowed with conditions.

9. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the SHO, CSCID, Nagercoil, on 26.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.79/2026 of CSCID, Nagercoil, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which he shall be released from custody.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within fifteen

days from today without fail.

- iii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iv. The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.
- v. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- vi. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:48:43 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, CSCID, Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.172/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000238-2026)

Arokia Ashik S/o. Kilites

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Kanyakumari Police Station,

Crime No. 93/2026 of Kanyakumari Police Station,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. John Milton, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1215/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the
respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner

has been complying the condition from 08.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 08.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22 20:13:32
+0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Kanyakumari Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	Crl.M.P.No. 166/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்டநாள்	22.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	ராஜேஷ், த/பெ சிறுமணி
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:54:24 +0530

(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

தீர்ப்புரை/உத்தரவு நகல் வழங்கும் நபரின்
பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம் தேதியுடன்.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 166/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000252-2026)

Rajesh, S/o Sirumani

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kottar Police Station,
Crime No. 136/2026 of Kottar Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Legal Aid Defense Counsel Thiru K.F.
Ajin Britto, u/s 483 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 296(b), 118(1), 109, 103(1) and 351(3) of BNS and Sec. 4 of TNPHW Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 18.04.2026 at about 9.00 P.M. there is a wordy altercation between the accused and the defacto complainant's family near their residence at Arattu Road. At that time, the accused abused them, leading to a scuffle wherein the deceased and the accused fell down. Subsequently, the accused attacked the deceased with a screw driver and iron rod, resulting in his death and also caused injuries to the defacto complainant and her husband and also criminally intimidated them. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and no such occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 20.04.2026 and the investigation is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner and the deceased are neighbours. The petitioner used to quarrel with the deceased under the influence of liquor.

On 16.04.,2026, the petitioner assaulted the deceased with hand. Again on 18.04.2026 the petitioner assaulted the deceased with stick. So the deceased assaulted tge petitioner and both of them fell down and they sustained minor injuries. So the petitioner went to his house and took a screwdriver and an iron rod and stabbed on the left hand of the deceased with screwdriver. So the daughter and son in law of the deceased came to rescue the deceased. But the petitioner stabbed both of them with screwdriver. Both of them sustained injuries on their wrist. Then the petitioner assaulted on the head of the deceased with iron rod repeatedly. So he sustained severe injuries and he died. Petitioner was arrested on 20.04.2026 and the injured persons discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The allegations against the petitioner is that the petitioner assaulted on the deceased with iron rod on his head repeatedly and also he assaulted the daughter and son in law of the deceased with screwdriver. The materials placed before this Court prima facie disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the offence. Considering the gravity of the offence, and the stage of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. As such, this petition deserves to be

dismissed.

7. In the result, this Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:54:34 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.174/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000242-2026)

V. Arulraj S/o. Varampetran

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No. 50/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S.B. Abeth Benny Stephen,
praying to relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 191(2), 126(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 303 of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 06.03.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.756/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on

07.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1136/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e, on every Monday at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 13.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 13.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:13:48 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 178/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000257-2026)

1. Ponpandidurai, S/o. Esakkimuthu
2. Karuppasamy, S/o. Mariyappan .. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Karungal Police Station,
Crime No.142/2026 of Karungal Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil. .. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Varatharajan, u/s
482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 303(2) of BNS and Sec. 21(4) of Mines and Minerals Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 27.04.2026 the accused persons illegally removed gravel in a patta land bearing Survey Nos. 284/1A, 284/1B1 and 284(2) without proper permit. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are innocent and the 1st petitioner is the owner cum driver of the JCB bearing Chassis No. PUNJD14AKS3558300 and the 2nd petitioner is also an owner cum driver of the another one JCB bearing serial No. 0401D01262 and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as stated in the FIR and the vehicles were seized and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioners are driver cum owners and they excavated soil from the private land and at that time, the police party went there and seized two vehicles and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and both the petitions may be dismissed.

6. It is the case of the prosecution that the petitioners had excavated soil from private land without proper permission. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the Hon'ble High Court, in similar matters, had directed the accused persons to deposit certain amounts before the District Mines and Minerals Foundation Trust concerned. However, according to the

learned Public Prosecutor, there is uncertainty as to whether such Foundation Trust account has been operationalised in the Nagercoil District and, therefore, there is practical difficulty in insisting upon compliance of the condition in the manner earlier directed. Hence, he sought for suitable modification of the condition by directing the petitioners to deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- before the Government Treasury through the Department of Mines and Minerals.

7. Considering the nature of the allegations, the submissions made by the learned Public Prosecutor and the necessity to ensure compliance of the conditions in a practicable manner, this Court is inclined to allow the petition with appropriate modifications.

8. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the Court concerned, the petitioners shall be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each, with two sureties each for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Judicial Magistrate Court, Eraniel, subject to the following conditions:-

i. The petitioners shall appear before the Court concerned within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, without fail. The Assistant Director of Mines and Minerals, Nagercoil, shall issue necessary challans to the petitioners for remittance of a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each into the Government Treasury under the

appropriate head of account, and the petitioners shall produce proof of such deposit before the Court concerned.

ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.

iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:50:49 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Karungal Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)
The Assistant Director of Mines, Nagercoil.
The counsel for the petitioners in both petitions.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivados, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 171/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000238-2026)

Selvin Jayakumar @ Kumar S/o. Selvaraj (A2) ... Petitioner
/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kotticode Police Station,
Crime No. 1/2026 of Kotticode Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Prasath V, praying to relax the
condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 126(2), 296(b), 118(1), 308(4) and 351(3) of
BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 11.03.2026 in
Crl.M.P.No.742/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign
before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders and

subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 25.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1319/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e, on every Monday at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition from 27.04.2026 and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition only from 27.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:17:20 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kotticode Police Station.
(through court cell e- Mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 173/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000262-2026)

Sanjay @ Sanjay Raj (A1)
S/o. Santhosh @ Santhosh Raj

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Palugal Police Station,
Crime No. 82/2026 of Palugal Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru C.V. Arun, u/s 482 of
BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 06.05.2026 at about 12.30 P.M., the accused abused the son of the defacto complainant in filthy words, assaulted him, caused injuries and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is a 2nd year B.Tech student and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as alleged by the prosecution and the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are 5 accused in this case and the petitioner is A1. On 08.05.2006, the petitioner and other accused waylaid the son of the defacto complainant and abused him and assaulted him on his face, chest and back and now the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is a college going student and the injured was discharged from the hospital.

7. Heard both sides. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/accused with conditions.

8. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 7.00 P.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:48:55 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).

The Sub Inspector of Police, Palugal Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.175/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000261-2026)

Mohammed Sherif S/o. Mohideen Khan (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No. 77/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Varatharajan, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS and Sec. 21(1) of Mines and
Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1218/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 06.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:14:02 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode)

The Sub Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 180/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000244-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 181/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000243-2026)

Arkis Diana In Judi Alphonc (A2)

W/o Christopher ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.180/2026

Raveenthiran (A1)

S/o Rassiah ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.181/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station, Nagercoil,

Crime No. 28/2026 of AWPS, Marthandam,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. A. Paulraj and
P. Michael respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail

to the petitioner in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These two petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number.

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 498(A) and 406 of IPC and Section 3(1) and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. CrI.M.P. No.180/2026 has been filed by A2 and CrI.M.P.No.181/2026 has been filed by A1 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the A1 and the defacto complainant's daughter was solemnized on 07.08.2017 and after marriage, the accused caused cruelty against the defacto complainant and demanded additional dowry from the defacto complainant and her daughter. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.180/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and she is the family friend of 1st accused and she is the caretaker of the mother of 1st accused and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the

prosecution and she is in no way connected with this case and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.181/2026 would contend that the defacto complainant is the mother in law of this petitioner and the marriage between the petitioner and the daughter of the defacto complainant was solemnized on 07.08.2017 and out of the wedlock, they had no issues and after marriage, this petitioner wne to Qatar on 03.09.2017 after that he made all arrangements and taken his wife to Qatar on the same month end. Further it would be contended that on 17.06.2025 his wife got a job in Qatar and on the same day, she deserted the petitioner without any information and from 17.06.2025, there is no conversation between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Subsequently, his mother was hospitalised in serious condition and so on 01.05.2026 he came to India and came to know that the defacto complainant presented a false complaint against the petitioners and so he filed the IDOP before the Family Court, Nagercoil on 18.05.2026 in filing No.262/2026. Further it would be contended that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the intention of the defacto complainant is to remand the petitioner to judicial

custody and to demand money of Rs.2 Crores from him by illegal means and she is attempting to stop the petitioner to go to Qatar for employment and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that A1 is the son in law of the defacto complainant. A1 wanted to marry A2. The petitioner and other accused demanded additional dowry and harassed the daughter of the defacto complainant. So, on 05.05.2026, the defacto complainant lodged the petition before the Superintendent of Police. On 09.05.2026, the 1st accused appeared and assumed that he would return 100 sovereigns of gold jewels and household articles and file a divorce petition. But, A1 did not comply the condition and he did not hand over the jewels. So, this case has been registered and the investigation of the case is not yet over and it is a matrimonial dispute and the matter may be referred to mediation.

9. The FIR arises out of dispute between husband and wife. There are allegations of dowry demand and harassment. From the arguments of both side, it is noted that, on 09.05.2026, a complaint of the present nature appears have been settled among the parties. Subsequent to that, A1 did not comply the condition and hand over the jewels of the

defacto complainant's daughter. The learned Public Prosecutor states that the matter may be referred to mediation. Taking note of the above, this court is of the view that it is not a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioners might be necessary and this court is inclined to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner in both petitions till 02.06.2026 with conditions.

10. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on interim anticipatory bail till 02.06.2026 on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.

The petitioner in both petitions/A1 and A2 and the defacto complainant's daughter are directed to appear before the Mediation Centre, Nagercoil on 27.05.2026 at 11.30 A.M. and other subsequent dates to be fixed by the Mediators for mediation.

Call on 03.06.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:44:59 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.

(through e-mode)

The Mediation Centre, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.

(through court cell e-mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 180/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000244-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 181/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000243-2026)

Arkis Diana In Judi Alphonc (A2)

W/o Christopher ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.180/2026

Raveenthiran (A1)

S/o Rassiah ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.181/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station, Nagercoil,

Crime No. 28/2026 of AWPS, Marthandam,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. A. Paulraj and
P. Michael respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail

to the petitioner in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These two petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number.

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 498(A) and 406 of IPC and Section 3(1) and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. CrI.M.P. No.180/2026 has been filed by A2 and CrI.M.P.No.181/2026 has been filed by A1 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the A1 and the defacto complainant's daughter was solemnized on 07.08.2017 and after marriage, the accused caused cruelty against the defacto complainant and demanded additional dowry from the defacto complainant and her daughter. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.180/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and she is the family friend of 1st accused and she is the caretaker of the mother of 1st accused and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the

prosecution and she is in no way connected with this case and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.181/2026 would contend that the defacto complainant is the mother in law of this petitioner and the marriage between the petitioner and the daughter of the defacto complainant was solemnized on 07.08.2017 and out of the wedlock, they had no issues and after marriage, this petitioner wne to Qatar on 03.09.2017 after that he made all arrangements and taken his wife to Qatar on the same month end. Further it would be contended that on 17.06.2025 his wife got a job in Qatar and on the same day, she deserted the petitioner without any information and from 17.06.2025, there is no conversation between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Subsequently, his mother was hospitalised in serious condition and so on 01.05.2026 he came to India and came to know that the defacto complainant presented a false complaint against the petitioners and so he filed the IDOP before the Family Court, Nagercoil on 18.05.2026 in filing No.262/2026. Further it would be contended that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the intention of the defacto complainant is to remand the petitioner to judicial

custody and to demand money of Rs.2 Crores from him by illegal means and she is attempting to stop the petitioner to go to Qatar for employment and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that A1 is the son in law of the defacto complainant. A1 wanted to marry A2. The petitioner and other accused demanded additional dowry and harassed the daughter of the defacto complainant. So, on 05.05.2026, the defacto complainant lodged the petition before the Superintendent of Police. On 09.05.2026, the 1st accused appeared and assumed that he would return 100 sovereigns of gold jewels and household articles and file a divorce petition. But, A1 did not comply the condition and he did not hand over the jewels. So, this case has been registered and the investigation of the case is not yet over and it is a matrimonial dispute and the matter may be referred to mediation.

9. The FIR arises out of dispute between husband and wife. There are allegations of dowry demand and harassment. From the arguments of both side, it is noted that, on 09.05.2026, a complaint of the present nature appears have been settled among the parties. Subsequent to that, A1 did not comply the condition and hand over the jewels of the

defacto complainant's daughter. The learned Public Prosecutor states that the matter may be referred to mediation. Taking note of the above, this court is of the view that it is not a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioners might be necessary and this court is inclined to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner in both petitions till 02.06.2026 with conditions.

10. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on interim anticipatory bail till 02.06.2026 on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.

The petitioner in both petitions/A1 and A2 and the defacto complainant's daughter are directed to appear before the Mediation Centre, Nagercoil on 27.05.2026 at 11.30 A.M. and other subsequent dates to be fixed by the Mediators for mediation.

Call on 03.06.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:44:59 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.

(through e-mode)

The Mediation Centre, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.

(through court cell e-mode)

The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.183/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000199 -2026)

James S/o. Dhas

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Vadasery Police Station,
Crime No. 128/2026 of Vadasery Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P.G.I. Thanu, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 324(3) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1317/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the

respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 06.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:15:07 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Vadasery Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 187/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000217-2026)

1. Rajesh (A1)
S/o. Soosaimariyan
2. Singarajan (A2)
S/o. Devadhas

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Arumanai Police Station,
Crime No. 83/2026 of Arumanai Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P. Suresh, u/s 482 of
BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 296(b), 115(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 12.04.2026 at about 11.00 P.M. the accused persons abused the defacto complainant in filthy language, attacked him and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the pros and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 12.04.2026, these petitioners consumed alcohol in a Marriage Hall and the defacto complainant is the Manager of the Hall. So, he questioned the petitioners and immediately, the petitioners abused him and pulled his shirt and assaulted on his body with hand and subsequently, they showed knife and threatened him and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been

committed by the petitioners/accused and though the learned Public Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial

Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:52:31 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Arumanai Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.185/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000231-2026)

Robert @ Robert Babiyan (A4)

S/o. Susai Suresh

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Crime No. 189/2025 of Nesamony Nagar Police Station

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P. Subramonian, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 351(2) and 318(4) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal

Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 27.02.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.595/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 21.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 21.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly twice i.e. on 1st and 15th day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:15:52 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Nesamony Nagar Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 189/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000240-2026)

Yashvanth S/o. Kumar (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kanyakumari Police Station,

Crime No. 82/2026 of Kanyakumari Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru N. Ratheesh, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 3(5), 309(4) and 49 of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1263/2026 with
condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police
daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner

has been complying the modified condition from 04.04.2026 onwards and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition only from 04.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:17:34 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil. (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kanyakumari Police Station.
(through court cell e- Mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.186/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000258-2026)

1. Rajini S/o. Suriyan
 2. Shyju S/o. Sathananthan
 3. Maradona S/o. Selvaraj
- ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Kulasekharam Police Station,
Crime No.33/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru K. Aneesh, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS and Sec. 21(1) of Mines and
Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

3. The 1st and 2nd petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 03.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.516/2026 and the 3rd petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 05.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.748/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1062/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e, on every Monday at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition from 06.04.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition only from 06.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e. on 1st day of every month at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:18:17 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 155/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000226-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 184/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000245-2026)

Jaya Ganesh J (A1)

C/o. Jebamoni

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.155/2026

1. Jepamani (A3)

S/o. Thangaiyan Nadar

2. Jenish, S/o Jebamani (A4)

3. Jeniba, W/o Vaikundamani (A5) .. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.184/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station, Marthandam,

Crime No. 24/2026 of AWPS, Marthandam,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. Prasath .V and G. Lal respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. These two petitions are filed by different accused, but in same crime number.

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 85, 316(2), 115(2) and 351(1) of BNS and Section 3(1), 4 and 6 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. CrI.M.P. No.155/2026 has been filed by A1 and CrI.M.P.No.184/2026 has been filed by A3 to A5 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of the prosecution is that the 1st accused is the husband of the defacto complainant and the accused 2 to 5 are relatives of A1 and the marriage between the 1st accused and the defacto complainant was solemnized on 24.11.2019. Subsequent to the marriage, the 1st accused abused the defacto complainant and demanded additional dowry. Due to that, the defacto complainant gave Rs.8 Lakhs from her parents to 1st accused. The other accused also demanded extra money, for which the

defacto complainant gave 16 sovereigns of gold ornament to them. They were continuously demanding money from the defacto complainant and demanded her to sell her gold jewellery for all their personal needs. On 06.10.2025, A2 to A4 abused the defacto complainant and A2 and A5 assaulted the defacto complainant by using hands and A3 assaulted her with stick and criminally intimidated her. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.155/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he is the husband of the defacto complainant and he is working in abroad and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as stated in the FIR and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.184/2026 would contend that the 1st petitioner is the father, 2nd petitioner is the brother and the 4th petitioner is the sister of the defacto complainant and the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the respondent police has registered this case mechanically without conducting any preliminary enquiry. Further it would be contended that this FIR has been lodged only as a counter blast to the earlier complaint initiated by the

2nd petitioner against the defacto complainant regarding the theft/ misappropriation of jewels and money belonging to their family and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioners and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as stated in the FIR and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that A1 is the husband of the defacto complainant and A2 is the mother, A3 is the father and A4 is the brother and A5 is the sister of A1. The accused persons demanded additional dowry of Rs.10 lakhs and in connection that, the parents of the defacto complainant gave Rs.8 Lakhs. So, on 06.10.2025, A2, A3 and A5 abused the defacto complainant and A2 slapped on both side of her face with hand and assaulted on her with leg, A3 assaulted her with stick on her hand and A5 also assaulted on her stomach and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is not yet over and it is a matrimonial dispute and the matter may be referred to mediation.

9. The FIR arises out of dispute between husband and wife who are the 1st accused and defacto complainant and other accused are relatives of A1. There are allegations of dowry demand and harassment.

The learned Public Prosecutor would state that the injured was discharged from the hospital and in the event of considering this application, the matter may be referred to mediation. Taking note of the above, this court is of the view that it is not a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner might be necessary. In such circumstances, both petitions deserve to be allowed.

10. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in his discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
 Digitally signed by
 PARAMASIVADOSS
 Date: 2026.05.22
 19:44:48 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode)
 The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.
 (through court cell e-mode)
 The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 190/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000229-2026)

Jeyakumar S/o. Selvamani

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

South Thamaraikulam Police Station,

Crime No. 66/2026 of South Thamaraikulam Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Jawahar Lal, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 324(4) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil, on 30.04.2026 in
Crl.M.P.No.1299/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign
before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivakasi daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00

P.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. Report received from the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivakasi through g-mail. A perusal of report shows that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 to 21.05.2026 except on 09.05.2026 and 10.05.2026.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M., until further orders and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:17:48 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivakasi.

The Sub Inspector of Police, South Thamaraiikulam Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 192/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000260-2026)

Chandru @ V. Chandra Kumar (A1)

S/o. Vishwanathan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kottar Police Station,

Crime No. 129/2026 of Kottar Police Station,

Rep. By Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Sahaya Arasu, praying to
modify the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the records.

2. Offence alleged u/s 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions
Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 18.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No. 1204/2026 with
condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate

No.III, Madurai daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 29.04.2026 and 30.04.2026 and his opposite party threatened him that they would cause his life in danger in Madurai and so he is panic and prayed that the condition may be modified to sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil daily twice at 10.30 A.M and 5.00 P.M., and prayed that the condition may be modified.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the reasons stated by the petitioner/accused, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M., until further orders and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:11:28 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Madurai.
The Inspector of Police, Kottar Police Station. (through court cell e-mode)

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 194/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	22.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	ஜெகன், த/பெ அச்சுதன்
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 தொலைபேசி எண்.9943110250 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:02:01 +0530

(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

தீர்ப்புரை/உத்தரவு நகல் வழங்கும் நபரின்
பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம் தேதியுடன்.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 194/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000237-2026)

Jagan, S/o Achutan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Arumanai Police Station,
Crime No. 5/2026 of Arumanai Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Prasath V, u/s 483 of BNS, praying to
grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused alleged to have been committed the
offence u/s 305(a) and 331(4) of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 02.01.2026 around 10.00

Hours the accused trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and stolen 5 3/4 sovereigns of thali chain, two bangles each having one sovereign, totally 7 3/4 sovereigns of jewels and a cash of Rs.29,500/-. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 30.01.2026 and the earlier bail petition in CrI.M.P.No.605/2026 was dismissed by the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai on 21.04.2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 01.01.2026 midnight this petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant by breaking open the door and stolen 7.75 sovereigns of gold jewels and a cash of Rs.29,500/- and escaped from the scene of occurrence and the petitioner was arrested on 30.01.2026 and the investigation of the case is over and the police laid charge sheet and taken on file as CC No.191/2026 pending before the Judicial Magistrate Court No.I, Kuzhithurai and now the case stands posted on today i.e. 22.05.2026 and summons issues to L.W.1 to L.W.3. This petitioner has 58 previous theft and robbery cases and if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, definitely he will abscond. Mere filing of charge sheet is not a mitigating circumstances to grant bail to the petitioner and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would state that the petitioner was apprehended on 30.01.2026 in Crime No.28/2024 of Kaliyakkavilai

Police Station pertaining to CrI.M.P. No.193/2026 and he was taken into custody from 19.01.2026 in offence related to CrI.M.P. No.193/2026. He would claim that the other cases which is pending as against him, the Investigation Officer has not proceeded with the investigation and the same is pending without development. In these circumstances, he would claim that he is facing incarceration period of more than 4 months as of now. Further, he would claim that there is no development in other cases pending against him, which is about the paucity of cases registered as against him. But on the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor seriously object to the bail application that the petitioner is involved in 58 robbery and theft cases, even in the present case, the stolen property not yet recovered from him and the charge sheet laid on the completion of investigation. He would claim the antecedents of the petitioner does not favour in him for the consideration of the bail application as he would periodically chronic in many cases and mere filing of charge sheet will not mitigate the granting of bail application. Taking note of the antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused at this stage. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:02:09 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivados, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

S.T.C. No. 6/2025 in DVC No.38/2024 of the Judicial Magistrate,
Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.

CrI.M.P. No. 199/2026 in C.A. No. 3/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000265 -2026)

Dinesh Kumar S/o. Kasi Raja ... Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

/Vs./

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. S. Ezhil Arasi
W/o Dinesh Kumar | .. 1 st respondent/Complainant |
| 2. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil. | ... 2 nd Respondent |

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me in the
presence of Thiru J. Sajin, advocate for the petitioner and Thiru Sahaya
Varuvel Rajan, Advocate for the 1st respondent and Thiru P. Linus Raj, Public
Prosecutor for the State and upon perusing the materials available on record,
this court delivered the following:

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner seeks suspension of the sentence imposed on
the petitioner in S.T.C. No.6/2025 of the Court of Judicial Magistrate,

Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil by Judgment dated 04.05.2026 till the disposal of appeal

3. It appears that the petitioner has been convicted by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil in S.T.C No.6/2025 by Judgment dated 04.05.2026 for the breach of order of maintenance for seven months and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for six months for each month and to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- for each month of alleged violation i.e 7 months and in default of payment of fine, to undergo simple imprisonment for three months for the offence u/s 31 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 and the sentences are to run consecutively.

4. Aggrieved by the Judgment and conviction, the petitioner/Accused has filed the appeal and this petition to suspend the sentence.

5. Fine amount paid by the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has every chance to win the appeal and now the petitioner is under judicial custody and prayed to suspend the sentence and to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent would contend that the petitioner harassed the 1st respondent in many ways and the 1st respondent filed STC No.6/2025 for non payment of arrears of maintenance

amount of Rs.2,25,000/-. It would further contended that the 1st respondent is blessed with two children and they are studying in Carol Matriculation Higher Secondary School, Thuvarankadu and she wants to pay school fees for her children and prayed that the court may be directed to pay the entire maintenance amount of Rs.2,25,000/- to the 1st respondent and after filing STC 6/2025, the petitioner had paid Rs.55,000/- and the same was adjusted in Crl.M.P. No.311/2024 arrears and if the petitioner fails to pay the arrear amount, the petition may be dismissed.

8. The learned trial court has imposed, "எதிரிமீது பிரிவு 31 குடும்ப வன்முறை பெண்கள் பாதுகாப்பு சட்டத்தின்கீழ் எதிரி குற்றவாளி என தீர்மானித்து, ஒவ்வொரு மாதமும் உத்தரவை மீறியதாக கருதி, ஒவ்வொரு மாதத்திற்கும், ஆறு மாதம் சாதாரண சிறைத்தண்டனையும் மற்றும் ஒவ்வொரு மாதத்திற்கும் ரூ.1000/-ம் அபராதம் விதித்தும் இந்நீதிமன்றம் உத்தரவிடுகிறது. மேலும், மேற்கண்ட தண்டனை காலத்தை ஒன்றன்பின் ஒன்றாக அனுபவிக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் உத்தரவிடப்படுகிறது. அதன்படி ஏழு மாதங்களுக்கு 42 மாதங்கள் சாதாரண சிறைத்தண்டனை விதித்தும், ரூ.7000/-ம் அபராதம் கட்ட தவறினால் 3 மாதம் சாதாரண சிறைத்தண்டனை விதித்தும் கு.வி.மு.ச. பிரிவு 255(2)ன் கீழ் எதிரி குற்றவாளி"

9. It is seen from the records that the trial Court, taking note of repeated violations of the order of maintenance and the commission of default for every month, imposed sentence in respect of seven counts and directed that the sentences shall run consecutively, one after another. It is further seen that the petitioner did not file any petition for suspension of sentence before the trial Court and, pursuant to the judgment, he was remanded to custody and is presently undergoing sentence.

10. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that since the petitioner is already in custody and undergoing sentence, some reasonable time may be granted for compliance of the conditions imposed by this Court and that the petitioner is ready to comply with the same immediately upon his release from jail.

11. Considering the submissions made and taking note of the fact that the petitioner is presently undergoing sentence, this Court is inclined to suspend the substantive sentence of imprisonment subject to stringent conditions so as to secure compliance of the maintenance order passed in favour of the first respondent. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and the substantive sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner by the lower Court is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal, subject to the following conditions:-

i. The petitioner shall 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, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil. On such compliance, the petitioner shall be released on bail, without reference to the compliance of the next two conditions which is imposed below.

ii. The petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) directly to the first respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

iii. Thereafter, the petitioner shall continue to pay a sum of Rs.7,000/- per month towards maintenance to the first respondent regularly, pending disposal of the appeal.

iv. In the event of violation of any of the aforesaid conditions, this order of suspension of sentence shall stand automatically vacated and the respondent shall be at liberty to seek issuance of necessary warrant against the appellant/accused for undergoing the remaining period of sentence.

1. Accordingly, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition stands allowed.
2. The appeal is posted on 19.06.2026 for further hearing.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
 PARAMASIVADOSS
 Date: 2026.05.22
 20:38:33 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.
 (through e-Mode)
 The Superintendent, Central Prison, Palayamkottai.
 The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivados, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.188/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000248-2026)

1. Edward Bright S/o. Joseph (A 1)
2. Ida Bel W/o. Edward Bright (A 2) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Vadasery Police Station,
Crime No.69/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Varatharajan, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 49, 191(2), 191(3), 329(4), 324(5), 296(b),
115(2), 118(1), 74, 303(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.963/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the

respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition only from 06.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:18:30 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Vadasery Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 193/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	22.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	ஜெகன், த/பெ அச்சுதன்
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 தொலைபேசி எண்.9943110250 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:01:00 +0530
(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

தீர்ப்புரை/உத்தரவு நகல் வழங்கும் நபரின்
பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம் தேதியுடன்.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 193/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000235-2026)

Jagan, S/o Achutan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Kaliyakkavilai Police Station,
Crime No. 28/2024 of Kaliyakkavilai Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Prasath V, u/s 483 of BNS,
praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused alleged to have been committed the
offence u/s 392 of IPC.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 23.01.2024 at about 2.30
P.M. this petitioner/accused and one Mahendrakumar were jointly committed robbery

at the house of defacto complainant at Kurumathu Balakulathankarai, while the co-accused stood outside watching, this petitioner/accused entered into the house and forcibly y snatched a golden chain weighing 2 sovereigns from the defacto complainant, leaving a portion of the chain in her hand, thereafter, both were escaped, sold the stolen chain at Neyyattinkara, Kerala for Rs.20,000/- and spent Rs.8,000/- and transferred the remaining amount Rs.12,000/- to the bank account of another one accused Nirmala, knowing it to be robbery proceeds, withdrew and used the amount. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 19.01.2026 and the earlier bail petition in CrI.M.P.No.604/2026 was dismissed by the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai on 06.05.2026 and the case has been charge sheeted and the same is pending before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 23.01.2024 this petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and snatched a golden chain from the defacto complainant, but she resisted, so the petitioner escaped with a portion of chain. The 2nd accused was waiting outside of the house as a spy and A3 is the wife of A2. Stolen property not yet recovered and the investigation of the case is over and the police laid charge sheet and taken on file as CC No.157/2024 pending before the Judicial Magistrate Court No.I, Kuzhithurai and now the case stands posted on 25.05.2026 and summons

issues to L.W.1 to L.W.3. This petitioner has 58 previous theft and robbery cases and if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, definitely he will abscond. Mere filing of charge sheet is not a mitigating circumstances to grant bail to the petitioner and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would state that the petitioner was apprehended on 19.01.2026 in Crime No.28/2024 of Kaliyakkavilai Police Station pertaining to Crl.M.P. No.193/2026 and he was taken into custody from 19.01.2026 in offence related to Crl.M.P. No.193/2026. He would claim that the other cases which is pending as against him, the Investigation Officer has not proceeded with the investigation and the same is pending without development. In these circumstances, he would claim that he is facing incarceration period of more than 4 months as of now. Further, he would claim that there is no development in other cases pending against him, which is about the paucity of cases registered as against him. But on the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor seriously object to the bail application that the petitioner is involved in 58 robbery and theft cases, even in the present case, the stolen property not yet recovered from him and the charge sheet laid on the completion of investigation. He would claim the antecedents of the petitioner does not favour in him for the consideration of the bail application as he would periodically chronic in many cases and mere filing of charge sheet will not mitigate the granting of bail application. Taking note of the antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused at this stage. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:01:27 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

S.T.C. No. 4/2023 of the Court of Judicial Magistrate,
Fast Track Court (Magisterial Level), Eraniel

Crl.M.P. No. 200/2026 in C.A. No. 4/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000266 -2026)

C. Rajan Jayakumar,
S/o. Citdamparam Nadar

... Petitioner/Appellant

/Vs./

D. Eniyan,
S/o. Devadhasan

... Respondent /Complainant

This petition coming on today for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru J. John Jayakumar, Advocate for the petitioner and upon hearing both side and upon perusing the materials available on record, this court delivered the following:

ORDER

The petitioner seeks suspension of sentence imposed on the petitioner in STC No.4/2023 on 21.04.2026 of the Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court (Magisterial Level), Eraniel till the disposal of the criminal appeal.

2. It appears that the petitioner has been convicted by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court (Magisterial Level), Eraniel in STC No.4/2023 by Judgment dated 21.04.2026 and the petitioner/accused was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for twelve months and to pay a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- as compensation to the complainant u/s 357(3) of Cr.P.C. within a period of 30 days from the date of Judgment, in default of payment of amount, to undergo further period of simple imprisonment for two months for the offence u/s 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

3. Aggrieved by the judgment and conviction, the accused has filed the appeal and this petition to suspend the sentence.

4. The petitioner has not paid the compensation amount of Rs.5,00,000/-.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was on bail during trial and he got fair chances of success in the appeal and the trial court has suspended the sentence till 22.05.2026 and prayed to suspend the sentence.

6. The Hon'ble High Court in its decision in ***C.R. Balasubramaniam /Vs./ P. Eswaramoorthy*** reported as **2024: MHC:5897** has directed that while dealing with an application for suspension of sentence or for grant of bail when an appeal is filed against the conviction

for offence u/s 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, the Courts must not mechanically impose a condition of deposit of 20% of the compensation amount/the cheque amount u/s 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and that when any ground has been raised by the appellant for reducing the percentage or for exempting the deposit of such amount, it has to be dealt with by the appellate court and a reasoned order must be passed if the court wants to direct the appellant to deposit 20% of the compensation amount/cheque amount. In this regard, the petitioner in this petition has not raised any special grounds which would warrant the reduction of the amount to be deposited u/s 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, except stating that he has a fair chance to success in the appeal and that he was on bail all along. In such circumstances, this court does not find any reason to reduce the amount to be deposited from 20% as required u/s 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

7. In the result, the substantive portion of sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner and the order of compensation passed by the lower court are suspended with condition that the petitioner/appellant shall deposit 20% of the total compensation amount imposed by the trial court i.e. Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) on or before 21.07.2026 and on his surrendering before the court concerned within 15 days from the date of this order, the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on

bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court (Magisterial Level), Eraniel.

On the failure of the petitioner, to comply with the above said conditions, the suspension granted to him shall stand automatically cancelled and the Magistrate concerned shall take necessary steps to secure the petitioner/accused.

Call on 19.06.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:18:59 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court (Magisterial Level), Eraniel.
(through e-Mode)

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 195/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	22.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	அருண்சிங், த/பெ நோபல்சிங்
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:02:24 +0530

(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

தீர்ப்புரை/உத்தரவு நகல் வழங்கும் நபரின்
பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம் தேதியுடன்.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.195/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000250-2026)

Arunsingh

S/o. Nobelsingh

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Keeriparai Police Station,

Crime No. 11/2026 of Keeriparai Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Legal Aid Defense Counsel Tmt S.P.

Ashika Prasad, u/s 483 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 103(1) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the deceased was working under the defacto complainant's pineapple plantation. The deceased have the habit of to meet the persons belong to his native who were working in the banana plantations. In continuation of the same, on 21.03.2026 at about 5.00 P.M. the deceased had gone to meet the said persons. On 22.03.2026 early morning 1.14 A.M. the defacto complainant got the call from his brother that some unknown person had assaulted the deceased and left him on road side. On the same day nearly 6.00 A.M. the defacto complainant and the Watchman went to the spot and they found the deceased sustained multiple injuries. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and he is in no way connected with this case and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 25.03.2026 and the investigation of the case is over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that this petitioner and the deceased are the native of Jharkhand State. They have working in a rubber estate in Kanyakumari District. The petitioner married the sister of the deceased. On 21.03.2026

the petitioner and the deceased were talking with each other in a drunken mood. At that time, the deceased abused the family members of the petitioner in filthy language and so the petitioner pushed down the deceased in the road and caught hold the head of the deceased and dashed against his head on the road repeatedly and so he sustained severe injuries and died in the spot and the petitioner was arrested on 25.03.2026 and the investigation of the case is not yet over and if the petition is allowed, definitely he will abscond, because he is a native of Jharkhand and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The allegations against the petitioner is that he caught hold the head of the deceased and dashed against his head on the road repeatedly and he sustained severe injuries and died in the spot. The materials placed before this Court prima facie disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the offence. Considering the gravity of the offence and the stage of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

8. In the result, this Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:02:36 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

S.T.C. No. 165/2020 of the Court of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil.

Crl.M.P. No. 198/2026 in C.A. No. 2/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000264 -2026)

Rajan, S/o. Velappan

... Petitioner/Appellant

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Rep. by the Inspector of Police,

Traffic Investigation Wing, Nagercoil,

through the Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru N. Kanakaraj, u/s 430 of BNSS,
praying to suspend the sentence imposed on the petitioner in S.T.C. No. 165/2020 of
the Court of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil by Judgment dated 21.04.2026 till
the disposal of appeal.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of
appeal.
3. It appears that the petitioner has been convicted by the learned

Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil in S.T.C No.165/2020 by Judgment dated 21.04.2026 and the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- in default of payment of fine, to undergo imprisonment for one month for the offence u/s 279 of IPC and also he was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for three months for the offence u/s 338 of IPC .

4. Aggrieved by the Judgment and conviction, the petitioner has filed this appeal and this petition to suspend the sentence.

5. Fine amount paid by the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was on bail during trial and he has every chance to win the appeal and the trial court has suspended the sentence till 21.05.2026 and prayed to suspend the sentence.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and prays for dismissal of this application.

8. Considering the fact that the arguable points are available to the petitioner to challenge the conviction, this court is inclined to suspend the substantive sentence alone and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail.

9. In the result, the substantive sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner by the lower court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil within two weeks from the date of this order and accordingly this petition is allowed.

On the failure of the petitioner to comply with the above said condition,
the suspension granted to him shall stand automatically cancelled.

Appeal stands posted on 19.06.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:18:42 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-Mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 197/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000259-2026)

1. Esakki Rajan Karthigayan

S/o. Karthigayan

2. Karthikeyan Vijaya Chandran

S/o. Vijaya Chandran

... Petitioners

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kottar Police Station,

Crime No. 129/2026 of Kottar Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Sahaya Arasu, praying to
extend the time to appear before the court concerned.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the Petition.

2. Offence alleged u/s 296(b), 118(1), 115(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 21.04.2026 in CrI.M.P.

No.1290/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear before the court concerned within 15 days from the date of order.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the respondent police searched the petitioners in another one case in Crime No. 148/2026 of Kottar Police Station and due to such apprehension of arrest, they filed a petition for anticipatory bail in Crl.M.P.No.116/2026 before the Vacation Court and the same was allowed on 15.05.2026 and so they are unable to surrender before the court concerned within the stipulated time and prayed for extension of time to appear.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that he leaves to the court.

6. Considering the reason stated by the learned counsel for the petitioners and also considering the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor that he has no serious objection, this court is inclined to extend one week time.

7. In the result, this court direct the petitioners to surrender before the court concerned within one week from today on condition that the petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only) before the Mediation Centre, Nagercoil and accordingly, this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:05:38 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge.
Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, Kottar Police Station. (through court cell e-mode)

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 202/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000269-2026)
and
Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000270-2026)

V. Selvakumar S/o. Vaikundaperumal

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.202/2026

/Vs./

C. Azhagesan S/o. Chellathurai

... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No.172/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.202/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Jayakumar,
u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner and the intervening
petition in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Regu, on
behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the bail
petition filed by the accused in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offences u/s 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS @ u/s 296(b), 115(2), 109, 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS

3. The case of prosecution is that on 15.05.2026 at about 10.45 P.M., while the informant was standing in front of his house, the petitioner along with other accused persons surrounded the informant and assaulted him and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the petitioner and the defacto complainant was having strained relationship with respect of the administration of the temple. The defacto complainant is residing four kilometre away from that place and he came to the village on the date of incident, for the purpose of creating a commotion against the petitioner and his family and the case in crime No.173/2026 has been registered against the informant and his family members. On 15.05.2026 at about 5.45 P.M., when the defacto complainant was in his house, this petitioner and two others assaulted the defacto complainant and in that assault, both of them sustained grievous injuries. Now the petitioner is undergoing treatment on the Government Hospital and the defacto complainant discharged from the hospital. The petitioner already suffering from liver and lungs

complications and he is 54 years old and the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2026 and at the time of arrest, Section 47 of BNSS has not complied by the respondent police. In the counter case in Crime No.173/2026, the defacto complainant was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court. Moreover, the matter is very simple in respect of the administration of the temple and the petitioner is senior lawyer. and the matter may be referred to mediation and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The aforesaid bail application was moved today and along with the bail application an urgent application was also filed, which is allowed and the case was heard at the end of the list. While so , the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as Crl.M.P. No.203/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the 1st accused is the President of Melakattuvilai Arulmigu Kailasanathar Thirukovil for the past 15 years and in the meantime, on 06.02.2026 the defacto complainant and some others gave an application for electing new office bearers and on that basis, new office bearers including defacto complainant were elected by the members of the temple. Due to that enmity, several complaints are pending. The defacto complainant filed Writ

Petition WP CrI.(MD) No.1756/2026 before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court regarding administration of the temple and the High Court has directed the 5th respondent HR & CE Department to appoint suitable person to take over the charge. But, the 1st accused had conducted festival by violating the court order and the 1st accused and his associates assaulted some persons and the case in Crime No.147/2026 has been registered. Subsequently, on the instigation of the 1st accused, his sons abused the defacto complainant and his associates in filthy language and published the abusive language in facebook and threatened him through instagram ID. On 15.05.2026, the accused persons abused the parents of the defacto complainant and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him with aruval and stick and when A1 assaulted on the head of the defacto complainant, which was prevented by him and caused injury on his right hand and cut of the little finger and also sustained injuries all over body and if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and he is a threat to the intervening petitioner and his family members and prayed that the bail petition may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor also opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are

cousin brothers and there are rival groups in connection with the administration of the temple at Melakattuvilai. It is submitted that the defacto complainant had already obtained orders from the Hon'ble High Court in relation to administration of the temple by the HR & CE Department. It is further submitted that an earlier occurrence took place on 25.04.2026 in respect of which Crime No.147/2026 was registered and the petitioner had already obtained anticipatory bail in CrI.M.P.No.33/2026. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that subsequently, on 15.05.2026, the petitioner and other accused went to the house of the defacto complainant, abused the parents of the defacto complainant and thereafter assaulted the defacto complainant, causing grievous cut injuries on his wrist and severing one of his fingers. Though the injured defacto complainant has since been discharged from the hospital, the petitioner himself is presently undergoing treatment in hospital and was subsequently arrested. The investigation is still in progress and therefore the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed grant of bail.

8. It is represented before this Court that the petitioner is undergoing treatment for various health complications and is presently admitted as an inpatient in the Government Hospital, Asaripallam. Considering the said medical condition, this Court permitted the petition to

be numbered and taken up for urgent hearing. The defacto complainant also appeared in person along with his counsel and produced medical records and other documents showing that his little finger had been severed in the occurrence and that surgical procedures had been undertaken.

9. This Court is of the view that necessary medical treatment and protection shall be provided to the petitioner during his custody. Accordingly, it is open to the Superintendent of Police concerned to ensure that adequate medical treatment is provided to the petitioner and, if required, to consider shifting him to a higher medical institution or multi-speciality hospital in accordance with the applicable prison and medical rules, if any request is made. Accordingly, the bail application is directed to be posted before the next Vacation Court for further consideration.

Call on 29.05.2026

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:41:03 +0530

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 140/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000174-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No. 204/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000271-2026)

T. Perumal Pillai

S/o. Thanumalayan

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.140/2026

/Vs./

Saranya,

D/o Jothimari

.. Intervening Petitioner/
Defacto Complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No. 151/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P.No. 140/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T.M. Sreekumar, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.204/2026 is filed by Advocate Tmt G. Velam, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petition in Crl.M.P. No. 140/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 296(b), 115(2), 324(4) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 25.04.2026 at 7.30 P.M., the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy words, assaulted him, damaged the household articles worth about Rs.20,000/- and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as alleged by the prosecution and the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as CrI.M.P.No.204/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant and there is some misunderstanding between them and she is living in her parents house with her children and on 25.04.2026 at 7.30 A.M. the accused came to her house and created problem to send her first son with him, but the defacto complainant refused to send her son with him, so he abused her in filthy language and damaged the household articles such as cupboard, dining table, chair and vessels and the value of the property is Rs.1 Lakh and assaulted the defacto complainant with broken glass pieces and she was admitted in the Government Hospital, Asaripallam. Further, she would contend that if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, he will create problem and the investigation of the case is not yet over and prayed that the anticipatory bail petition may be dismissed and if the petition is allowed, the petitioner may be directed to deposit some amount and the matter may be referred to mediation.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant is the wife of the petitioner and there

is some misunderstanding between them and they are living separately. On 25.04.2026 this petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, abused her and assaulted her with leg. Then the parents of the defacto complainant questioned the petitioner. So the petitioner assaulted them and damaged the household articles such as almirah and dining table and thereafter, the petitioner assaulted the mother of the defacto complainant and caused injury on her head with broken glass and subsequently, the petitioner caused cut injury on the defacto complainant with broken glass and then the petitioner assaulted the father of the defacto complainant on his right hand with pipe and totally there are three injured persons in this case and all the injured have been discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly essential and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and it is a matrimonial dispute between the parties and the matter may be referred to mediation.

8. The defacto complainant is the wife of the petitioner made complaint as against the petitioner that there is some matrimonial dispute between the husband and wife and the petitioner caused damages to the household articles worth of Rs.1 Lakh and also he has inflicted cut injuries over her body and her parents and due to the injury caused by the said

accused, she along with her parents were undergone treatment for substantial period and now they were discharged from the hospital. With regard to the intervening petition is concerned, it seems that there is a counter complaint which has also been lodged by the accused in the present case and the investigation has no progress. Further with regard to the said complaint and there is no proof of the CSR filed along with the petition, but it is even on the side of the prosecution, it has been stated that the defacto complainant and her parents were taking treatment for more than a week and now they are being discharged. Since the matter involves family dispute, the matter is referred to mediation.

9. The learned Public Prosecutor objected the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly essential. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab*** reported as ***AIR 1980 SC 1632***, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender

himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

10. In the present case, considering the nature of the offence and the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor, it would be appropriate to adopt the said approach of Hon'ble Supreme Court, so that both the rights referred above are balanced. As such, this petition deserves to be allowed with conditions.

11. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

i. The petitioner shall surrender before the SHO, Suchindrum Police Station on 26.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the

custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.151/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which he shall be released from custody.

ii. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail and also he is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) before the court concerned.

iii) After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

iv) The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.

v) The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

vi) The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is with in their discretion to approach the court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in *P.K.Shaji /Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560*.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
19:48:13 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner.

In the Court of Vacation Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District
at Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru. P. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 22nd day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 202/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000269-2026)
and
Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000270-2026)

V. Selvakumar S/o. Vaikundaperumal

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.202/2026

/Vs./

C. Azhagesan S/o. Chellathurai

... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No.172/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.202/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Jayakumar,
u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner and the intervening
petition in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Regu, on
behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the bail
petition filed by the accused in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offences u/s 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS @ u/s 296(b), 115(2), 109, 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS

3. The case of prosecution is that on 15.05.2026 at about 10.45 P.M., while the informant was standing in front of his house, the petitioner along with other accused persons surrounded the informant and assaulted him and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the petitioner and the defacto complainant was having strained relationship with respect of the administration of the temple. The defacto complainant is residing four kilometre away from that place and he came to the village on the date of incident, for the purpose of creating a commotion against the petitioner and his family and the case in crime No.173/2026 has been registered against the informant and his family members. On 15.05.2026 at about 5.45 P.M., when the defacto complainant was in his house, this petitioner and two others assaulted the defacto complainant and in that assault, both of them sustained grievous injuries. Now the petitioner is undergoing treatment on the Government Hospital and the defacto complainant discharged from the hospital. The petitioner already suffering from liver and lungs

complications and he is 54 years old and the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2026 and at the time of arrest, Section 47 of BNSS has not complied by the respondent police. In the counter case in Crime No.173/2026, the defacto complainant was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court. Moreover, the matter is very simple in respect of the administration of the temple and the petitioner is senior lawyer. and the matter may be referred to mediation and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The aforesaid bail application was moved today and along with the bail application an urgent application was also filed, which is allowed and the case was heard at the end of the list. While so , the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as Crl.M.P. No.203/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the 1st accused is the President of Melakattuvilai Arulmigu Kailasanathar Thirukovil for the past 15 years and in the meantime, on 06.02.2026 the defacto complainant and some others gave an application for electing new office bearers and on that basis, new office bearers including defacto complainant were elected by the members of the temple. Due to that enmity, several complaints are pending. The defacto complainant filed Writ

Petition WP CrI.(MD) No.1756/2026 before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court regarding administration of the temple and the High Court has directed the 5th respondent HR & CE Department to appoint suitable person to take over the charge. But, the 1st accused had conducted festival by violating the court order and the 1st accused and his associates assaulted some persons and the case in Crime No.147/2026 has been registered. Subsequently, on the instigation of the 1st accused, his sons abused the defacto complainant and his associates in filthy language and published the abusive language in facebook and threatened him through instagram ID. On 15.05.2026, the accused persons abused the parents of the defacto complainant and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him with aruval and stick and when A1 assaulted on the head of the defacto complainant, which was prevented by him and caused injury on his right hand and cut of the little finger and also sustained injuries all over body and if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and he is a threat to the intervening petitioner and his family members and prayed that the bail petition may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor also opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are

cousin brothers and there are rival groups in connection with the administration of the temple at Melakattuvilai. It is submitted that the defacto complainant had already obtained orders from the Hon'ble High Court in relation to administration of the temple by the HR & CE Department. It is further submitted that an earlier occurrence took place on 25.04.2026 in respect of which Crime No.147/2026 was registered and the petitioner had already obtained anticipatory bail in CrI.M.P.No.33/2026. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that subsequently, on 15.05.2026, the petitioner and other accused went to the house of the defacto complainant, abused the parents of the defacto complainant and thereafter assaulted the defacto complainant, causing grievous cut injuries on his wrist and severing one of his fingers. Though the injured defacto complainant has since been discharged from the hospital, the petitioner himself is presently undergoing treatment in hospital and was subsequently arrested. The investigation is still in progress and therefore the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed grant of bail.

8. It is represented before this Court that the petitioner is undergoing treatment for various health complications and is presently admitted as an inpatient in the Government Hospital, Asaripallam. Considering the said medical condition, this Court permitted the petition to

be numbered and taken up for urgent hearing. The defacto complainant also appeared in person along with his counsel and produced medical records and other documents showing that his little finger had been severed in the occurrence and that surgical procedures had been undertaken.

9. This Court is of the view that necessary medical treatment and protection shall be provided to the petitioner during his custody. Accordingly, it is open to the Superintendent of Police concerned to ensure that adequate medical treatment is provided to the petitioner and, if required, to consider shifting him to a higher medical institution or multi-speciality hospital in accordance with the applicable prison and medical rules, if any request is made. Accordingly, the bail application is directed to be posted before the next Vacation Court for further consideration.

Call on 29.05.2026

Pronounced by me in open court this the 22nd day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.22
20:41:03 +0530