

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 57/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000060-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.69/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000090-2026)

M. Rajakumar S/o. Muthukumar (A1)

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.57/2026

/Vs./

Kala W/o. Nelson

... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Thuckalay Police Station,

Crime No.204/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.57/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru V. Muthu
Vaneesh, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioners and the
intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.69/2026 is filed by Advocate

Thiru Prem Sahayadhas, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the bail petition filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.57/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 109(1), 115(2), 296(b), 333 and 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of TNPWH Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 P.M., the accused persons illegally trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her in filthy language and pushed her down and assaulted her and her son with hands and legs and also assaulted the son of the defacto complainant with a ruval on his left hand 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 he has not committed any offence as alleged and the defacto complainant and her relatives assaulted the petitioner and caused injury. The petitioner is a business man and he is handling business with his wife who was also the accused in this case and if he is in judicial custody continuously, the

business will be struck off and his family will suffer a lot without his financial support and no previous case is pending against him and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioner was arrested on 03.05.2026 and has been in judicial custody and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as CrI.M.P. No.69/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the intervening petitioner's son Alden Pal is an advocate and he used to put posts in the social media and there was an enmity between him and A1 in connection with politics and also the fitness and food business run by A1. On 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., accused persons trespassed into the compound of the intervening petitioner and abused her and her son using obscene language and A1 showed obscene signs to the intervening petitioner and opened the door forcefully and pushed her down and her son and also her mother and assaulted them with hand. In continuation, A1 assaulted the son of intervening petitioner on his right shoulder using billhook with an intention of murdering him. The

intervening petitioner, her sons and 71 years old mother were admitted in the Government Hospital at Padmanabhapuram and the intervening petitioner and her younger son Alden Pal are still in hospital and A1 using his criminal background and henchmen will go to any extent in causing harm to the intervening petitioner and her family members and all the accused had come a long way from their place to the place of occurrence armed with weapons with criminal intention of murdering Alden Pal 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 her family members and prayed that the bail petition may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the son of the defacto complainant is a You tuber and he published some videos degrading the product of A1. So there is an enmity between the son of the defacto complainant and the petitioner. So on 03.05.2026 this petitioner and three others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her and outraged her modesty and assaulted her with hand and then the petitioners inflicted cut injury on the left shoulder of the son of the defacto complainant with aruval and two sons of the defacto complainant also sustained injury. The husband of the defacto complainant also sustained injury and the injured persons have been

discharged from the hospital 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.

8. This Court notices that the intervening petitioner has produced certain videographic materials during the course of hearing, which prima facie show that the accused persons had entered into the house compound of the defacto complainant armed with an aruval and that there was a heated verbal altercation between the parties. The video materials also appear to indicate that members of the public had intervened during the course of the occurrence and that the entire episode subsequently surfaced widely on various social media platforms.

9. It appears from the submissions made before this Court that A1 is engaged in the business of marketing certain food supplement and Ayurvedic product in the name of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” through social media platforms and that the son of the defacto complainant, who is stated to be a law student and YouTuber, had uploaded videos questioning the nature, efficacy, and legitimacy of such products and had allegedly attempted to spread awareness regarding the same. Prima facie, the materials placed before this Court indicate that the occurrence appears to have emanated from the rivalry and hostility generated through such online publications and

counter allegations in social media.

10. This Court also takes note of the submission made on behalf of the intervening petitioner that, despite specific allegations relating to the nature of the product of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” marketed by A1, no licence issued by the AYUSH authorities has been produced before this Court by the accused side as of now, though certain FSSAI certification documents are stated to be available. However, this Court refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legality or authenticity of the products in question, since the same falls squarely within the domain of investigation and it is for the Investigating Officer to enquire into the seriousness of such allegations and take appropriate action in accordance with law, if required.

11. At the same time, this Court cannot ignore the seriousness of the allegation that the accused persons and more particularly, this Petitioner had allegedly entered the residence of the defacto complainant in broad daylight armed with a dangerous weapon like an aruval and indulged in acts of intimidation and assault. Entering into the residential premises of another person with weapons, particularly in the context of an already existing hostility, is undoubtedly a matter of concern and cannot be lightly brushed aside.

12. However, this Court also takes note of the fact that the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is progressing. Balancing the nature of allegations, the materials presently available on record, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused in this petition with stringent conditions for further taking consideration of the period of incarceration of the petitioner/accused i.e for the past 12 days, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused with condition.

13. 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.I, Padmanabhapuram and after release the petitioner shall stay at Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is allowed.

14. 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:20:48 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-Mode)

The Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District.

The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil.

(through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.56/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000052-2026)

Raja S/o. Chellaperumal (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Eraniel Police Station,
Crime No.237/2014 of Eraniel Police Station,
(CC No.31/2020 of Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel)
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by the Legal Aid Defense Counsel M. Anitha,
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 409 and 480 of IPC. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the case was posted on 05.01.2026 for framing of charges and that, on that day, due to viral fever, the petitioner could not appear before the trial Court. Consequently, a Non-Bailable Warrant was issued against him on 05.01.2026. On execution of the warrant, the petitioner was arrested by the respondent police on 13.01.2026 and has been under judicial custody for the past 120 days. It is further submitted that the earlier petition in M.P.No.4/2026 filed by the petitioner was dismissed on 02.03.2026 by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. It is also submitted that P.W.1 and P.W.2 have already been examined in this case and that the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for bail to the petitioner.

3. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner is the accused in C.C.No.31/2020 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Eraniel. Since the petitioner failed to appear before the trial Court, the learned Judicial Magistrate issued a Non-Bailable Warrant against him on 05.01.2026 and, on execution of the warrant, he was arrested by the police on 13.01.2026. It is further submitted

that the learned Judicial Magistrate had followed the guidelines laid down in the Pillappan judgment and charges were framed against the accused on 16.02.2026. Thereafter, on 23.02.2026, L.W.1 and L.W.2 appeared before the Court, but the accused sought the assistance of Legal Aid Counsel and therefore the witnesses were not cross-examined. It is further submitted that the case now stands posted on 18.05.2026. According to the learned Public Prosecutor, though the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents, if he is released on bail, there is every possibility that he may abscond and the trial may not progress further. It is also contended that the accused has been deliberately avoiding the cross-examination of witnesses and has been dodging the trial proceedings, and that the same is a calculated attempt on the part of the accused to protract the proceedings. Therefore, he raised serious objection to granting bail to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Considered the arguments of the learned Public Prosecutor. Taking note of the fact that the petitioner/accused has been under incarceration for more than 120 days and that charges have already been framed against him in respect of offences relating to theft, and also considering the submission made by the learned Public Prosecutor that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the

petitioner/accused, taking into account the nature of the offences alleged and the prolonged period of incarceration undergone by him, namely 122 days.

5. 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/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel.

6. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. It is brought to the notice of this Court that though P.W.1 and P.W.2 had already been examined, they were not cross-examined on the side of the accused. Therefore, on the very next day of his release, the petitioner shall avail the assistance of Legal Aid Counsel, if necessary, and shall positively cooperate with the trial proceedings and be ready for the cross-examination of witnesses without fail. Accordingly, this petition is allowed.

7. The learned Judicial Magistrate shall ensure that unnecessary adjournments are avoided and shall proceed with the trial in an expeditious and consistent manner so as to ensure early disposal of the case. If there is any violation of the above conditions, the Investigating Officer is at liberty to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that the bail was granted by the Sessions

Court, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:20:28 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel (through e-Mode)

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

The Inspector of Police, Eraniel 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 57/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000060-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.69/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000090-2026)

M. Rajakumar S/o. Muthukumar (A1)

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.57/2026

/Vs./

Kala W/o. Nelson

... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Thuckalay Police Station,

Crime No.204/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.57/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru V. Muthu
Vaneesh, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioners and the
intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.69/2026 is filed by Advocate

Thiru Prem Sahayadhas, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the bail petition filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.57/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 109(1), 115(2), 296(b), 333 and 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of TNPWH Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 P.M., the accused persons illegally trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her in filthy language and pushed her down and assaulted her and her son with hands and legs and also assaulted the son of the defacto complainant with a ruval on his left hand 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 he has not committed any offence as alleged and the defacto complainant and her relatives assaulted the petitioner and caused injury. The petitioner is a business man and he is handling business with his wife who was also the accused in this case and if he is in judicial custody continuously, the

business will be struck off and his family will suffer a lot without his financial support and no previous case is pending against him and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioner was arrested on 03.05.2026 and has been in judicial custody and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as CrI.M.P. No.69/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the intervening petitioner's son Alden Pal is an advocate and he used to put posts in the social media and there was an enmity between him and A1 in connection with politics and also the fitness and food business run by A1. On 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., accused persons trespassed into the compound of the intervening petitioner and abused her and her son using obscene language and A1 showed obscene signs to the intervening petitioner and opened the door forcefully and pushed her down and her son and also her mother and assaulted them with hand. In continuation, A1 assaulted the son of intervening petitioner on his right shoulder using billhook with an intention of murdering him. The

intervening petitioner, her sons and 71 years old mother were admitted in the Government Hospital at Padmanabhapuram and the intervening petitioner and her younger son Alden Pal are still in hospital and A1 using his criminal background and henchmen will go to any extent in causing harm to the intervening petitioner and her family members and all the accused had come a long way from their place to the place of occurrence armed with weapons with criminal intention of murdering Alden Pal 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 her family members and prayed that the bail petition may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the son of the defacto complainant is a You tuber and he published some videos degrading the product of A1. So there is an enmity between the son of the defacto complainant and the petitioner. So on 03.05.2026 this petitioner and three others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her and outraged her modesty and assaulted her with hand and then the petitioners inflicted cut injury on the left shoulder of the son of the defacto complainant with aruval and two sons of the defacto complainant also sustained injury. The husband of the defacto complainant also sustained injury and the injured persons have been

discharged from the hospital 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.

8. This Court notices that the intervening petitioner has produced certain videographic materials during the course of hearing, which prima facie show that the accused persons had entered into the house compound of the defacto complainant armed with an aruval and that there was a heated verbal altercation between the parties. The video materials also appear to indicate that members of the public had intervened during the course of the occurrence and that the entire episode subsequently surfaced widely on various social media platforms.

9. It appears from the submissions made before this Court that A1 is engaged in the business of marketing certain food supplement and Ayurvedic product in the name of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” through social media platforms and that the son of the defacto complainant, who is stated to be a law student and YouTuber, had uploaded videos questioning the nature, efficacy, and legitimacy of such products and had allegedly attempted to spread awareness regarding the same. Prima facie, the materials placed before this Court indicate that the occurrence appears to have emanated from the rivalry and hostility generated through such online publications and

counter allegations in social media.

10. This Court also takes note of the submission made on behalf of the intervening petitioner that, despite specific allegations relating to the nature of the product of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” marketed by A1, no licence issued by the AYUSH authorities has been produced before this Court by the accused side as of now, though certain FSSAI certification documents are stated to be available. However, this Court refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legality or authenticity of the products in question, since the same falls squarely within the domain of investigation and it is for the Investigating Officer to enquire into the seriousness of such allegations and take appropriate action in accordance with law, if required.

11. At the same time, this Court cannot ignore the seriousness of the allegation that the accused persons and more particularly, this Petitioner had allegedly entered the residence of the defacto complainant in broad daylight armed with a dangerous weapon like an aruval and indulged in acts of intimidation and assault. Entering into the residential premises of another person with weapons, particularly in the context of an already existing hostility, is undoubtedly a matter of concern and cannot be lightly brushed aside.

12. However, this Court also takes note of the fact that the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is progressing. Balancing the nature of allegations, the materials presently available on record, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused in this petition with stringent conditions for further taking consideration of the period of incarceration of the petitioner/accused i.e for the past 12 days, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused with condition.

13. 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.I, Padmanabhapuram and after release the petitioner shall stay at Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is allowed.

14. 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:20:48 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-Mode)

The Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District.

The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil.

(through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 102/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000181-2026)

John Buckeer Ali S/o. Shahul Hameed

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Vadasery Police Station,

Crime No. 131/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate V. Surya, praying to condone
the non compliance of condition by the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 309(5),
309(6) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions
Court, Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1429/2026 with condition

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner sustained injuries on his hand and is undergoing treatment at Government Medical College Hospital, Asaripallam and performed surgery on 12.05.2026 and therefore, the petitioner was unable to complying the condition imposed upon him by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil from 06.05.2026 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.

6. The case of the petitioner is that he has undergone treatment in Asaripallam Government Medical College Hospital, which was substantiate about the operation is also been conducted, along with the petition, certificate also produced. In these circumstances, this court is inclined to condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioner and also relax the condition for a further period till 25.05.2026 and thereafter, he shall comply the condition.

7. In the result, non compliance of condition by the petitioner from 06.05.2026 is condoned and also relaxed the condition for a further period till 25.05.2026 and thereafter, he shall comply the condition and

accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by

PARAMASIVADOSS

Date: 2026.05.15

20:21:20 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To

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

The 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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.130/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000158-2026)

T. Sunil S/o. Thankappan (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Anjugramam Police Station,
Crime No. 57/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M.A. Mohan, 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.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Judge, Nagercoil on 08.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.771/2026 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 19.04.2026 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 19.04.2026 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:23:13 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Anjugramam 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.127/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000178-2026)

Shahul Hameed Subair (A2)

S/o. Haja Mohideen

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

Aralvoimozhy Police Station,

Crime No. 93/2026 of Aralvoimozhy 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), 115(2), 118(l), 324 and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal

Sessions Judge, Nagercoil on 18.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1248/2026 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 29.04.2026 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 29.04.2026 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:22:55 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Inspector of Police, Aralvoimozhi 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 120/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000139 -2026)

Sameera @ Shameera (A1)

W/o. Bathusha @ Mohamed Bathusha

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Thuckalay Police Station,

Crime No. 646/2025 of Thuckalay Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 316(2), 318(4), 329(3), 296(b), 115(2) and
351(2) of BNS @ 316(2) and 318(4) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 12.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.851/2026 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 on 08.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1148/2026 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 13.04.2026 to till date 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:25:46 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram (through e-Mode)

The Sub Inspector of Police, Thuckalay 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 119/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000140 -2026)

Joseph Maria Sebastian (A1)

S/o. Arulappan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Crime No. 51/2026 of Nesamony Nagar 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 sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 406, 420 and 120(b) of IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 26.03.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.980/2026 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 on

18.04.2026 in CrI.M.P.No.1245/2026 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 to till date 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:33:59 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.118/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000141 -2026)

Ancilin Uresh S/o. Thankaraj (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Karungal Police Station,

Crime No.100/2026 Karungal Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 16.04.2026 in
Crl.M.P.No.1105/2026 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 30.04.2026 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 condition only from 30.04.2026 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS

Date: 2026.05.15
20:25:27 +0530

Principal Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To

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

The Inspector of Police, Karungal 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 106/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000131-2026)

Sumesh S/o. Sukumaran

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kottar Police Station,

Crime No. 101/2024 of Kottar Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 174 Cr.PC @ 302 of IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil on 06.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.782/2026 with condition that the petitioner
should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil daily at
10.30 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by
the Principal Sessions Judge, Nagercoil on 17.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No. 1171/2026

with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil 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 the case has been charge sheeted and taken on file as SC No.87/2026 pending before the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. Report received from the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil through g-mail. A perusal of report shows that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 20.04.2026 to 11.05.2026.

6. Considering the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner/accused that the case has been charge sheeted and taken on file as SC No.87/2026 pending before the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:25:08 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 104/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000182-2026)

Saravanan S/o. Prabakaran (A3) ... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Crime No. 65/2026 of Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Tmt. D. Annie Sophia Rexline,
praying to relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 61(2) and 310(4) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 01.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1085/2026 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 on 21.04.2026 in

Crl.M.P. No.1281/2026 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 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:24:49 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil (through e-Mode)
The 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 101/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000180 -2026)

Simson Raj, S/o. Manuvel

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Colachel Police Station,

Crime No. 87/2026 of Colachel Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s. 296(b), 131, 118(1), 351(3) and 281 of BNS
2023.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 21.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1247/2026 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 onwards and the petitioner is a physically challenged person and he finds it very difficult in observing the condition 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 condition from 23.04.2026.

6. Considering the reason stated 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:34:12 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate. Eraniel (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Colachel 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 100/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000171-2026)

1. Ajay S/o. Punitha John (A1)

2. Rejila @ Jakulin Rejila (A2)

W/o. Punitha John

3. Anitha W/o. Mathiazhakan (A3)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Puthukadai Police Station,

Crime No. 66/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Pal Raj, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 324(2), 296(b), 118(1), 115(2) and 351(3) of

BNS.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Judge, Nagercoil on 06.03.2026 in CrI.M.P.No.758/2026 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 Judge, Nagercoil on 01.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1087/2026 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 modified condition from 06.04.2026 and due to the condition, they are unable to do their daily works 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 modified 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 petitioners 2 and 3 are women, this court is inclined to modify the condition in respect of 1st petitioner/A1 and in respect of petitioners 2 and 3/A2 and A3, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

7. In the result, in respect of 1st petitioner/A1, condition is modified that the 1st petitioner/A1 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 in respect of petitioners 2 and 3/A2 and A3, condition is totally relaxed and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:24:30 +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)

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 99/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000169-2026)

1. Thambi Jebaseelan S/o. William (A1)

2. Rosey T W/o. George (A3) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Thiruvattar Police Station,

Crime No. 108/2026 of Thiruvattar Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Kiruba S, 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), 351(2), 303(2) NP of BNS
and Sec. 4 of TNPHW Act.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Judge, Nagercoil on 16.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1116/2026 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 1st petitioner/A1 has been complying the condition from 22.04.2026 and the 2nd petitioner/A3 has been complying the condition from 25.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st petitioner/A1 has been complying the condition only from 22.04.2026 and the 2nd petitioner/A3 has been complying the condition only from 25.04.2026 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:33:44 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 97/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000162 -2026)

Navin Suresh S/o. Suresh Kumar (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No.90/2026 of Marthandam Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

..Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 191(2), 191(3), 329(4), 296(b), 115(2) and
351(3) of BNS and Sec. 3(1) of TNPPDL Act.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 17.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1237/2026 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 27.04.2026 to till date and the petitioner has to look after his aged parents who depends upon him 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 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:33:14 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Inspector of Police, Marthandam 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 96/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000160 -2026)

Sundarraaj, S/o. Baburaj (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Vadasery Police Station,

Crime No. 124/2025 of Vadasery Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor,

Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 120B and 420 of IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 23.03.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.919/2026 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 07.04.2026 onwards 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 07.04.2026 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:32:56 +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)

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 98/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000167 -2026)

Vishnu, S/o. Suresh (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No. 90/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of
BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 08.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1166/2026 with condition
that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 6.00

P.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 22.04.2026 to till date and the petitioner is a college student and due to the condition, his college studies is affecting 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 from 24.04.2026.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner/accused that the petitioner is a student 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:33:29 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 95/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000175-2026)

Mitesh V, S/o. Vilas

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No. 90/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Kannan, 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), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3)

BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 08.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1120/2026 with condition
that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 6.00

P.M. until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a student and he has been complying the condition from 18.04.2026 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 18.04.2026 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 submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner/accused that the petitioner is a student 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:32:38 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Suchindurm 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 92/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000135 -2026)

Johncily S/o. Johnson (A1)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Rajakkamangalam Police Station,

Crime No.19/2026 of Rajakkamangalam 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 sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s. 103(1) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted a bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 30.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1080/2026 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 01.04.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 02.04.2026 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:32:03 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Rajakkamangalam Police station.
(through court cell e- Mode)

In the Court of Principal 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 91/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000134 -2026)

R. Selva Murugan (A4)
S/o Ramakrishnan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kanyakumari Police Station,
Crime No.490/2025 of Kanyakumari Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 49, 103(1), 190 and 238(a) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions
Court, Nagercoil on 25.03.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.967/2026 with condition that
the petitioner should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Nagercoil daily 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 30.03.2026 to 13.04.2026 and he did not comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026, due to illness of his child and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. Report received from the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil through g-mail. A perusal of report shows that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 30.03.2026 to 13.04.2026 and from 28.04.2026 to 13.05.2026 and he did not comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026.

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 Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil weekly once i.e on every Monday at 10.30 A.M. until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:24:12 +0530
PARAMASIVADOSS
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Kanyakumarai 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 90/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000136-2026)

Selva Murugan S/o. Ramakrishnan (A4)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kanyakumari Police Station,

Crime No. 490/2025 of Kanyakumari Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru V. Muthu Vaneesh
praying to condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioner on
14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 49, 103(1), 190 and 238(a) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Judge, Nagercoil on 25.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.967/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil daily 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 30.03.2026 to 13.04.2026 and he did not comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026, due to sudden and serious medical emergency of his daughter and the daughter of the petitioner fell ill and was admitted in the hospital at Vellore for treatment and the petitioner was compelled to remain at Vellore to care for her and due to that, he was not able to comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026 and from 28.04.2026 he has been complying the condition regularly and prayed that the non compliance of condition by the petitioner from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026 may be condoned.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026 the petitioner did not comply the condition and the investigation of the case is not yet over.

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 from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026.

7. In the result, non compliance of condition by the petitioner from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026 is condoned and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:22:30 +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. Paramasivados, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 89/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000130-2026)

1. Justin Kumar S/o. Arulappan(A1)

2. Rajesh S/o. Arulappan (A2)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No. 59/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Ariharan, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 126(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Judge, Nagercoil on 18.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.912/2026 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 Judge, Nagercoil on 17.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1170/2026 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 modified condition from 20.04.2026 and due to the condition, they are unable to do their daily works 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 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 petitioners/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 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 15th day of May, 2026
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:31:47 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.88/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000132-2026)

1. Sundar S/o. Gopalan (A1)

2. Rajesh S/o. Samynadar (A2)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No. 35/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru N. Radhakrishnan, 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) Mines and
Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

3. The 1st petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 12.03.2026 in CrI.M.P.No. 840/2026 and the 2nd
petitioner was granted anticipatory bail on 16.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.897/2026
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 on 08.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1149/2026 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 modified condition from 13.04.2026 onwards 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 modified condition 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:34:30 +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)

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 87/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000129-2026)

1. Jansi Rani M W/o. Dalstoy (A2)

2. D.J. Dapson S/o. Dalstoy (A3)

3. Dalstoy S/o. Moses (A4)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station, Colachel,

Crime No. 9/2026 of AWPS, Colachel,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A.R. Subash Kumar, praying
to relax the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 498 (A), 406, 506 (ii) of IPC r/w Sec. 4 and 6
of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 20.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1284/2026 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 30.04.2026 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 30.04.2026 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 age of the petitioners 1 and 3, this court is inclined to relax the condition totally in respect of petitioners 1 and 3/A2 and A4 and in respect of 2nd petitioner/A3, this court is inclined to modify the condition.

7. In the result, in respect of petitioners 1 and 3/A2 and A4, condition is totally relaxed and in respect of 2nd petitioner/A3, condition is modified that the 2nd petitioner/A3 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:31:28 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai. (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Colachel.
(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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.86/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-0000115-2026)

Anbazzhagan (A1) S/o. Thanumalaiya Perumal ... Petitioner
/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Eathamozhi Police Station,
Crime No. 33/2026 of Eathamozhi 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 sides. Perused the records.

2. Offences alleged u/s 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, Nagercoil on 30.03.2026 in CrI.M.P.No. 965/2026 with condition
that the petitioner shall stay at Thoothukudi, appear and sign before the Judicial
Magistrate No.II, Thoothukudi daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M., until
further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified on 29.04.2026 in

Crl.M.P. No.1359/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police 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 modified condition from 30.04.2026 onwards 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 30.04.2026 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. and 5.00 P.M., until further orders and accordingly this petition is partly allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS

Date: 2026.05.15
20:23:51 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Sub Inspector of Police, Eathamozhi 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 80/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000123-2026)

Aneesh S/o. Valsalam

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station, Marthandam,

Crime No. 56/2025 of AWPS, Marthandam,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor,

Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P. Subramonian, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 64 and 351(2) of BNS and Sec. 67 of IT Act.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 28.01.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.308/2026 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 on 27.03.2026 in
Crl.M.P. No.957/2026 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:30:54 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.
(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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 79/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000126 -2026)

1. Abishek @ Abishek Kumar S/o. Kathiraven(A2)
2. Mithun Sanjai S/o. Poomani (A3) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Vadasery Police Station
Crime No. 126/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Mathan, praying to relax
the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 27.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1352/2026 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 30.04.2026 and due to the condition, they are unable to do their daily works 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 30.04.2026 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:26:22 +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)

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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.73/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-0000112-2026)

Vijaya W/o. Chelladurai (A2)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

South Thamaraikulam Police Station,

Crime No. 64/2026 of South Thamaraikulam 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 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) of BNS and Sec. 4 of
TNPHW Act.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1349/2026 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:23:34 +0530
PARAMASIVADOSS
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil

(through e-mode)

The Sub Inspector of Police, South Thamaraikulam 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 72/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000096 -2026)

Vishnu Nagarajan S/o. Nagarajan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kottar Police Station

Crime No. 65/2026 of Kottar Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru K. Pon Muthu Pandian,
praying to relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 126(2), 296(b), 308(4), 351(3) and 109 of
BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 24.02.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.572/2026 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 on 26.03.2026 in

Crl.M.P. No.978/2026 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 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:26:06 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.5/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000021-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.68/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000089-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.24/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000048-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.67/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000088-2026)

1. Karkulali W/o. Rajakumar (A3)

2. Ganesan S/o. Selvam (A4) ... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.5/2026

Ruben S/o. Ponnumani ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.24/2026
/Vs./

Kala, W/o Nelson .. Intervening Petitioner/Informant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No.204/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 5/2026 and 24/2026 are filed by Advocates Tvl.

M. Paneer Selvam and R. Arjun Subash @ Mano respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the intervening petitions in CrI.M.P. Nos. 68/2026 and 67/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru Prem Sahayadhas, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petitions filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 & 24/2026.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the anticipatory bail petitions and the intervening petitions.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 109(1), 115(2), 296(b), 333, 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act.

4. The case of prosecution is that the son of the defacto complainant is a law student and You Tuber, who posted videos criticized the A1's Ayurveda Lehyam videos in his you tube channel and on 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., the accused persons rushed to the house of the defacto complainant in a KIA Car bearing Regn. No.TN 74 BJ 9042 and used filthy language and push down the defacto complainant and assaulted

her and her son with hands and legs and also assaulted her son on his left hand with aruval and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the 1st petitioner/wife of A1 is B.Sc Nursing graduate and owner of the Raja Boron Marketing and the 2nd petitioner is doing carpentry work and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the son of defacto complainant has voluntarily spread rumor against the 1st accused based on his exercise and his marketing and due to previous enmity, this false case has been foisted against the petitioners and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and A1 is YouTube influencer who posted videos on health diet and also a vendor of Ayurveda supplements in social media platforms and the criticizing videos uploaded by the defacto complainant's son creates an enmity and carry forwarded to a verbal dispute between them and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he was not present in the occurrence place 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. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petitions and that petitions were numbered as CrI.M.P. Nos.67/2026 & 68/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the intervening petitioner's son Alden Pal is an advocate and he used to put posts in the social media and there was an enmity between him and A1 in connection with politics and also the fitness and food business run by A1. On 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., accused persons trespassed into the compound of the intervening petitioner and abused her and her son using obscene language and A1 showed obscene signs to the intervening petitioner and opened the door forcefully and pushed her down and her son and also her mother and assaulted them with hand. In continuation, A1 assaulted the son of intervening petitioner on his right shoulder using billhook with an intention of murdering him. The intervening petitioner, her sons and 71 years old mother were admitted in the Government Hospital at Padmanabhapuram and the intervening petitioner and her younger son Alden Pal are still in hospital and A1 using his criminal background and henchmen will go to any extent in causing harm to the

intervening petitioner and her family members and all the accused had come a long way from their place to the place of occurrence armed with weapons with criminal intention of murdering Alden Pal and if the petitioners are released on bail, there is every chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and her family members and prayed that the anticipatory bail petitions may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the son of the defacto complainant is a You tuber and he published some videos degrading the product of A1. So there is an enmity between the son of the defacto complainant and the 1st accused. So on 03.05.2026 the 1st accused and three others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her and outraged her modesty and assaulted her with hand and then the petitioners and A1 inflicted cut injury on the left shoulder of the son of the defacto complainant with aruval and two sons of the defacto complainant also sustained injury. The husband of the defacto complainant also sustained injury and the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

8. Heard both side. Considered the arguments of the learned Public

Prosecutor as well as the learned counsel appearing for the intervening petitioner. Both sides vehemently advanced their submissions touching upon the background of the dispute, the social media activities of the parties, and the seriousness of the allegations involved in the present case.

9. This Court notices that the intervening petitioner has produced certain videographic materials during the course of hearing, which prima facie show that the accused persons had entered into the house compound of the defacto complainant armed with an aruval and that there was a heated verbal altercation between the parties. The video materials also appear to indicate that members of the public had intervened during the course of the occurrence and that the entire episode subsequently surfaced widely on various social media platforms.

10. It appears from the submissions made before this Court that A1 is engaged in the business of marketing certain food supplement and Ayurvedic product in the name of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” through social media platforms and that the son of the defacto complainant, who is stated to be a law student and YouTuber, had uploaded videos questioning the nature, efficacy, and legitimacy of such products and had allegedly attempted to spread awareness regarding the same. Prima facie, the materials placed before this Court indicate that the occurrence appears to have emanated

from the rivalry and hostility generated through such online publications and counter allegations in social media.

11. This Court also takes note of the submission made on behalf of the intervening petitioner that, despite specific allegations relating to the nature of the product of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” marketed by A1, no licence issued by the AYUSH authorities has been produced before this Court by the accused side as of now, though certain FSSAI certification documents are stated to be available. However, this Court refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legality or authenticity of the products in question, since the same falls squarely within the domain of investigation and it is for the Investigating Officer to enquire into the seriousness of such allegations and take appropriate action in accordance with law, if required.

12. At the same time, this Court cannot ignore the seriousness of the allegation that the accused persons had allegedly entered the residence of the defacto complainant in broad daylight armed with a dangerous weapon like an aruval and indulged in acts of intimidation and assault. Entering into the residential premises of another person with weapons, particularly in the context of an already existing hostility, is undoubtedly a matter of concern and cannot be lightly brushed aside.

13. However, this Court also takes note of the fact that the injured

persons have been discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is progressing. Balancing the nature of allegations, the materials presently available on record, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused in both petitions with stringent conditions.

14. 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 1st petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and the 2nd petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.5/2026 and the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 shall stay at Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15 20:14:39
+0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District.
The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 117/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000148-2026)

1. R. Jegan S/o. Rajendran

2. S. Prabin S/o. Stephen Jeyakumar

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Thuckalay Police Station,

Crime No.146/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru T. Sri Ram, 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 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 118(1), 324(5) and 351(2) of BNS.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that

initially, the name of the petitioners were not mentioned in the FIR and the respondent police are frequently summoning and informing them that their name is likely to be included in the FIR under the description of “three more known persons” and there exists a civil dispute between the defacto complainant and the accused persons named in the FIR and owing to the same, a quarrel ensued on 28.03.2026 at 7.00 A.M., and during the course of said quarrel, the accused persons assaulted the defacto complainant and caused damage to the pathway and the petitioners are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and the said pathway is a common pathway used by more than 50 residents and the petitioners did not involved in the alleged incident and the 2nd petitioner is getting married on 13.05.2026 and the defacto complainant in collusion with the respondent police, is attempted to create disturbance and hardship to the said marriage by falsely implicating him in the present case and the petitioners are innocent 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.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are 9 accused in this case. The 1st accused is the President of Vilavancode Town Panchayat. On 02.03.2026, the petitioners and several other accused trespassed into the property of the defacto complainant and damaged the compound wall and attempted to form

a pathway through the property of the defacto complainant. Which was questioned by the defacto complainant, the 1st accused abused and pulled her hair and assaulted her with hand on her back. A2 and A3 caught hold the hair of the defacto complainant and A4 assaulted her with hand. A5 outraged the modesty of the defacto complainant. A6 threatened her. The petitioners and another one accused present in the spot and the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant. A5 damaged the mobile phone of the defacto complainant and the total damages is Rs.1,50,000/- 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.

5. Initially, the petitioners were not arrayed as an accused and after investigation, the prosecution agency narrated allegation against these accused in the present place of occurrence, where other accused tried to form a pathway illegally by entering the property of the defacto complainant, since the petitioners to be arranged as accused, they have present in the scene of occurrence and also 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.

6. 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 and also the petitioners are directed to deposit a sum of Rs.15,000/- each (In total Rupees Thirty Thousand only) 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:16:02 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.116/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000183-2026)

1. Karthick @ Karthikeyan S/o. Vijayachandran
 2. Essakki @ Essakkirajan S/o. Karthikeyan .. Petitioners
- /Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kottar Police Station,
Crime No.148/2026 of Kottar Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru G. Geon Jenish, 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 109, 296(b) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 27.04.2026 at about 2.30
A.M., the defacto complainant, petitioners/accused and other persons

consumed liquor and there arose a quarrel between them consuming and at that time, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant and caused stab injury to him with knife and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and they have been falsely implicated in this case and they have no knowledge about the alleged occurrence till the police is searching them to arrest 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 defacto complainant and petitioners and other accused were consuming liquor together on 27.04.2026. At that time, after consuming liquor, there arose quarrel with each other, and A1 stabbed the defacto complainant on his left hand with knife. The petitioners also stabbed the defacto complainant on his stomach and right shoulder with knife and no previous case is pending against the petitioners 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. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor.

Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also 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 appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:15:41 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli.
The Inspector of Police, Kottar 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.115/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000166-2026)

1. Viknesh S/o. Wilson (A1)

2. Sujin S/o. Sundaran (A2)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Palugal Police Station,

Crime No.79/2026 of Palugal Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru N. Kanakaraj, 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
offences u/s 296(b), 131 and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 27.04.2026 at about 6.15 P.M., while the informant went to Puthan Market,, the accused person consumes alcohol and fell on the informant and the informant turn and saw him, immediately the accused person abused him in filthy words and took tapioca and threw upon the informant and tried to assault him using aruval and knife. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and nothing had happened as alleged by the prosecution and the false case has been foisted against the petitioners and the investigation of the case is almost over 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 27.05.2026, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant and pelted tapioca on the defacto complainant and there is no injury to the defacto complainant and the petitioners threatened the defacto complainant with knife 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 Public Prosecutor would state that there is no injury to the defacto complainant. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners and also considering the fact that there is no injury caused to the defacto complainant, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:14:13 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Palugal 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 113/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000163-2026)

1. Aniesmohammed, S/o Nagoor (A1)
2. S. Nagoor, S/o. Syad Ravuthar (A2) .. Petitioners
/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Nesamony Nagar Police Station,
Crime No.97/2026 of Nesamony Nagar Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru V. Sabapathi, 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), 118(1), 324(4) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity, on 28.04.2026 at about 4.45 P.M., the accused persons abused the informant in filthy language and assaulted him by using changili on his head and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the informant is the 1st petitioner's brother in law and 2nd petitioner's son in law and the 1st petitioner married the informant's sister and they have a male child and due to misunderstanding between the 1st petitioner and his wife, they are living separately for last 2 ½ years and regarding the family dispute, the informant's sister lodged a complaint before All Women Police, Nagercoil and the police referred the petition to Social Welfare Officer, Nagercoil. On 28.04.2026, while petitioners were standing in front of their shop at Christu Nagar, the informant and one another entered into the shop and assaulted the 1st petitioner and due to the said quarrel, the informant also sustained injury on his head and the injured were admitted in the Government Medical College Hospital at Asaripallam and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the preliminary investigation is almost over and due to family dispute this case is registered against them and already this petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in CrI.M.P.

No.1/2026 dated 08.05.2026 and in the earlier petitioner, section of law wrongly mentioned as Sec.115(1) and 118(2) of BNS instead of Sec.115(2) and 118(1) of BNS, but Sec. 296(b), 324(4) and 351(3) of BNS are correct 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 there are two accused in this case and A1 is the husband of the sister of defacto complainant, that is the brother-in-law and A2 is the father of A1. Due to misunderstanding between A1 and his wife, they are living separately. So, she filed a petition before the Social Welfare Officer and on enquiry, the petitioners returned 14 sovereigns of jewels. On 15.04.2026, the petitioners and the sister of defacto complainant and the mother appeared before the Social Welfare Officer. At that time, the petitioners abused the sister of the defacto complainant and on the same day, the defacto complainant went to the shop of the petitioners and questioned them. So, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant and A2 assaulted the defacto complainant on his back head with iron chain repeatedly and A1 assaulted the defacto complainant on his chest with leg and the injured was discharged from the hospital. Already these petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court on 08.05.2026 and in the said application

section of law was wrongly mention.

6. Already, this petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court on 08.05.2026. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that in the earlier petition, the section of law mistakenly mentioned as Sec. 115(1) and 118(2) of BNS instead Sec.115(2) and 118(1) of BNS and filed this petition with correct section of law. Considering the fact that already the petitioners were granted anticipatory bail on the ground 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:13:51 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Nesamony Nagar 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.111/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000170-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.129/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000173-2026)

Maria Arokia Jagan @ Jagan (A9)

S/o. Lopus

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.111/2026

1. Ajay .R, S/o. Ramaiya. (A6)

2. Anandh S/o. Mani (A7)

3. Daniel Gifton S/o. Rajamani (A8)

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.129/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Nesamany Nagar Police Station,

Crime No.86/2026 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. MA. Shiva
Kumaar and R. Ram Sundar respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant
anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 303(2) of BNS.

4. CrI.M.P. No.111/2026 has been filed by A9 and CrI.M.P. No.129/2026 has been filed by A6 to A8 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that on 18.04.2026 at about 5.00 A.M., the respondent police found that in survey No.1936, the accused persons 1 to 4 loaded red sand in their vehicles with the help of Hitachi operated by the 5th accused and the 6th accused is the owner of the Tipper Lorry bearing Regn. No.TN 49 AD 6575 and TN 75 AY 6914 which were driven by the accused 1 and 2 and the 9th accused arranged the owners of the vehicles for work. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.111/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and no such occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and on the basis of the false petition, the respondent police foisted this false case against the petitioner and the investigation in this case is almost over 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 CrI.M.P. No.129/2026 would contend that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and all the allegations against the petitioners are false and no such occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and on the basis of false complaint, the respondent police foisted this false case against the petitioners and the investigation in this case is almost over 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 on 18.04.2026 when the respondent police were conducting patrol duty near Derik Junction, at that time, the petitioners were illegally loaded red sand from the land in R.S. No.1936 in a tippers bearing Reg. No. TN49 AD 6675, TN75 AY 6914, TN88 M 0468 and a tractor bearing Reg. No. TN74 BF 0475 with the help of Hitachi. The vehicles with contraband seized by the police. The petitioners were arrested by the police on 18.04.2026. A1 is the driver of the vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN49 AD 6575, A2 is the driver of vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN75 AY 6914, A3 is the owner cum driver of vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN88 M 0468, A4 is the driver of the tractor bearing Reg. No. TN74 BF 0475, A5 is the driver of hitachi, A6 is the owner of the vehicles bearing Reg. Nos. TN49 AD 6575,

A7 is the owner of the tractor bearing Reg. No. TN74 BF 0475, A8 is the owner of the hitachi and A9 is the organiser of the work and the FIR was registered only on 18.04.2026 and the investigation of the case is not yet over and the private complaint and the petition for confiscation of the vehicles are to be filed by the respondent police before the concerned Judicial Magistrate and already the learned Principal Sessions Judge granted interim bail till 02.06.2026, to the co-accused/A1 to A5 on 30.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. Nos.1375/2026 and 1378/2026 and in the event of considering this application, the same condition may be imposed on the petitioners.

9. The FIR has been registered on 18.04.2026. Nearly 28 days from the date of FIR, the Investigation Officer has not filed the petition to confiscate the vehicle involved in this case and the private complaint, indicating the lack of seriousness on the part of the Investigation officer in proceeding with the prosecution of the offence alleged against the petitioners. The co-accused/A1 to A5 were granted interim bail till 02.06.2026 by the Principal Sessions Judge in CrI.M.P. Nos.1375 and 1378/2026, dated 30.04.2026. In the said circumstances, this court finds that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners may not be required for the prosecution and this court is inclined to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners 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 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 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*.

Call on 03.06.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:13:08 +0530
PARAMASIVADOSS
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Inspector of Police, Nesamany Nagar Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.111/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000170-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.129/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000173-2026)

Maria Arokia Jagan @ Jagan (A9)

S/o. Lopus

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.111/2026

1. Ajay .R, S/o. Ramaiya. (A6)

2. Anandh S/o. Mani (A7)

3. Daniel Gifton S/o. Rajamani (A8)

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.129/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Nesamany Nagar Police Station,

Crime No.86/2026 of Nesamany Nagar Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. MA. Shiva
Kumaar and R. Ram Sundar respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant
anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 303(2) of BNS.

4. CrI.M.P. No.111/2026 has been filed by A9 and CrI.M.P. No.129/2026 has been filed by A6 to A8 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that on 18.04.2026 at about 5.00 A.M., the respondent police found that in survey No.1936, the accused persons 1 to 4 loaded red sand in their vehicles with the help of Hitachi operated by the 5th accused and the 6th accused is the owner of the Tipper Lorry bearing Regn. No.TN 49 AD 6575 and TN 75 AY 6914 which were driven by the accused 1 and 2 and the 9th accused arranged the owners of the vehicles for work. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.111/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent and no such occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and on the basis of the false petition, the respondent police foisted this false case against the petitioner and the investigation in this case is almost over 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 CrI.M.P. No.129/2026 would contend that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and all the allegations against the petitioners are false and no such occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and on the basis of false complaint, the respondent police foisted this false case against the petitioners and the investigation in this case is almost over 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 on 18.04.2026 when the respondent police were conducting patrol duty near Derik Junction, at that time, the petitioners were illegally loaded red sand from the land in R.S. No.1936 in a tippers bearing Reg. No. TN49 AD 6675, TN75 AY 6914, TN88 M 0468 and a tractor bearing Reg. No. TN74 BF 0475 with the help of Hitachi. The vehicles with contraband seized by the police. The petitioners were arrested by the police on 18.04.2026. A1 is the driver of the vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN49 AD 6575, A2 is the driver of vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN75 AY 6914, A3 is the owner cum driver of vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN88 M 0468, A4 is the driver of the tractor bearing Reg. No. TN74 BF 0475, A5 is the driver of hitachi, A6 is the owner of the vehicles bearing Reg. Nos. TN49 AD 6575,

A7 is the owner of the tractor bearing Reg. No. TN74 BF 0475, A8 is the owner of the hitachi and A9 is the organiser of the work and the FIR was registered only on 18.04.2026 and the investigation of the case is not yet over and the private complaint and the petition for confiscation of the vehicles are to be filed by the respondent police before the concerned Judicial Magistrate and already the learned Principal Sessions Judge granted interim bail till 02.06.2026, to the co-accused/A1 to A5 on 30.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. Nos.1375/2026 and 1378/2026 and in the event of considering this application, the same condition may be imposed on the petitioners.

9. The FIR has been registered on 18.04.2026. Nearly 28 days from the date of FIR, the Investigation Officer has not filed the petition to confiscate the vehicle involved in this case and the private complaint, indicating the lack of seriousness on the part of the Investigation officer in proceeding with the prosecution of the offence alleged against the petitioners. The co-accused/A1 to A5 were granted interim bail till 02.06.2026 by the Principal Sessions Judge in CrI.M.P. Nos.1375 and 1378/2026, dated 30.04.2026. In the said circumstances, this court finds that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners may not be required for the prosecution and this court is inclined to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners 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 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 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*.

Call on 03.06.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:13:08 +0530
PARAMASIVADOSS
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Inspector of Police, Nesamany Nagar Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 108/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000168-2026)

Mohamed Kasim S/o. Mohamed Thaka

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Crime No.98/2026 of Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Santhosh Kumar, 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 329(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 28.04.2026 at about

16.30 hours, while the complainant was at S.N. Footwear shop, the petitioner trespassed into the shop of the defacto complainant and abused him in filthy language and assaulted him with iron rod on his stomach and kicked him and criminally intimidated him and his family. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and there are no previous cases of any nature against him and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case, due to family dispute and the defacto complainant is the accused in a counter case in Crime No.97/2026 of the same police station and as counter blast, this case has been registered against the petitioner to escape from the earlier crime 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 petitioner is the brother-in-law of the defacto complainant. On 28.04.2026, this petitioner and another one accused went to the shop of the defacto complainant and abused him and assaulted him with iron rod and A2 assaulted him on his face and chest with leg and the injured was discharged from the hospital and this is a case in counter matter 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 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 offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, 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. As such, this petition deserves to be allowed 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 II, Nagercoil subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the SHO, Nesamony Nagar Police Station, on 19.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.98/2026 of Nesamony Nagar 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.
- 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
 Digitally signed by
 PARAMASIVADOSS
 Date: 2026.05.15
 20:07:51 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
 The Inspector of Police, Nesamony Nagar 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 107/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000155-2026)

Michael @ Mariya Michael George
S/o. Vincent

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Anjugramam Police Station,

Crime No.88/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. 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 petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS and Sec. 4 of TNPWH Act
2002.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 25.03.2026 at 6.20 P.M., while the informant Alphonse was near to her house at Azhagappapuram, the petitioner used filthy words against the informant due to previous enmity and beaten her on her hands and leg with stone and criminally intimidated her. 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 is not a rowdy element 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 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 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.

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, Additional Mahila Court, 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:07:35+0530
PARAMASIVADOSS
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil
(through e-mode).

The Inspector of Police, Anjugramam 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.105/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000133-2026)

A. Retnaraj S/o. Arulanantham (A1) .. Petitioner
/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Boothapandy Police Station,
Crime No.19/2026 of Boothapandy Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed offences
under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 329(3), 324(5), and
351(3) of the BNS.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 13.01.2026 at about 5.52
a.m., while the complainant and one George Williams were taking a walk in
front of Jacob Chelliah Community College at Erachakulam, the first

accused abused them in filthy language. When the same was questioned by the said George Williams, A1 assaulted him with a stick on his chest and back. Thereafter, A1 instructed the petitioners who accompanied him to open the gate of the college, pursuant to which they trespassed into the campus and damaged five CCTV cameras, ten banner boards, the college name board, the office lock, the laboratory lock, and the articles available therein, and also criminally intimidated the complainant. The total damage caused is stated to be Rs.3,00,000/-. Hence, the charge.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was employed in the Military Hospital at Kuwait for about 20 years and returned to India in the year 1990 and has been residing at his native place, Cakkapattu. It is further submitted that the defacto complainant trespassed into the building situated in R.S.No.439/1 measuring an extent of 10.60 cents in Erachakulam Village, which belongs to the petitioner's daughter-in-law, who is presently working at Wellington, United Kingdom. She has filed a suit against the defacto complainant, who is the President of Blessing Life Foundation Trust, arraying him as the first defendant and the petitioner as the second defendant in O.S.No.115/2026 for recovery of possession, recovery of damages, recovery of mesne profits, and mandatory injunction, and the same is pending before the learned Additional District

Judge, Nagercoil. The petitioner had entered appearance on 17.04.2026. According to the learned counsel, after coming to know about the above suit, the defacto complainant created a scene through third parties and lodged a false complaint against the petitioner and others. The petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence. It is further submitted that the petitioner is aged about 80 years and his wife is aged about 76 years, and that his two sons are residing in the United Kingdom and Toronto, Canada respectively. The petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. It is also submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition. Hence, he prayed for anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there exists previous enmity between the defacto complainant and the petitioner. There are totally seventeen accused in this case and the petitioner is A1. The defacto complainant has been running a Paramedical College from the year 2012 onwards. On 13.01.2026, when the defacto complainant and another person were on a morning walk, the petitioner waylaid and abused the defacto complainant, which was questioned by the friend of the defacto complainant. Thereupon, the petitioner assaulted him on his chest and back, and the other accused opened the gate, trespassed into

the college campus, and damaged the CCTV cameras, laboratory, and other articles available in the college. The total damage caused is stated to be Rs.3,00,000/-. The petitioner is also stated to have one previous case against him. Though the injured has been discharged from the hospital, the investigation is not yet over, and therefore the learned Public Prosecutor raised serious objection to granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Alternatively, he submitted that if this application is considered, the petitioner may be directed to deposit some amount.

5. It is the case of the prosecution that A1 assaulted the defacto complainant and that all the other accused trespassed into the college campus of the defacto complainant and caused damage to certain articles worth Rs.3,00,000/-. The learned Public Prosecutor would submit that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. It is also seen that the criminal complaint was registered during the second week of January, 2026. Further, the parties to the complaint are relatives and there is a pending civil dispute between them. Taking note of the age of the petitioner, who is stated to be about 80 years old, and also considering the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with conditions.

6. 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 and also he shall deposit a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only).
- 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:07:02 +0530

To

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

The Sub Inspector of Police, Boothapandy 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.85/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000061-2026)

Jegan Raj S/o. Savari Muthu

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Puthukadai Police Station,

Crime No.148/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Stanly Casmic
Sundar, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2.The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed offences under
Sections 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 351(2), and 303(2) of the BNS and Section
4 of the TNPHW Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the wife of the petitioner. The petitioner allegedly harassed the defacto complainant, subjected her to cruelty, abused her in filthy language, assaulted her, committed theft of 13 sovereigns of gold jewels belonging to the defacto complainant, and criminally intimidated her. Hence, the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and that all the allegations levelled against him are false. The defacto complainant is the legally wedded wife of the petitioner and their marriage was solemnized on 25.10.2009. Out of the wedlock, they have been blessed with two children. The petitioner is a retired Indian Army personnel and is presently taking care of his aged father, who is about 80 years old and bedridden due to various age-related ailments. Owing to the continuous stress and difficulties involved in maintaining and caring for his aged father, certain misunderstandings and occasional wordy quarrels arose between the spouses in the ordinary course of matrimonial life, and due to such matrimonial discord, the defacto complainant lodged the present complaint against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner had never assaulted, abused, or threatened the defacto complainant as alleged. It is also submitted that the alleged 13 sovereigns of gold jewels are already in the custody of the respondent police. The petitioner is innocent, the

investigation is almost over, and he has no previous criminal antecedents. The petitioner is ready to abide by any condition, and therefore prayed for anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant is the wife of the petitioner. On 30.04.2026, the petitioner abused the defacto complainant, assaulted her with his hands, snatched a 13-sovereign gold chain from her, pulled her nighty, and outraged her modesty. It is further submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, but the investigation is not yet over. Therefore, he raised serious objection to granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. 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.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the defacto complainant is the wife of the petitioner and that certain matrimonial disputes and misunderstandings had arisen between them due to domestic and family circumstances. According to the petitioner, it is only in the background of such matrimonial discord that the present complaint came to be lodged. Though the allegation relates to the snatching of 13 sovereigns of gold jewels, considering the nature of the dispute between the parties, this Court is of the view that the matter substantially arises out of matrimonial discord between the husband and wife. Therefore, 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.

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 II, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the SHO, Puthukadai Police Station, on 19.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.148/2026 of Puthukadai 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 and also he is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:08:10 +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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.84/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000128-2026)

Ramya D/o. Krishnan (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,
Crime No. 8/2026 of District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

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

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the petition.
2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed offences under Sections 61(2) and 318(4) of the BNS.
3. The case of the prosecution is that A1 is the Branch Manager, A2 is the Assistant Manager, and the petitioner/A3 is the Customer Executive Grade-I of the informant finance company, and all of them worked in the Kanyakumari Branch-I of the informant company. During an

inspection conducted by the informant in the finance company, it was noticed that some gold ornaments were missing and certain packets had been tampered with, and that about 2115.300 grams of gold ornaments had been stolen. Hence, the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and that he is only the Customer Service Executive taking care of the security chest, and that he had no dealing with the pledged jewels. According to him, the pledged jewels were under the custody of accused Nos.1 and 2, and the petitioner was only acting as per their directions. It is further contended that there is no specific overt act attributed to the petitioner and that accused Nos.1 and 2 are the responsible persons. This is the second application, and the earlier application in Crl.M.P.No.1108/2026 was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Judge, Nagercoil, on 16.04.2026. It is further submitted that the investigation is almost completed and that the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition, and therefore prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there are totally three accused in this case and that the petitioner is A3. The petitioner worked as Deputy Manager of Muthoot Fincorp Private Finance Ltd. The petitioner and the other two accused were

responsible for the locker room. On 09.09.2024, when the pledged gold jewels were inspected by the Gold Inspector of the said company and Appraiser, it was found that some of the gold jewels had been stolen by the petitioner and the other two accused, and that spurious jewels had been substituted in the packets. Hence, the case was registered. Originally, the accused had agreed to repay the amount, but they failed to do so. The weight of the stolen jewels is 2024.80 grams. The total value of the jewels was Rs.99,82,176/- in the year 2024, and now the value of the same is Rs.1,67,43,000/-. It is further submitted that the petitioner had already approached this Court for anticipatory bail in CrI.M.P.No.1108/2026, and the same was dismissed on 16.04.2026 by the Principal Sessions Judge, Nagercoil. There is no change in circumstances, and all the accused are absconding. Therefore, he raised serious objection to granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is A3 and that she has no connection with the custody of the jewels. The learned Public Prosecutor would contend that the earlier application was dismissed only on 16.04.2026 and that all the accused are absconding. After hearing elaborate arguments, the earlier petition was dismissed on the ground that the quantity of stolen jewels is huge and that

the investigation was in the preliminary stage. Since there is no change in circumstances, 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:06:39 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 83/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000127-2026)

M. Thanu Moorthy S/o. T. Manoharan (A1)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No.122/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru K. Subhakaravel, 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 191(2), 296(b) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 30.03.2026 at about
11.30 P.M., the 1st accused along with eight other persons came in front of

the house of the defacto complainant with deadly weapons and called him out by using filthy words against him and when the wife of the defacto complainant has come out from the house, they abused her and and criminally intimidated them. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged and actually, the defacto complainant along with seven others trespassed into the house of the mother of the petitioner and assaulted her and damaged the household articles, window and public tap and intimidated her and therefore, the case in crime No.121/2026 has been registered against them and as a counter blast, this case has been foisted against the petitioner and nothing had happened as alleged and none of else sustained injury 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 30.03.2026, this petitioner and other accused went to the house of the defacto complainant with knife and iron rod and abused the wife of the defacto complainant and threatened her and there is no injury to anybody and the investigation is not yet over and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. 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 offences and also considering the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential, 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 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, Suchindrum Police Station, on 19.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.122/2026 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 fifteen days from today without fail.
- iii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:12:04 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli.
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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.82/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000143-2026)

Jeslin @ Jeslin Gnanamuthu (A3)

S/o. Gunamanipal

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kotticode Police Station,

Crime No.58/2026 of Kotticode Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru C. Jeffino, 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), 324(4), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity, on 28.04.2026, the accused persons abused the defacto complainant in filthy words and assaulted him and damaged the television kept in his shop for repair 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 no such occurrence had happened as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged and due to previous enmity, this false case has been foisted against the petitioner 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.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are four accused in this case and this petitioner is A3. On 27.04.2026, this petitioner and other accused abused the wife of the defacto complainant. So, she filed a petition before the police station. On 28.04.2026, the petitioner and other accused came to the shop of the defacto complainant and A1 damaged the TV kept in the shop of the defacto complainant with stone and then, the petitioner and other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and A3 pulled the shirt of the defacto complainant and A1 assaulted him on his shoulder with stick and A2

pelted stone on the defacto complainant and worth of damage is Rs.25,000/- and the petitioner/A3 is having one previous case 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 either the petition may be dismissed or in the event of considering this application, the petitioner may be directed to deposit some amount.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor would state that the injured was discharged from the hospital and in the event of considering this application, the petitioner may be directed to deposit some amount as damages. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and considering the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner 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.I, Padmanabhapuram subject to the following conditions:-

- i. 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.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
 PARAMASIVADOSS
 Date: 2026.05.15
 20:10:20 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
 The Inspector of Police, Kotticode 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 81/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000142-2026)

1. Ravikumar S/o. Mayandi (A1)
2. Ravi .S S/o. Subramanian (A2)
3. Babu S/o. Mayandi (A3) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Manavalakurichi Police Station,
Crime No.36/2026 of Manavalakurichi Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Prasath .V, 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 115(2), 118(1), 296(b) and 351(2) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the 1st accused and the uncle of the defacto complainant had a previous enmity regarding the land dispute. On 25.04.2026 at about 6.00 A.M., when the complainant went near that property, the accused who were working there by fixing a fence assaulted him and A1 assaulted him with iron rod and A2 assaulted him with hand and other accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and all the allegations are false and they are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and they never committed any offence as alleged and a counter case in Crime No.37/2026 is pending for investigation 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 25.04.2026, the petitioners were fencing in the pathway of the defacto complainant, which was questioned by the defacto complainant. So, A1 and A2 abused him and A1 assaulted him with iron rod and pushed him down and A2 assaulted him with hand and leg and A3 abused and threatened him and the injured was discharged from the hospital and this is a case in counter matter and he has serious objection to grant

anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

6. It is the case of the prosecution that due to pathway dispute, the accused persons caused injuries to the defacto complainant. The learned Public Prosecutor would state that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and also state that this is a case in counter. Considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and this is a case in counter, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 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, Eraniel 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:15:20 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Manavalakurichi 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 76/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000124-2026)

L. Perumal S/o. Lekshmana Pillai

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No.145/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Krishna Sreethar,
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 23.04.2026, the accused
abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him and
criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that on 23.04.2026, during State assembly election, the petitioner worked as agent for AIADMK party and at that time, the defacto complainant and four others quarreled with the petitioner and on that day night, the above persons came to the house of the petitioner under the influence of alcohol and quarreled with his wife and on 25.04.2026, when he came back to his house, the defacto complainant and his henchmen attacked the petitioner and the case in Crime No.146/2026 has been registered against the petitioner and the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and no such incident happened as alleged and he has no previous criminal antecedents 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.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that 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 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.

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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:10:01 +0530
PARAMASIVADOSS
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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 38/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000074-2026)

1. Sujin S/o. Chellan (A1)
2. Kanagamani S/o. Ramaswamy (A3)
3. Christoher S/o. Haris (A5) .. Petitioners
/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Puthukadai Police Station,
Crime No.144/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Pal Raj, 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 191(2), 126(2), 296(b), 303(2), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS and

Sec. 4 of TNPHWA, 2002.

3. The case of prosecution is that the defacto complainant and her husband (A3) are living separately for 2 ¼ years and on 27.04.2026 at about 7.00 P.M., when the defacto complainant is at home, all the accused wrongfully restrained her and abused her using filthy words and the 1st petitioner hold the right breast of the defacto complainant and tore the churidar and assaulted on her back and the 2nd accused snatched one sovereign of gold chain from her and other accused persons also assaulted the defacto complainant on her back and chest, and also criminally intimidated her. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and nothing had happened as alleged in the FIR and the real fact is that the defacto complainant and the 2nd petitioner/A3 are husband and wife and due to misunderstanding they were living separately for the past 3 years and D.V.C. No.23/2026 is pending before the Judicial Magistrate No.II at Kuzhithurai and the 2nd petitioner is employed in Bahrain and returned to his native place on 25.04.2026. On 27.04.2026 at about 7.30 P.M., the defacto complainant and along with other 6 persons trespassed into the house of 2nd petitioner and abused him using filthy words and started quarelling with him and during that incident, the petitioners 1

and 3 came to the house of 2nd petitioner, and suddenly they assaulted the petitioners with iron rod causing a fracture on right knee of the 3rd petitioner and also stamped on his legs. While the other accused came to the house by hearing the sound, the defacto complainant and other persons threatened to kill them. The 3rd petitioner lodged a complaint before the Puthukadai Police Station and the case in Crime No.143/2026 has been registered against the defacto complainant and the petitioners have not committed any offence 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 the defacto complainant is the Kalarani who is the wife of Kanagamani. Totally there are five accused in this case. The petitioners are A1, A3 and A5. A3 and the defacto complainant are husband and wife and they are living separately for more than 3 years. On 27.04.2026, when the defacto complainant was in the house, the petitioners and other accused restrained the defacto complainant and assaulted her and 1st petitioner caught hold right breast of the defacto complainant and tore her churidhar and assaulted her and snatched one sovereigns of chain of the defacto complainant and the 2nd petitioner and other accused assaulted her on her

chest with hand and threatened her and the injured was discharged from the hospital and this is a case in counter matter 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 and this is a case in counter, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions. But it is found that the present complaint, admittedly arises out of a case and counter-case situation. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that there is also a bail application filed by the defacto complainant and her son in connection with the counter case in CrI.M.P.No 6/2026 & CrI.M.P.No. 126/2026, wherein allegations of a similar nature have been levelled against them. The nature of the accusations in both cases appears to be substantially identical of causing bodily injury and trespass, indicating that both sides have attributed overt acts of assault and intimidation against each other arising out of the same occurrence and background circumstances. The materials placed before this Court prima facie indicate that there exist long-standing matrimonial

and familial disputes between the parties, particularly between the defacto complainant and the 2nd petitioner/A3, who are husband and wife and have admittedly been living separately for several years. It further appears that due to such strained family relationship and continuing domestic discord, other family members and relatives have aligned themselves with one side or the other, thereby escalating the dispute into criminal litigation involving allegations and counter allegations.

7. This Court is of the view that, in circumstances such as the present one, where there are rival versions arising out of the same transaction and both sides have alleged similar acts of assault and intimidation against each other, the possibility of exaggeration, over-implication, and reciprocal accusations cannot be ruled out at this stage of investigation. The existence of a counter case involving similar allegations probabalises the contention that the occurrence had its genesis in an ongoing familial and matrimonial dispute rather than in a unilateral criminal act. Therefore, balancing the nature of the allegations, the existence of case and counter-case, the discharge of the injured from the hospital, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions. In both the complaints, the accused are

enlarged on bail.

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.II, 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 Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Colachel 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:12:36 +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 Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Colachel.

(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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 6/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000022-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.126/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000154-2026)

A.Ashin Jenitto @ Asin Jenitto (A3)

S/o Arul dhas

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.6/2026

1. K. Katharin Kennath @ Ketharin Henith (A1)

S/o. Kanagamani

2. S. Kala Rani W/o. Kanagamani (A4)

... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.126/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Puthukadai Police Station,

Crime No.143/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 329(4), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

4. CrI.M.P. No.6/2026 has been filed by A3 and CrI.M.P. No.126/2026 has been filed by A1 and A4 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that on 27.04.2026 at about 7.30 P.M., the accused persons trespassed into the house of informant's neighbour and abused him with filthy words and assaulted him and when which was questioned by the informant, the accused abused the informant in filthy words and A1 pushed him and A1 to A3 assaulted him with iron rod and A4 assaulted him with leg and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.6/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the case has been cooked up against the petitioner by the informant only to harass him and the petitioner never committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the investigation of the case is almost over and the injured already discharged from hospital and it is a case in counter and the counter case in crime No.144/2026 has been registered against the informant and others 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 CrI.M.P. No.126/2026 would contend that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and nothing happened as stated by the prosecution and they never did any such act as alleged and due to previous enmity, this case has been foisted against them and the injured was discharged from hospital 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 totally there are seven accused in this case and the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.6/2026 is A3 and the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.126/2026 are A1 and A4. A4 is the wife of one Kanagamani and they

are living separately due to misunderstanding between them and the said Kanagamani was in Bahrain and now he came to India and hearing this news, on 27.04.2026, the petitioners and other accused trespassed into the house of Kanagamani, abused him using filthy words and also assaulted him. So, the defacto complainant came to the house of Kanagamani and when he rescue him, A1 pushed the defacto complainant and assaulted him with iron rod on his leg and left knee, A2 assaulted him with iron rod on the right leg, A3 assaulted him with iron rod on his leg, A4 assaulted him with iron rod on his leg. Now, the injured was discharged from the hospital and he had hospitalised for three days and this is a case in counter matter and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and both the petitions may be dismissed.

9. 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 and this is a case in counter, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions. But it is found that the present complaint, admittedly arises out of a case and counter-case situation. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that there is also a bail application

filed by the defacto complainant husband and his relatives connection with the counter case in CrI.M.P.No 38/2026, wherein allegations of a similar nature have been levelled against them. The nature of the accusations in both cases appears to be substantially identical of causing bodily injury and trespass, indicating that both sides have attributed overt acts of assault and intimidation against each other arising out of the same occurrence and background circumstances. The materials placed before this Court prima facie indicate that there exist long-standing matrimonial and familial disputes between the parties, particularly between the defacto complainant and the 2nd petitioner/A3, who are husband and wife and have admittedly been living separately for several years. It further appears that due to such strained family relationship and continuing domestic discord, other family members and relatives have aligned themselves with one side or the other, thereby escalating the dispute into criminal litigation involving allegations and counter allegations.

7. This Court is of the view that, in circumstances such as the present one, where there are rival versions arising out of the same transaction and both sides have alleged similar acts of assault and intimidation against each other, the possibility of exaggeration, over-implication, and reciprocal accusations cannot be ruled out at this stage of investigation. The existence

of a counter case involving similar allegations probabilises the contention that the occurrence had its genesis in an ongoing familial and matrimonial dispute rather than in a unilateral criminal act. Therefore, balancing the nature of the allegations, the existence of case and counter-case, the discharge of the injured from the hospital, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions. In both the complaints, the accused are enlarged on bail.

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.II, 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 Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:16:47 +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 Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 6/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000022-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.126/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000154-2026)

A.Ashin Jenitto @ Asin Jenitto (A3)

S/o Arul dhas

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.6/2026

1. K. Katharin Kennath @ Ketharin Henith (A1)

S/o. Kanagamani

2. S. Kala Rani W/o. Kanagamani (A4)

... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.126/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Puthukadai Police Station,

Crime No.143/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 329(4), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

4. CrI.M.P. No.6/2026 has been filed by A3 and CrI.M.P. No.126/2026 has been filed by A1 and A4 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that on 27.04.2026 at about 7.30 P.M., the accused persons trespassed into the house of informant's neighbour and abused him with filthy words and assaulted him and when which was questioned by the informant, the accused abused the informant in filthy words and A1 pushed him and A1 to A3 assaulted him with iron rod and A4 assaulted him with leg and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.6/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the case has been cooked up against the petitioner by the informant only to harass him and the petitioner never committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the investigation of the case is almost over and the injured already discharged from hospital and it is a case in counter and the counter case in crime No.144/2026 has been registered against the informant and others 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 CrI.M.P. No.126/2026 would contend that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and nothing happened as stated by the prosecution and they never did any such act as alleged and due to previous enmity, this case has been foisted against them and the injured was discharged from hospital 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 totally there are seven accused in this case and the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.6/2026 is A3 and the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.126/2026 are A1 and A4. A4 is the wife of one Kanagamani and they

are living separately due to misunderstanding between them and the said Kanagamani was in Bahrain and now he came to India and hearing this news, on 27.04.2026, the petitioners and other accused trespassed into the house of Kanagamani, abused him using filthy words and also assaulted him. So, the defacto complainant came to the house of Kanagamani and when he rescue him, A1 pushed the defacto complainant and assaulted him with iron rod on his leg and left knee, A2 assaulted him with iron rod on the right leg, A3 assaulted him with iron rod on his leg, A4 assaulted him with iron rod on his leg. Now, the injured was discharged from the hospital and he had hospitalised for three days and this is a case in counter matter and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and both the petitions may be dismissed.

9. 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 and this is a case in counter, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions. But it is found that the present complaint, admittedly arises out of a case and counter-case situation. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that there is also a bail application

filed by the defacto complainant husband and his relatives connection with the counter case in CrI.M.P.No 38/2026, wherein allegations of a similar nature have been levelled against them. The nature of the accusations in both cases appears to be substantially identical of causing bodily injury and trespass, indicating that both sides have attributed overt acts of assault and intimidation against each other arising out of the same occurrence and background circumstances. The materials placed before this Court prima facie indicate that there exist long-standing matrimonial and familial disputes between the parties, particularly between the defacto complainant and the 2nd petitioner/A3, who are husband and wife and have admittedly been living separately for several years. It further appears that due to such strained family relationship and continuing domestic discord, other family members and relatives have aligned themselves with one side or the other, thereby escalating the dispute into criminal litigation involving allegations and counter allegations.

7. This Court is of the view that, in circumstances such as the present one, where there are rival versions arising out of the same transaction and both sides have alleged similar acts of assault and intimidation against each other, the possibility of exaggeration, over-implication, and reciprocal accusations cannot be ruled out at this stage of investigation. The existence

of a counter case involving similar allegations probabalises the contention that the occurrence had its genesis in an ongoing familial and matrimonial dispute rather than in a unilateral criminal act. Therefore, balancing the nature of the allegations, the existence of case and counter-case, the discharge of the injured from the hospital, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions. In both the complaints, the accused are enlarged on bail.

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.II, 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 Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:16:47 +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 Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.75/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000121-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.109/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000179-2026)

R. Dinesh (A4)

S/o.Ravindran

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.75/2026

1. Jebin S/o. Christoher @ Selvan (A1)

2. Melbin @ Belbin S/o. Palus @ Palis (A2)

3. Rajesh S/o. Rajendran (A3) .. Petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.109/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Arumanai Police Station,

Crime No.96/2026 of Arumanai Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. A. K. Binu

Bharath and C.V. Arun respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petition.

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 296(b), 118(1) and 303(2)(NP) of BNS.

4. The case of prosecution is that on 02.05.2026 at about 9.13 P.M., while the informant was on the way to home, the accused were consuming alcohol and smoking ganja, which was questioned by the defacto complainant, the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and attacked him with bottle and stone and one of the accused inserted cloth in the mouth of the defacto complainant and snatched Rs.5,000/- and a golden chain weighing 3 sovereigns from the defacto complainant. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.75/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the petitioner and defacto complainant are friends and the informant himself created trouble with the petitioner and others and no such

occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner has no previous case and the injured was discharged from the hospital 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.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.109/2026 submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and there is no specific overt attributed against the petitioners and the investigation is over 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.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 02.05.2026 these petitioners and another one accused consumed ganja and liquor in the pathway, which was questioned by the defacto complainant. So the accused persons assaulted the defacto complainant with bottle and stone and one of the accused closed the mouth of the defacto complainant with cloth and another one accused stolen his golden chain weighing 3 sovereigns and Rs.5,000/- from the defacto complainant and the stolen properties are to be recovered from the petitioners and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly

essential 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 both petitions may be dismissed.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor objected that the stolen properties are to be recovered from the petitioners and 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.

9. 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.

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, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall surrender before the SHO, Arumanai Police Station on 19.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which they shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.96/2026 of Arumanai 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 shall stay at Gandarvakkottai, Pudukkottai District appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Gandarvakkottai daily twice at 10.30 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
 Digitally signed by
 PARAMASIVADOSS
 Date: 2026.05.15
 20:09:40 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
 The Judicial Magistrate, Gandarvakkottai, Pudukkottai District.
 The Inspector of Police, Arumanai Police Station.
 (through court cell e-Mode)
 The counsel for the petitioner in both petition.

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.75/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000121-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.109/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000179-2026)

R. Dinesh (A4)

S/o.Ravindran

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.75/2026

1. Jebin S/o. Christoher @ Selvan (A1)

2. Melbin @ Belbin S/o. Palus @ Palis (A2)

3. Rajesh S/o. Rajendran (A3) .. Petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.109/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Arumanai Police Station,

Crime No.96/2026 of Arumanai Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. A. K. Binu

Bharath and C.V. Arun respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petition.

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 296(b), 118(1) and 303(2)(NP) of BNS.

4. The case of prosecution is that on 02.05.2026 at about 9.13 P.M., while the informant was on the way to home, the accused were consuming alcohol and smoking ganja, which was questioned by the defacto complainant, the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and attacked him with bottle and stone and one of the accused inserted cloth in the mouth of the defacto complainant and snatched Rs.5,000/- and a golden chain weighing 3 sovereigns from the defacto complainant. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.75/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the petitioner and defacto complainant are friends and the informant himself created trouble with the petitioner and others and no such

occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner has no previous case and the injured was discharged from the hospital 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.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.109/2026 submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and there is no specific overt attributed against the petitioners and the investigation is over 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.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 02.05.2026 these petitioners and another one accused consumed ganja and liquor in the pathway, which was questioned by the defacto complainant. So the accused persons assaulted the defacto complainant with bottle and stone and one of the accused closed the mouth of the defacto complainant with cloth and another one accused stolen his golden chain weighing 3 sovereigns and Rs.5,000/- from the defacto complainant and the stolen properties are to be recovered from the petitioners and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly

essential 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 both petitions may be dismissed.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor objected that the stolen properties are to be recovered from the petitioners and 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.

9. 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.

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, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall surrender before the SHO, Arumanai Police Station on 19.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which they shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.96/2026 of Arumanai 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 shall stay at Gandarvakkottai, Pudukkottai District appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Gandarvakkottai daily twice at 10.30 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
 Digitally signed by
 PARAMASIVADOSS
 Date: 2026.05.15
 20:09:40 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
 The Judicial Magistrate, Gandarvakkottai, Pudukkottai District.
 The Inspector of Police, Arumanai Police Station.
 (through court cell e-Mode)
 The counsel for the petitioner in both petition.

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 51/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000062-2026)

Aslin Vino S/o. Rajasekaran

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Thiruvattar Police Station,

Crime No.152/2026 of Thiruvattar Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P.R. Aswin, 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), 329(3), 118(1), 351(3) and 324(4) of BNS and Sec. 4 of
TNPHW Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 02.05.2026 at about 6.30 P.M., the accused trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, used filthy words against the defacto complainant, assaulted him and criminally intimidated him and also harassed the female family members of the defacto complainant and have also caused damage to the house hold property to the tune of Rs.20,000/-. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the FIR has been lodged against the petitioner with a view to harass and humiliate him and the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. There is absolutely no motive on his part to commit any of the alleged offences and the petitioner sustained head injury in the road accident and he has been duly noted by medical professionals and he is under active medical treatment for the same and in view of his medical condition, he is not a person who would willfully or deliberately misbehave with neighbours or commit any of the alleged criminal acts. The complainant and the petitioner are residents of the same locality and there exists a prior personal enmity between the complainant's family and the petitioner's family, which has been the root cause of the false implication of the petitioner and the complainant has taken undue advantage of his vulnerable medical condition and the proximity of our residences to

foist a false case against him, with the sole intention of harassing and pressurizing him and his family and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the investigation 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 on 02.05.2026 this petitioner chased one Rajagopal with knife. So the said Rajagopal went to the house of the defacto complainant for his safety and locked the door from inside. So the petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant by breaking open the door and assaulted the Rajagopal with hand, which was questioned by the defacto complainant. Immediately, the petitioner abused the defacto complainant and assaulted his with hand on his shoulder, which was questioned by the wife of the defacto complainant. So the petitioner pulled her hair and pushed her down and assaulted on her stomach with leg and then the petitioner stabbed the defacto complainant on his left hand and chest with knife and damaged the windows worth of Rs.20,000/-, which was questioned by the relative of the defacto complainant. Then the petitioner abused and threatened them and then he pulled the saree of one Jayala and outraged her modesty and assaulted her and totally four injured persons in this case and the injured have been 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. 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 have been discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner 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.II, Padmanabhapuram 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 stay at Avudaiyarkoil, Pudukkottai District, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Avudaiyarkoil daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15 20:09:05
+0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Judicial Magistrate, Avudaiyarkoil, Pudukkottai District.

The Inspector of Police, Thiruvattar 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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 41/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000056-2026)

Michel Sabari Muthu @ Michaelsavarimuthu (A1)

S/o. Joseph Jeyaseelan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,

Crime No.9/2026 of DCB, Nagercoil,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

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

ORDER

The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 61(2) and 318(4) of BNS.

2. During enquiry, the learned counsel for the petitioner made
an endorsement on the petition stating that not pressing the petition.

3. In view of the endorsement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this petition is dismissed as not pressed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:08:47 +0530
PARAMASIVADOSS
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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 29/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000051-2026)

1. Kalaiarasan S/o. Krishnan (A2)
2. Balan @ Balasubramanian S/o. Mahalingam (A3)
3. Saravanan S/o. Mahalingam (A4) .. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Rajakkamangalam Police Station,
Crime No.103/2026 of Rajakkamangalam Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Varatharajan, 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 303(2), 62, 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS @ u/s

303(2), 62, 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) and 109(1) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 26.04.2026 at early hours, at Tharamapuram near the house of Chelladurai, the petitioner and two other accused have attempted to steal a bike, which was questioned by the neighbours, they attacked them with coconut husk and which was questioned by the informant, he was attacked by one Subinjoy and the son of informant was also attacked by the 1st petitioner with aruval and criminally intimidated them. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them 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 26.04.2026 these petitioners and two other accused assaulted one Chelladurai and his wife, they raised alarm. So the defacto complainant came to rescue the said Chelladurai, the petitioners inflicted cut injury all over the body of the defacto complainant with aruval. So the son of the defacto complainant came to rescue his father, at that time, the 2nd accused inflicted multiple cut injuries all over his body with aruval and other accused threatened the defacto complainant and his son and now the

injured were discharged from the hospital. Originally the case was registered u/s 303(2), 62, 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS and subsequently, section of law is altered u/s 109(1) of BNS. The 1st accused has five previous cases and the 3rd accused Manikandan had one previous case and other accused has no previous cases and the investigation of the case 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 were 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, 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 Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel daily at 10.30 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:16:25 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Rajakkamangalam 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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.25/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000043-2026)

K. Vineeth S/o. Kunasekar

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

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

Crime No.74/2026 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 28.04.2026, while the respondent police conducted vehicle check up near Kottar Kampolam area in the morning hours, the accused person illegally transported 400 kg. of PDS rice in Honda City Car. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and that he has not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and that the entire case has been falsely foisted against him. According to the learned counsel, the contraband property as well as the vehicle alleged to have been used for transportation have already been seized by the respondent police and, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by taking the petitioner into custody. It is further contended that substantial investigation has already been completed and that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate 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 28.04.2026, the petitioner was found illegally transporting 400 kilograms of PDS rice in a car towards the State of Kerala. 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. The learned Public Prosecutor would further submit that, though the present seizure pertains to 400 kilograms of PDS rice, the investigation conducted so far gives rise to a strong suspicion that the present occurrence is not an isolated act of illegal transportation, but forms part of a larger, systematic, and organised network engaged in the diversion and smuggling of essential commodities meant for the Public Distribution System.

6. It is further submitted that the investigating agency suspects the involvement of several persons operating in coordination across districts and even across State borders for the illegal procurement, storage, transportation, and sale of PDS commodities in the black market. According to the prosecution, the present seizure is only a small portion of the illegal activity and appears to be merely the “tip of the iceberg”. The learned Public Prosecutor would emphasize that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is absolutely necessary to achieve a major breakthrough in the investigation, including the identification of the principal offenders storage points, procurement channels, and the larger conspiracy behind the organised diversion of PDS rice.

7. 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.

8. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. It is the specific case of the prosecution that 400 kilograms of rice meant exclusively for the Public Distribution System were recovered in connection with the present occurrence. Though the quantity seized may not by itself be the sole deciding factor, the apprehension expressed by the prosecution regarding the existence of a larger organised racket engaged in the illegal diversion and transportation of PDS commodities cannot be lightly brushed aside at this stage of investigation.

9. The materials placed before this Court indicate that the investigating agency is attempting to trace the larger chain of illegal procurement and movement of PDS rice and to identify the persons involved in such organised activities. According to the prosecution, the present recovery is only a preliminary lead and the investigation is likely to result in a major breakthrough with regard to the functioning of a wider illegal

network dealing with diversion of essential commodities meant for economically weaker sections of society. Therefore, the requirement of custodial interrogation assumes significance for the purpose of effectively investigating the larger conspiracy and unearthing the full extent of the organised operation.

10. 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, and the specific stand taken by the prosecution that custodial interrogation is necessary to uncover the broader organised crime network, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/accused at this stage. Accordingly, this petition deserves to be dismissed.

11. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:08:29 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 8/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000024-2026)

1. Kumar S/o Chellakkan (A1)
 2. Saju @ Shaji S/o Russeliyan (A2)
 3. Robi @ Mohanakumar, S/o Vethakann (A3) ...Petitioners
- /Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kollencode Police Station,
Crime No.69/2026 of Kollencode 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 petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that on 19.03.2026 at about 20.00 hours, while the informant along with his relative were coming out of a TASMAC bar at Oorambu, the accused were standing near the TASMAC bar and the informant demanded Rs. 2000/- from A1 which was given to him before two months and quarrel arose between them and the accused abused the informant with filthy words and assaulted him with stone and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the case has been cooked up against the petitioners by the informant only to harass them and the petitioners never committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution and the injured was discharged from hospital and the investigation of the case is almost over 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 19.03.2026, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with stone and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the 1st accused has two previous cases and the 3rd accused has one previous case and the investigation is not yet over and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly essential and he has serious objection to grant

anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

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.II, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall surrender before the SHO, Kollencode Police Station on 19.05.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which they shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.69/2026 of Kollencode 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 shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli daily twice at 10.30 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:15:00 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
 The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli.
 The Inspector of Police, Kollencode 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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 2/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000011-2026)

T. Stephen S/o Thangappan Nadar .. Petitioner
/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Boothapandy Police Station,
Crime No.159/2026 of Boothapandy Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

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

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the petition.
2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s
126(2), 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.
3. The case of the prosecution is that on 21.04.2026 at about 9.00
p.m., while the defacto complainant and his friends were standing near
Kesavan Puthoor Bus Stop and discussing the election, the accused came
there, waylaid the defacto complainant, abused him in filthy language,

assaulted him on the back of his neck, head, and left ear with an aruval, and criminally intimidated him. Hence, the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and that he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR, and that no such occurrence had taken place as stated in the FIR. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no previous cases and that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. This is the second application, and the first anticipatory bail application in CrI.M.P.No.1367/2026 was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil, on 30.04.2026 on the ground that the injured had not been discharged from the hospital. Now, the change in circumstances is that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is ready to abide by any condition, and therefore prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that though the injured has been discharged from the hospital, the petitioner has two previous cases. Out of the two cases, one case is under Section 324 IPC and another is a rape case. Therefore, he prayed that either the petition may be dismissed or, if the petition is allowed, stringent conditions may be imposed.

6. Considered the arguments 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 has been 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 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.
- 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
 PARAMASIVADOSS
 Date: 2026.05.15
 20:07:19 +0530
 Vacation Sessions Judge,
 Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
 The Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy (through e-mode).
 The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai.
 The Sub Inspector of Police, Boothapandy Police Station.
 (through court cell e-Mode)
 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. 133/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	15.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	பாபு, த/பெ கேசவன் நாயர்
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 வி. உதயசூரியா, எம்.எல்., செயலாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். 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: 2026.05.15
20:19:12 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.133/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000157-2026)

Babu S/o. Kesavan Nair

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No.371/2025 of Thuckalay Police Station,
(CC No.414/2025 of JM No.I, Padmanabhapuram)
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Dhinesh Kumar, 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 331(4) and 305(a) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 07.05.2025 at about 3.45 A.M., this petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and committed theft of gold ornaments. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that on 18.03.2026, the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram issued NBW against the petitioner and on execution of warrant, the police arrested the petitioner on 20.04.2026. The petitioner was not at all involved in the alleged crime and he is a coolie worker and he is aged about 62 years and he has to look after his wife and children who depends upon him and he is such an unhealthy person and if bail is not granted, he will be put to very serious health issues and the earlier bail petition filed by the petitioner in M.P. No.5/2026 was dismissed by the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram on 28.04.2026 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 the petitioner is a native of Kerala. On 07.05.2025 at 3.45 A.M. the petitioner and two other accused trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and stolen 42.75 sovereigns of gold ornaments and a cash of Rs.20,000/- and escaped from the scene of occurrence. On

09.05.2025 the petitioner was arrested and the case has been charge sheeted and taken on file as CC No. 414/2025 pending on the file of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram and thereafter, the petitioner did not appear before the court regularly. On 28.11.2025 the learned Judicial Magistrate issued Non Bailable Warrant against the petitioner and subsequently, he committed another offence in Crime No.358/2025 of Kaliyakkavilai Police Station and he was arrested by the Kaliyakkavilai Police on 08.12.2025 and then he was remanded to this court under PT Warrant on 15.12.2025. The petitioner has nine theft and robbery cases and now the case stands posted on 26.05.2026 for framing of charge and if the petitioner is released on bail, definitely he will abscond and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the objection of the learned Public Prosecutor that the petitioner/Accused has nine previous theft and robbery cases and due to his non appearance, the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram issued Non Bailable Warrant against the petitioner on 28.11.2025 and subsequently, the petitioner has not taken any steps to recall the warrant and the case is posted for framing of charges and also considering the antecedents of the petitioner/accused, this court is not convinced that the present petitioner/accused will be available for the trial

in the event of release on bail, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:19:23 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.125/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000185-2026)

Sivasankar S/o. Chellam

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Karungal Police Station,
Crime No.49/2026 of Karungal Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by the Legal Aid Defense Counsel
Thiru D.R. Bright Joel, 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 303(2) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 16.02.2026 at night

hours, the accused person has committed theft of 11 bunches of banana at the defacto complainant's property which is situated at Mangalakuntru. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and the respondent police falsely registered the case against the petitioner and the alleged theft property has been seized and recovered by the police. The petitioner and the defacto complainant are close relatives and due to money dispute between them, the defacto complainant gave a false complaint against the petitioner and the petitioner was arrested on 06.03.2026 and he has been under judicial custody for the past 68 days and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No.280/2026 filed by the petitioner before the Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel was dismissed on 18.04.2026 and it is a settled principle of law that "bail is a rule, jail is an exception" and "every accused should be treated as a innocent until proved guilty" and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the submission made by the learned Public Prosecutor that the petitioner along with the

other accused allegedly committed theft of 27 bunches of red banana on two different occasions and sold the same for a total sum of Rs.36,000/-, out of which only a sum of Rs.9,000/- has been recovered from the petitioner, this Court has also taken note of the fact that the petitioner has been under incarceration for the past 70 days.

6. This Court is conscious of the fact that the petitioner is stated to have three previous theft cases against him and that the investigation is still pending. However, at the same time, the prolonged incarceration of the petitioner for more than 70 days in connection with allegations relating to theft of agricultural produce, namely *red banana thar*, raises serious concerns regarding the proportionality of continued pre-trial detention. The object of detention pending investigation or trial is primarily to secure the presence of the accused and to ensure a fair and unhindered investigation, and not to impose a punitive detention before adjudication of guilt.

7. It is a settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that “bail is the rule and jail is the exception,” particularly when the investigation has substantially progressed and continued incarceration no longer appears indispensable for the purpose of investigation. Pre-trial detention cannot be permitted to assume the character of a pre-conviction punishment. The constitutional guarantee of personal liberty under Article 21 of the

Constitution of India mandates that deprivation of liberty pending trial must be justified on compelling grounds and must satisfy the test of fairness, reasonableness, and proportionality.

8. Considering the nature of the allegations, the value of the alleged stolen property, the extent of recovery already effected, the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner for the past 70 days, and balancing the investigational requirements with the right to personal liberty of the accused, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused with stringent conditions.

9. 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/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. The petitioner shall also deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) before the Court concerned in connection with Crime No.49/2026 of Karungal Police Station and the learned Magistrate shall redeposit the said amount in an interest-bearing account in any one of the nationalised banks.

10. After release, the petitioner shall stay at Illuppur, Pudukkottai District and shall appear and sign before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Illuppur twice daily at 10.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed.

11. If there is any violation of the above conditions, the Investigating Officer is at liberty to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate for cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that the bail was granted by the Sessions Court, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala.***

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:18:57 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-Mode)
The Judicial Magistrate, Illuppur, Pudukkottai District.
The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil,
(through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Karungal Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The Superintendent, District Jail, Nagercoil.(through e-mode)
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. 124/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	15.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	சுதீர், த/பெ முகம்மது காசிம்
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 வி. உதயசூரியா, எம்.எல்., செயலாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். 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: 2026.05.15
20:18:32 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 124/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000138-2026)

Sudeer S/o. Mohammed Kasim (A1)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu

Through the Inspector of Police,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No. 104/2026 of Marthandam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Paul Raj, 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 331(4) and 305(a) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 26.02.2026 at midnight, the accused persons trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and stolen a golden chain weighing 2 sovereign and golden bangle weighing 1 sovereign and Samsung Tab and motorcycle. 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 been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner was arrested on 11.03.2026 and is in judicial custody for the past 63 days and the respondent police has not filed charge sheet before the court till date and this is the 2nd bail application before this court and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No.55/2026 was dismissed by this court on 08.05.2026 and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No.1354/2026 was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 27.04.2026 and now the change of circumstances is that 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 there are four accused in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A1. According to the prosecution, on 26.02.2026 at about 2.00 A.M., the petitioner along with the other accused criminally trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and committed theft of a gold chain weighing about two sovereigns, a golden bangle weighing about one sovereign, a Samsung Tab and a Yamaha Fascino motorcycle. It is further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 11.03.2026.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the petitioner is a native of Kerala and is involved in several theft and robbery cases in the State of Kerala. Apart from the said criminal antecedents, the petitioner is also involved in another case in Crime No.204 of 2025 on the file of Palugal Police Station for the offence under Section 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. It is submitted that though the stolen gold chain and the motorcycle have been recovered, the gold bangle weighing one sovereign and the Samsung Tab are yet to be recovered and the investigation is still in progress.

7. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the co-accused/A2 was granted bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai in CrI.M.P.No.574 of 2026 dated 10.04.2026 only on the ground that he had no criminal antecedents. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the earlier bail application filed by the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.55 of 2026 was dismissed by this court only on 08.05.2026, and that there is absolutely no change in circumstances thereafter warranting reconsideration of the present application. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

8. Heard the submissions of the learned Public Prosecutor and perused the materials available on record. It is seen that the petitioner had earlier approached this court seeking bail in CrI.M.P.No.55 of 2026 and the same was dismissed on 08.05.2026 after considering the nature of the allegations, the pending recovery of stolen properties and the criminal antecedents of the petitioner.

9. In the present petition, no subsequent change in circumstances has been placed before this Court so as to take a different view from that already taken by the learned Principal Sessions Judge. The allegations against the petitioner relate to house trespass and theft committed during midnight hours. The materials placed before this Court prima facie disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the offence. It is also pertinent to note that part of the stolen properties, namely the gold bangle and Samsung Tab, are yet to be recovered. Therefore, custodial interrogation and continuation of investigation appear necessary for effective recovery of the remaining stolen articles and for ascertaining the role played by the accused persons. Further, the petitioner is stated to have criminal antecedents involving similar offences. At this stage, if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, there is every possibility of his absconding or interfering with the course of investigation.

10. Though the co-accused/A2 has been granted bail, the same cannot automatically enure to the benefit of the present petitioner, particularly in view of the specific allegation regarding his involvement and his criminal antecedents, which distinguish his case from that of the co-accused.

11. Considering the gravity of the offence, the pending recovery of stolen properties, the criminal antecedents attributed to the petitioner, and the absence of any change in circumstances after dismissal of the earlier bail application, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:18:41 +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.123/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	15.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	மணிகண்டன் த/பெ. திருவாழி (எ 3)
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 குழுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி வி. உதயசூரியா, எம்.எல்., செயலாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். 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: 2026.05.15
20:17:53 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.123/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000137 -2026)

Manikandan S/o. Thiruvazhi (A3)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Aralvaimozhy Police Station,

Crime No. 145/2023 of Aralvaimozhy Police Station,

(SC No.312/2023 of Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil.)

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 341, 342, 294(b), 302 and 506(ii) of IPC.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 09.06.2023 at about
8.15 P.M., due to previous enmity, the informant's relative one

Shanmuganathan contacted the informant through cell phone and said that all the accused were standing nearby shop at CSI Church and waiting to create a problem to the informant's husband. Immediately, the informant went to the spot, at that time the accused persons were stopped the informant's husband's motor cycle and A2 and the petitioner/A3 pushed down the informant's husband from his motor cycle and A1 assaulted him by using knife and caused injury on his chest and stomach. The informant and the above said Shanmuganathan were raising alarm and came to the spot, A1 abused the informant in filthy language and threatened her by showing knife. Suddenly the informant's husband was taken to hospital and he died at about 9.00 P.M. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offence alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged and the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.06.2023 and the earlier petitions filed by the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.6258/2023, CrI.M.P. No.6580/2023, 904/2026 and 1259/2026 were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 20.11.2023, 29.11.2023, 23.03.2026 and 18.04.2026 respectively on the ground that the present case is the concluding stage and now the change of circumstances is that two more witnesses need to be examined 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 is A3 in SC No.312/2023 and the petitioner is a rowdy element and he has 7 previous cases and he is a history sheeter in HS No.309/2015 of Aralvaimozhi Police Station. Already, this petitioner was convicted for the offence punishable u/s 302 of IPC by the learned Additional District Judge, Nagercoil in SC No.287/2017 and the sentence in the earlier judgment was suspended by the High Court will not mitigate circumstances and the trial is in the concluding stage and the petitioner has seven previous cases and out of seven cases, one case is murder case and the petitioner is a history sheeter in HS No.309/2015 of Aralvaimozhy Police Station and the earlier bail petition in Crl.M.P. No.1259/2026 was dismissed by this court only on 18.04.2026 and there is no change in circumstances and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor that the petitioner is a convicted accused and though the Hon'ble High Court has suspended the sentence imposed on the petitioner, the trial of the present case is in the concluding stage and the earlier bail petition in Crl.M.P. No. 1259/2026 was dismissed by this court only on 18.04.2026 and there is no change in circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused at this stage. As such, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:18:05 +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	Crl.M.P.No. 103/2026 & 128/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	15.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	பிரமோத் சந்திரன், த/பெ ராமச்சந்திரன் நாயர் .. Crl.M.P.No. 103/2026-ன் மனுதாரர் J.P. ஜோபின் (A2), த/பெ ஜாண்சன் .. Crl.M.P.No. 128/2026-ன் மனுதாரர்
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 வி. உதயசூரியா, எம்.எல்., செயலாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9943110250 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983
----	---	---

PARAMASIVADOSS
(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:17:25 +0530

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.103/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000112-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.128/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000146-2026)

Pramod Chandran

S/o. Ramachandran Nair

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.103/2026

J.P. Jobin (A2)

S/o. Johnson

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.128/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Palugal Police Station,

Crime No.25/2026 of Palugal Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. N. Sheeba and T. Santhosh Kumar respectively, u/s 483 of BNSS praying to grant 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 329(3) of BNS and Sec. 3(1) of TNPPDL Act.

4. CrI.M.P.No.103 of 2026 has been filed by accused one Pramod Chandran and CrI.M.P.No.128 of 2026 has been filed by A2 seeking enlargement on bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that on 13.02.2026 at about 11.10 P.M., the accused persons trespassed into the compound and damaged several vehicles parked therein, including Passion Pro. Maruthi Swift Car, Bolero pick-up, Ashok Leyland Dost vehicle and also a Honda Activa belonging to another tenant and also window glasses were also broken and the damage value around Rs.80,000/-. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.103/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences

alleged against him and he did not know the defacto complainant and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and he has no connection with the defacto complainant and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the police registered a false complaint against him and the petitioner was arrested and has been in judicial custody from 18.02.2026 and the co-accused were released on bail by the Principal Sessions Judge on 17.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1238/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.128/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent and the petitioner is not at all connected with the alleged occurrence and never caused any damage to the house or cars parked therein and he has no intention to cause any damage to the cars or in the house and nothing had happened as alleged in the FIR and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioner never involved in any such offence and no other cases pending against him and the earlier petitions in Crl.M.P. Nos.645/2026 and 817/2026 were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 26.02.2026 and 12.03.2026 respectively on the ground that the investigation is in the initial stage and abscondance of co-accused and grave nature of offence 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 there is a previous enmity between the house owner of defacto complainant namely one Jose and A4 in this case. On 13.02.2026, A1 to A4 and 2 other accused formed themselves into an unlawful assembly and conspired together to commit murder of Jose. So, they came to the house of Jose in a car with deadly weapons, but Jose was not available in his house. There are several cars parked in front of his house. All the accused damaged the cars and the total damages is Rs.80,000/-. The tenant of the Jose who is the defacto complainant in this case is the owner of the cars. So, he filed a complaint and a case was registered against the accused. Subsequently, these petitioners concealed themselves in a lonely place, at that time, the police party went there, immediately, all the accused trespassed into the church compound, the watchman questioned them. So they assaulted the watchman and damaged another on car and the Marthandam Police registered a case in Crime No.90/2026 against the petitioners and other accused. Subsequently, the accused persons divided into two groups and one group went to Railway track and another group went to another one place which is within the jurisdiction of Kollencode Police. At that time, the defacto complainant in Palugal case came there in a

car, immediately they assaulted him and damaged the car. So third case in Crime No.35/2026 registered against the accused. Co-accused were arrested by the Kollencode Police and remanded to judicial custody. Now the petitioner in CrI.MP No.103/2026 is concerned, he was remanded in this case under P.T. Warrant on 05.03.2026. A2 Jobin was arrested on 29.04.2026 and both the petitioners are the accused in Crime No.90/2026 of Marthandam Police Station. So the prosecution filed a petition for request before the concerned Judicial Magistrate to issue P.T. warrant and the same is pending and if the petitioners are released on bail, definitely they will abscond and they have to be remanded in Crime No.90/2026 of Marthandam Police Station and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner in both petitions and the petitions may be dismissed.

9. Though the learned counsel for the petitioners in both petitions submitted that the co-accused was granted bail, the learned Public Prosecutor represented that the petitioners committed three consecutive sequence of events, the close proximity of time between the occurrences, the manner in which the accused persons are alleged to have operated as an organised group, and the continuation of violent activities across different jurisdictions prima facie indicate coordinated criminal conduct extending

beyond a mere isolated act of property damage. The prosecution has also specifically contended that the investigation is now focused on identifying the principal conspirators and the “main pin” behind the series of organised offences and on unearthing the larger network and planning involved in the occurrences.

10. Further, the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that petitions seeking issuance of P.T. warrants in connection with Crime No.90/2026 of Marthandam Police Station are pending before the concerned Judicial Magistrate and that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is still required in connection with the said crime as well as the other related occurrences. The investigation is still at a crucial and preliminary stage and the police are in the process of identifying the complete chain of events, the role of each accused, the source of weapons, the conspiracy involved, and the persons who orchestrated the continuous criminal acts across jurisdictions.

11. Considering the serious nature of the allegations, the organised manner in which the offences are alleged to have been committed, the prima facie materials relating to an attempt to commit murder, the successive occurrences within a short span of time, the requirement of further custodial investigation, and the possibility of the petitioners absconding or interfering with the investigation if enlarged on bail at this stage, this Court is not

inclined to grant bail to the petitioners/accused at this stage. Accordingly, these two petitions deserve to be dismissed.

12. In the result, both Criminal Petitions are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:17:37 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	Crl.M.P.No. 103/2026 & 128/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	15.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	பிரமோத் சந்திரன், த/பெ ராமச்சந்திரன் நாயர் .. Crl.M.P.No. 103/2026-ன் மனுதாரர் J.P. ஜோபின் (A2), த/பெ ஜாண்சன் .. Crl.M.P.No. 128/2026-ன் மனுதாரர்
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 வி. உதயசூரியா, எம்.எல்., செயலாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9943110250 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983
----	---	---

PARAMASIVADOSS
(பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்)

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:17:25 +0530

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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.103/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000112-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.128/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000146-2026)

Pramod Chandran

S/o. Ramachandran Nair

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.103/2026

J.P. Jobin (A2)

S/o. Johnson

... Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.128/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Palugal Police Station,

Crime No.25/2026 of Palugal Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. N. Sheeba and T. Santhosh Kumar respectively, u/s 483 of BNSS praying to grant 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 329(3) of BNS and Sec. 3(1) of TNPPDL Act.

4. CrI.M.P.No.103 of 2026 has been filed by accused one Pramod Chandran and CrI.M.P.No.128 of 2026 has been filed by A2 seeking enlargement on bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that on 13.02.2026 at about 11.10 P.M., the accused persons trespassed into the compound and damaged several vehicles parked therein, including Passion Pro. Maruthi Swift Car, Bolero pick-up, Ashok Leyland Dost vehicle and also a Honda Activa belonging to another tenant and also window glasses were also broken and the damage value around Rs.80,000/-. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.103/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences

alleged against him and he did not know the defacto complainant and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and he has no connection with the defacto complainant and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the police registered a false complaint against him and the petitioner was arrested and has been in judicial custody from 18.02.2026 and the co-accused were released on bail by the Principal Sessions Judge on 17.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1238/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.128/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent and the petitioner is not at all connected with the alleged occurrence and never caused any damage to the house or cars parked therein and he has no intention to cause any damage to the cars or in the house and nothing had happened as alleged in the FIR and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioner never involved in any such offence and no other cases pending against him and the earlier petitions in Crl.M.P. Nos.645/2026 and 817/2026 were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 26.02.2026 and 12.03.2026 respectively on the ground that the investigation is in the initial stage and abscondance of co-accused and grave nature of offence 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 there is a previous enmity between the house owner of defacto complainant namely one Jose and A4 in this case. On 13.02.2026, A1 to A4 and 2 other accused formed themselves into an unlawful assembly and conspired together to commit murder of Jose. So, they came to the house of Jose in a car with deadly weapons, but Jose was not available in his house. There are several cars parked in front of his house. All the accused damaged the cars and the total damages is Rs.80,000/-. The tenant of the Jose who is the defacto complainant in this case is the owner of the cars. So, he filed a complaint and a case was registered against the accused. Subsequently, these petitioners concealed themselves in a lonely place, at that time, the police party went there, immediately, all the accused trespassed into the church compound, the watchman questioned them. So they assaulted the watchman and damaged another on car and the Marthandam Police registered a case in Crime No.90/2026 against the petitioners and other accused. Subsequently, the accused persons divided into two groups and one group went to Railway track and another group went to another one place which is within the jurisdiction of Kollencode Police. At that time, the defacto complainant in Palugal case came there in a

car, immediately they assaulted him and damaged the car. So third case in Crime No.35/2026 registered against the accused. Co-accused were arrested by the Kollencode Police and remanded to judicial custody. Now the petitioner in CrI.MP No.103/2026 is concerned, he was remanded in this case under P.T. Warrant on 05.03.2026. A2 Jobin was arrested on 29.04.2026 and both the petitioners are the accused in Crime No.90/2026 of Marthandam Police Station. So the prosecution filed a petition for request before the concerned Judicial Magistrate to issue P.T. warrant and the same is pending and if the petitioners are released on bail, definitely they will abscond and they have to be remanded in Crime No.90/2026 of Marthandam Police Station and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner in both petitions and the petitions may be dismissed.

9. Though the learned counsel for the petitioners in both petitions submitted that the co-accused was granted bail, the learned Public Prosecutor represented that the petitioners committed three consecutive sequence of events, the close proximity of time between the occurrences, the manner in which the accused persons are alleged to have operated as an organised group, and the continuation of violent activities across different jurisdictions prima facie indicate coordinated criminal conduct extending

beyond a mere isolated act of property damage. The prosecution has also specifically contended that the investigation is now focused on identifying the principal conspirators and the “main pin” behind the series of organised offences and on unearthing the larger network and planning involved in the occurrences.

10. Further, the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that petitions seeking issuance of P.T. warrants in connection with Crime No.90/2026 of Marthandam Police Station are pending before the concerned Judicial Magistrate and that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is still required in connection with the said crime as well as the other related occurrences. The investigation is still at a crucial and preliminary stage and the police are in the process of identifying the complete chain of events, the role of each accused, the source of weapons, the conspiracy involved, and the persons who orchestrated the continuous criminal acts across jurisdictions.

11. Considering the serious nature of the allegations, the organised manner in which the offences are alleged to have been committed, the prima facie materials relating to an attempt to commit murder, the successive occurrences within a short span of time, the requirement of further custodial investigation, and the possibility of the petitioners absconding or interfering with the investigation if enlarged on bail at this stage, this Court is not

inclined to grant bail to the petitioners/accused at this stage. Accordingly, these two petitions deserve to be dismissed.

12. In the result, both Criminal Petitions are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:17:37 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 78/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000122-2026)

Thavasilingamani S/o. Pathmanaban

... Petitioner

/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

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru K. Pon Muthu Pandian, 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
61(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 324(2) and 109 of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 03.04.2026, the defacto

complainant was lured by A1 and A2 to a coconut grove belonging to A1 under the guise of negotiation regarding withdrawal of an earlier criminal case lodged by the wife of the defacto complainant against A1. According to the prosecution, upon the refusal of the defacto complainant to withdraw the said complaint, A1 to A3 brutally assaulted him with iron rods causing grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and both legs. It is further alleged that the other accused, including the present petitioners, also participated in the occurrence and assaulted the defacto complainant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he is working as a Professor in a private college and he is only a relative of A1 and that he had merely handed over his vehicle to a representative of A1 without any knowledge regarding the alleged occurrence. It is also contended that he has been falsely implicated due to previous enmity and political rivalry. The learned counsel further submitted that though the petitioner was allegedly arrested on 30.04.2026 at about 4.10 P.M., he was produced before the learned Judicial Magistrate only on 01.05.2026 at about 10.30 P.M., thereby violating the mandatory safeguard contemplated under Section 58 of the BNSS and Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India. This is the 2nd bail petition and the earlier petition in Crl.M.P. No. 10/2026 was dismissed by this court on 08.05.2026 and now the change of circumstances is that the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is to abide by any condition imposed by this Court.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner is A5 in this case. The 1st accused 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 degrading against her name. 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 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 to A3 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. The petitioner was arrested on 30.04.2026 and the injured was discharged from the hospital on 10.05.2026 and the present petitioner is the henchmen of 1st accused 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.

6. Taking note of the fact that the present accused was arrested on 30.04.2026 and he is undergoing incarceration for the period of past 15 days and also the injured has been discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with condition.

7. Taking note of the fact that the present petitioner/accused was

arrested on 30.04.2026 and has been in judicial custody for more than 15 days, and also considering the fact that the injured has subsequently been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with conditions. At the same time, this Court is conscious of the serious nature of the allegations levelled in the present case. The prosecution allegations disclose a brutal assault said to have been committed by the principal accused, resulting in grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and both legs of the defacto complainant. The materials placed before this Court further indicate that the role attributed to the other accused, particularly the principal assailants, is grave in nature and the prosecution has also referred to their criminal antecedents and past conduct, which are stated to be serious and disturbing. The investigation is also stated to be in progress insofar as the involvement and overt acts of the remaining accused persons are concerned.

8. However, insofar as the present petitioner is concerned, this Court is taking into consideration the limited circumstances presently available on record, namely his period of incarceration for more than 15 days, the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, and the stage of investigation as against him. Therefore, the grant of bail to the present petitioner is based upon the peculiar facts and circumstances applicable to him alone. It is made clear that the observations made in this order and the grant of bail to the present petitioner shall not confer any parity or advantage to the other accused persons whose roles, overt acts, criminal antecedents, and involvement in the occurrence are required to be independently considered on their own merits and in accordance with law. This order shall not have

any bearing whatsoever upon the consideration of bail applications, if any, filed by the other accused.

9. In the result, 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 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:17:05 +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, Eathamozhy 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.5/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000021-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.68/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000089-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.24/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000048-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.67/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000088-2026)

1. Karkulali W/o. Rajakumar (A3)

2. Ganesan S/o. Selvam (A4) ... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.5/2026

Ruben S/o. Ponnumani ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.24/2026
/Vs./

Kala, W/o Nelson .. Intervening Petitioner/Informant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No.204/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 5/2026 and 24/2026 are filed by Advocates Tvl.

M. Paneer Selvam and R. Arjun Subash @ Mano respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the intervening petitions in CrI.M.P. Nos. 68/2026 and 67/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru Prem Sahayadhas, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petitions filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 & 24/2026.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the anticipatory bail petitions and the intervening petitions.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 109(1), 115(2), 296(b), 333, 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act.

4. The case of prosecution is that the son of the defacto complainant is a law student and You Tuber, who posted videos criticized the A1's Ayurveda Lehyam videos in his you tube channel and on 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., the accused persons rushed to the house of the defacto complainant in a KIA Car bearing Regn. No.TN 74 BJ 9042 and used filthy language and push down the defacto complainant and assaulted

her and her son with hands and legs and also assaulted her son on his left hand with aruval and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the 1st petitioner/wife of A1 is B.Sc Nursing graduate and owner of the Raja Boron Marketing and the 2nd petitioner is doing carpentry work and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the son of defacto complainant has voluntarily spread rumor against the 1st accused based on his exercise and his marketing and due to previous enmity, this false case has been foisted against the petitioners and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and A1 is YouTube influencer who posted videos on health diet and also a vendor of Ayurveda supplements in social media platforms and the criticizing videos uploaded by the defacto complainant's son creates an enmity and carry forwarded to a verbal dispute between them and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he was not present in the occurrence place 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. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petitions and that petitions were numbered as CrI.M.P. Nos.67/2026 & 68/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the intervening petitioner's son Alden Pal is an advocate and he used to put posts in the social media and there was an enmity between him and A1 in connection with politics and also the fitness and food business run by A1. On 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., accused persons trespassed into the compound of the intervening petitioner and abused her and her son using obscene language and A1 showed obscene signs to the intervening petitioner and opened the door forcefully and pushed her down and her son and also her mother and assaulted them with hand. In continuation, A1 assaulted the son of intervening petitioner on his right shoulder using billhook with an intention of murdering him. The intervening petitioner, her sons and 71 years old mother were admitted in the Government Hospital at Padmanabhapuram and the intervening petitioner and her younger son Alden Pal are still in hospital and A1 using his criminal background and henchmen will go to any extent in causing harm to the

intervening petitioner and her family members and all the accused had come a long way from their place to the place of occurrence armed with weapons with criminal intention of murdering Alden Pal and if the petitioners are released on bail, there is every chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and her family members and prayed that the anticipatory bail petitions may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the son of the defacto complainant is a You tuber and he published some videos degrading the product of A1. So there is an enmity between the son of the defacto complainant and the 1st accused. So on 03.05.2026 the 1st accused and three others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her and outraged her modesty and assaulted her with hand and then the petitioners and A1 inflicted cut injury on the left shoulder of the son of the defacto complainant with aruval and two sons of the defacto complainant also sustained injury. The husband of the defacto complainant also sustained injury and the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

8. Heard both side. Considered the arguments of the learned Public

Prosecutor as well as the learned counsel appearing for the intervening petitioner. Both sides vehemently advanced their submissions touching upon the background of the dispute, the social media activities of the parties, and the seriousness of the allegations involved in the present case.

9. This Court notices that the intervening petitioner has produced certain videographic materials during the course of hearing, which prima facie show that the accused persons had entered into the house compound of the defacto complainant armed with an aruval and that there was a heated verbal altercation between the parties. The video materials also appear to indicate that members of the public had intervened during the course of the occurrence and that the entire episode subsequently surfaced widely on various social media platforms.

10. It appears from the submissions made before this Court that A1 is engaged in the business of marketing certain food supplement and Ayurvedic product in the name of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” through social media platforms and that the son of the defacto complainant, who is stated to be a law student and YouTuber, had uploaded videos questioning the nature, efficacy, and legitimacy of such products and had allegedly attempted to spread awareness regarding the same. Prima facie, the materials placed before this Court indicate that the occurrence appears to have emanated

from the rivalry and hostility generated through such online publications and counter allegations in social media.

11. This Court also takes note of the submission made on behalf of the intervening petitioner that, despite specific allegations relating to the nature of the product of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” marketed by A1, no licence issued by the AYUSH authorities has been produced before this Court by the accused side as of now, though certain FSSAI certification documents are stated to be available. However, this Court refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legality or authenticity of the products in question, since the same falls squarely within the domain of investigation and it is for the Investigating Officer to enquire into the seriousness of such allegations and take appropriate action in accordance with law, if required.

12. At the same time, this Court cannot ignore the seriousness of the allegation that the accused persons had allegedly entered the residence of the defacto complainant in broad daylight armed with a dangerous weapon like an aruval and indulged in acts of intimidation and assault. Entering into the residential premises of another person with weapons, particularly in the context of an already existing hostility, is undoubtedly a matter of concern and cannot be lightly brushed aside.

13. However, this Court also takes note of the fact that the injured

persons have been discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is progressing. Balancing the nature of allegations, the materials presently available on record, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused in both petitions with stringent conditions.

14. 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 1st petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and the 2nd petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.5/2026 and the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 shall stay at Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15 20:14:39
+0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District.
The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.5/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000021-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.68/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000089-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.24/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000048-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.67/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000088-2026)

1. Karkulali W/o. Rajakumar (A3)

2. Ganesan S/o. Selvam (A4) ... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.5/2026

Ruben S/o. Ponnumani ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.24/2026
/Vs./

Kala, W/o Nelson .. Intervening Petitioner/Informant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No.204/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 5/2026 and 24/2026 are filed by Advocates Tvl.

M. Paneer Selvam and R. Arjun Subash @ Mano respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the intervening petitions in CrI.M.P. Nos. 68/2026 and 67/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru Prem Sahayadhas, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petitions filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 & 24/2026.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the anticipatory bail petitions and the intervening petitions.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 109(1), 115(2), 296(b), 333, 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act.

4. The case of prosecution is that the son of the defacto complainant is a law student and You Tuber, who posted videos criticized the A1's Ayurveda Lehyam videos in his you tube channel and on 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., the accused persons rushed to the house of the defacto complainant in a KIA Car bearing Regn. No.TN 74 BJ 9042 and used filthy language and push down the defacto complainant and assaulted

her and her son with hands and legs and also assaulted her son on his left hand with aruval and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the 1st petitioner/wife of A1 is B.Sc Nursing graduate and owner of the Raja Boron Marketing and the 2nd petitioner is doing carpentry work and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the son of defacto complainant has voluntarily spread rumor against the 1st accused based on his exercise and his marketing and due to previous enmity, this false case has been foisted against the petitioners and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and A1 is YouTube influencer who posted videos on health diet and also a vendor of Ayurveda supplements in social media platforms and the criticizing videos uploaded by the defacto complainant's son creates an enmity and carry forwarded to a verbal dispute between them and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he was not present in the occurrence place 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. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petitions and that petitions were numbered as CrI.M.P. Nos.67/2026 & 68/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the intervening petitioner's son Alden Pal is an advocate and he used to put posts in the social media and there was an enmity between him and A1 in connection with politics and also the fitness and food business run by A1. On 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., accused persons trespassed into the compound of the intervening petitioner and abused her and her son using obscene language and A1 showed obscene signs to the intervening petitioner and opened the door forcefully and pushed her down and her son and also her mother and assaulted them with hand. In continuation, A1 assaulted the son of intervening petitioner on his right shoulder using billhook with an intention of murdering him. The intervening petitioner, her sons and 71 years old mother were admitted in the Government Hospital at Padmanabhapuram and the intervening petitioner and her younger son Alden Pal are still in hospital and A1 using his criminal background and henchmen will go to any extent in causing harm to the

intervening petitioner and her family members and all the accused had come a long way from their place to the place of occurrence armed with weapons with criminal intention of murdering Alden Pal and if the petitioners are released on bail, there is every chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and her family members and prayed that the anticipatory bail petitions may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the son of the defacto complainant is a You tuber and he published some videos degrading the product of A1. So there is an enmity between the son of the defacto complainant and the 1st accused. So on 03.05.2026 the 1st accused and three others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her and outraged her modesty and assaulted her with hand and then the petitioners and A1 inflicted cut injury on the left shoulder of the son of the defacto complainant with aruval and two sons of the defacto complainant also sustained injury. The husband of the defacto complainant also sustained injury and the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

8. Heard both side. Considered the arguments of the learned Public

Prosecutor as well as the learned counsel appearing for the intervening petitioner. Both sides vehemently advanced their submissions touching upon the background of the dispute, the social media activities of the parties, and the seriousness of the allegations involved in the present case.

9. This Court notices that the intervening petitioner has produced certain videographic materials during the course of hearing, which prima facie show that the accused persons had entered into the house compound of the defacto complainant armed with an aruval and that there was a heated verbal altercation between the parties. The video materials also appear to indicate that members of the public had intervened during the course of the occurrence and that the entire episode subsequently surfaced widely on various social media platforms.

10. It appears from the submissions made before this Court that A1 is engaged in the business of marketing certain food supplement and Ayurvedic product in the name of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” through social media platforms and that the son of the defacto complainant, who is stated to be a law student and YouTuber, had uploaded videos questioning the nature, efficacy, and legitimacy of such products and had allegedly attempted to spread awareness regarding the same. Prima facie, the materials placed before this Court indicate that the occurrence appears to have emanated

from the rivalry and hostility generated through such online publications and counter allegations in social media.

11. This Court also takes note of the submission made on behalf of the intervening petitioner that, despite specific allegations relating to the nature of the product of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” marketed by A1, no licence issued by the AYUSH authorities has been produced before this Court by the accused side as of now, though certain FSSAI certification documents are stated to be available. However, this Court refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legality or authenticity of the products in question, since the same falls squarely within the domain of investigation and it is for the Investigating Officer to enquire into the seriousness of such allegations and take appropriate action in accordance with law, if required.

12. At the same time, this Court cannot ignore the seriousness of the allegation that the accused persons had allegedly entered the residence of the defacto complainant in broad daylight armed with a dangerous weapon like an aruval and indulged in acts of intimidation and assault. Entering into the residential premises of another person with weapons, particularly in the context of an already existing hostility, is undoubtedly a matter of concern and cannot be lightly brushed aside.

13. However, this Court also takes note of the fact that the injured

persons have been discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is progressing. Balancing the nature of allegations, the materials presently available on record, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused in both petitions with stringent conditions.

14. 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 1st petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and the 2nd petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.5/2026 and the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 shall stay at Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15 20:14:39
+0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District.
The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.5/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000021-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.68/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000089-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.24/2026 (CNR.No.TNKK0V-000048-2026)

and

Intervening petition in Crl.M.P. No.67/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000088-2026)

1. Karkulali W/o. Rajakumar (A3)

2. Ganesan S/o. Selvam (A4) ... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.5/2026

Ruben S/o. Ponnumani ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.24/2026
/Vs./

Kala, W/o Nelson .. Intervening Petitioner/Informant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No.204/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. Nos. 5/2026 and 24/2026 are filed by Advocates Tvl.

M. Paneer Selvam and R. Arjun Subash @ Mano respectively, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the intervening petitions in CrI.M.P. Nos. 68/2026 and 67/2026 are filed by Advocate Thiru Prem Sahayadhas, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petitions filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 & 24/2026.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the anticipatory bail petitions and the intervening petitions.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offences u/s 109(1), 115(2), 296(b), 333, 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act.

4. The case of prosecution is that the son of the defacto complainant is a law student and You Tuber, who posted videos criticized the A1's Ayurveda Lehyam videos in his you tube channel and on 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., the accused persons rushed to the house of the defacto complainant in a KIA Car bearing Regn. No.TN 74 BJ 9042 and used filthy language and push down the defacto complainant and assaulted

her and her son with hands and legs and also assaulted her son on his left hand with aruval and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and the 1st petitioner/wife of A1 is B.Sc Nursing graduate and owner of the Raja Boron Marketing and the 2nd petitioner is doing carpentry work and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the son of defacto complainant has voluntarily spread rumor against the 1st accused based on his exercise and his marketing and due to previous enmity, this false case has been foisted against the petitioners and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and A1 is YouTube influencer who posted videos on health diet and also a vendor of Ayurveda supplements in social media platforms and the criticizing videos uploaded by the defacto complainant's son creates an enmity and carry forwarded to a verbal dispute between them and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he was not present in the occurrence place 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. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petitions and that petitions were numbered as CrI.M.P. Nos.67/2026 & 68/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the intervening petitioner's son Alden Pal is an advocate and he used to put posts in the social media and there was an enmity between him and A1 in connection with politics and also the fitness and food business run by A1. On 03.05.2026 at about 11.00 A.M., accused persons trespassed into the compound of the intervening petitioner and abused her and her son using obscene language and A1 showed obscene signs to the intervening petitioner and opened the door forcefully and pushed her down and her son and also her mother and assaulted them with hand. In continuation, A1 assaulted the son of intervening petitioner on his right shoulder using billhook with an intention of murdering him. The intervening petitioner, her sons and 71 years old mother were admitted in the Government Hospital at Padmanabhapuram and the intervening petitioner and her younger son Alden Pal are still in hospital and A1 using his criminal background and henchmen will go to any extent in causing harm to the

intervening petitioner and her family members and all the accused had come a long way from their place to the place of occurrence armed with weapons with criminal intention of murdering Alden Pal and if the petitioners are released on bail, there is every chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and her family members and prayed that the anticipatory bail petitions may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the son of the defacto complainant is a You tuber and he published some videos degrading the product of A1. So there is an enmity between the son of the defacto complainant and the 1st accused. So on 03.05.2026 the 1st accused and three others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused her and outraged her modesty and assaulted her with hand and then the petitioners and A1 inflicted cut injury on the left shoulder of the son of the defacto complainant with aruval and two sons of the defacto complainant also sustained injury. The husband of the defacto complainant also sustained injury and the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

8. Heard both side. Considered the arguments of the learned Public

Prosecutor as well as the learned counsel appearing for the intervening petitioner. Both sides vehemently advanced their submissions touching upon the background of the dispute, the social media activities of the parties, and the seriousness of the allegations involved in the present case.

9. This Court notices that the intervening petitioner has produced certain videographic materials during the course of hearing, which prima facie show that the accused persons had entered into the house compound of the defacto complainant armed with an aruval and that there was a heated verbal altercation between the parties. The video materials also appear to indicate that members of the public had intervened during the course of the occurrence and that the entire episode subsequently surfaced widely on various social media platforms.

10. It appears from the submissions made before this Court that A1 is engaged in the business of marketing certain food supplement and Ayurvedic product in the name of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” through social media platforms and that the son of the defacto complainant, who is stated to be a law student and YouTuber, had uploaded videos questioning the nature, efficacy, and legitimacy of such products and had allegedly attempted to spread awareness regarding the same. Prima facie, the materials placed before this Court indicate that the occurrence appears to have emanated

from the rivalry and hostility generated through such online publications and counter allegations in social media.

11. This Court also takes note of the submission made on behalf of the intervening petitioner that, despite specific allegations relating to the nature of the product of “*Yanaikavalam Lehiam*” marketed by A1, no licence issued by the AYUSH authorities has been produced before this Court by the accused side as of now, though certain FSSAI certification documents are stated to be available. However, this Court refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legality or authenticity of the products in question, since the same falls squarely within the domain of investigation and it is for the Investigating Officer to enquire into the seriousness of such allegations and take appropriate action in accordance with law, if required.

12. At the same time, this Court cannot ignore the seriousness of the allegation that the accused persons had allegedly entered the residence of the defacto complainant in broad daylight armed with a dangerous weapon like an aruval and indulged in acts of intimidation and assault. Entering into the residential premises of another person with weapons, particularly in the context of an already existing hostility, is undoubtedly a matter of concern and cannot be lightly brushed aside.

13. However, this Court also takes note of the fact that the injured

persons have been discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is progressing. Balancing the nature of allegations, the materials presently available on record, and the requirement of investigation on the one hand with the liberty of the petitioners on the other hand, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused in both petitions with stringent conditions.

14. 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 1st petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.5/2026 shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and the 2nd petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.5/2026 and the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.24/2026 shall stay at Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15 20:14:39
+0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Karmbakkudi, Pudukkottai District.
The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners 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 15th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 54/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000054-2026)

Prakash S/o. Viswanathan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu
Through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No. 164/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Sivakumar, 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 281, 125(b) and 105 of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 09.04.2026 at about 10.00 P.M.,
when the informant was riding his motor cycle in which, his daughter/deceased as
pillion rider, the petitioner drove the vehicle bearing Regn. No.TN 18 BH 2436 in a

rash and negligent manner and dashed against the motor cycle of the informant and in that incident, the daughter of informant died at the spot. 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 intention to commit murder of the daughter of the defacto complainant and the alleged accident was happened due to traffic congestion and the public assaulted the petitioner and caused injuries on his cheek, neck, back and all over his body and the petitioner is in need of medical treatment and the petitioner was arrested on 09.04.2026 and has been in judicial custody from 10.04.2026 and this is the 2nd bail application and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No. 1240/2026 was dismissed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 24.04.2026 and now the investigation of the case 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 on 09.04.2026, while the defacto complainant was driving his motorcycle along with his daughter near Thuckalay, the petitioner drove his Taurus Lorry in a speedy and negligent manner and hit on the backside of the motorcycle. So, the defacto complainant and her daughter fell down on the road. Then, the wheel of the Taurus lorry rolled up and down on the daughter of the defacto complainant. So, she died on the spot. So, the case was registered u/s 281 125(a) 106(1) of BNS. Subsequently, the section of law was altered u/s 281, 125(a) and 105 of BNS. The petitioner was arrested on 10.04.2026. Already the District Collector gave a time schedule to ply the

lorries those who transport the mineral to Kerala. But, the accused confessed that though he goes in a normal speedy, he can transport one trip on one day to Kerala and in a speedy manner, he can transport 2 loads on the same day. It is a routine habit of the petitioner/driver and other lorry drivers who transporting minerals to Kerala. This petitioner is concerned, the investigation of the case is almost over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor that this petitioner is concerned, the investigation of the case is almost over and also considering the period of incarceration of the petitioner (i.e.) for the past 35 days, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with condition.

7. In the result, 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.I, Padmanabhapuram 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.

8. 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 15th day of May, 2026.

PARAMASIVADOSS
Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:20:11 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-Mode)

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

The Inspector of Police, Thuckalay Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)

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

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. 17/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	15.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	வின்சென்ட் ராஜ், த/பெ தங்கப்பன்
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 வி. உதயசூரியா, எம்.எல்., செயலாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். 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: 2026.05.15
26:19:45 +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 15th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 17/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000032-2026)

Vincent Raj, S/o. Thangappan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kotticode Police Station,
Crime No.26/2026 of Kotticode Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Ramaswamy, 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), 109 of BNS @ 103 of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the deceased person's sister was staying at the deceased person's house and at that time, accused abused and assaulted the deceased person and when the complainant and her sister-in-law came to see it, the accused cursed the deceased person and smashed his head against the nearby compound wall and hit the deceased person with right hand and threw him into the canal water and the injured was admitted in the Asaripallam Government Medical College Hospital and he was died on 23.02.2026. 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 he has been falsely implicated in this case and the petitioner was arrested and has been in judicial custody from 21.02.2026 and in judicial custody, his mental condition is highly affected and so, he need psychiatrist treatment and there is no prior enmity between the deceased person and the petitioner and the investigation of the case is almost over and the police is about to file charge sheet and no previous case is pending against the petitioner 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 caught hold the head of the deceased and dashed against him in a compound wall and pushed him down and dipped into the channel and originally the case was registered u/s 296(b) and 109 of BNS. On 23.02.2026 the injured succumbed to his injuries and the section of law was altered u/s 103 of BNS and the petitioner was arrested on 21.02.2026 and the investigation of the case is over and the police laid charge sheet through e-filing on 09.05.2026 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 him in a compound wall and pushed him down pushed him down and dipped into the channel. and he succumbed to his injuries. The materials placed before this Court prima facie disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the offence.

7. Though the learned Public prosecutor submitted that on 09.05.2026 the respondent police laid charge sheet before the concerned Judicial Magistrate through e-filing, considering the gravity of the offence, 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 15th day of May, 2026.

Digitally signed by
PARAMASIVADOSS
Date: 2026.05.15
20:19:54 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The counsel for the petitioner.