

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 62/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000012 -2026)

1. Regin Raj S/o. Palan (A1)
2. Abisha R.K. W/o. Shaji (A2)
3. Kala Rani W/o. Regin Raj (A3) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Kollencode Police Station,
Crime No.46/2026 of Kollencode Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Padmasanan, 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) and 324(4) of BNS Act.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 12.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.841/2026 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 06.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1113/2026 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 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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kollencode 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.7/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000023-2026)

Kijin Mon, S/o Krishnadhas (A2)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Puthukadai Police Station,

Crime No.131/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s 281, 125, 296(b), 78(2), 79 and 351(2) of BNS and Sec. 4 of
Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman (Amendment) Act 2002.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 04.04.2026 at 9.20 P.M., the informant along with of his daughter was riding a two wheeler bearing Reg.No.TN 75 BH 1567 and accompanied by his elder sister and one of his daughter in a two wheeler bearing Reg.No. TN 75 AC 2621 and at that time, the accused followed the informant and his sister's vehicle and abused them, subsequently when the public gathered, the accused left the scene place and again followed the informant and his sister near JR Mahal and pushed the informant's sister and abused them with filthy words and criminally intimidated them. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and the complaint was given after a delay of 12 days from the date of alleged occurrence and the case has been cooked up against the petitioner by the informant only to harass him and the petitioner never committed any sort of offences as alleged by the prosecution 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 there are totally three accused in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A2. According to the prosecution, on 04.04.2026, the defacto complainant, her sister and the two daughters of the defacto

complainant were proceeding on two motorcycles. At that time, the petitioner along with the other two accused came on another motorcycle, followed them, abused them in filthy language and made obscene gestures towards them. When the same was questioned by the general public, the accused persons left the place. Thereafter, the accused again followed them, and one among the accused allegedly pushed down the sister of the defacto complainant from the two-wheeler in which she was travelling, abused her and criminally intimidated her. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that though no grievous injury was sustained, the acts alleged against the accused disclose intimidation and harassment directed against women in a public place. It was further submitted that the investigation is still in progress and that custodial interrogation of the accused may be necessary for effective investigation. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. The allegation in the complaint is that the accused persons followed the defacto complainant, her sister and her daughters, verbally abused them and made obscene gestures towards them. It is further alleged that later on the same day, the petitioner and the other accused again intercepted them, pushed down the sister of the defacto complainant from the two-wheeler and criminally intimidated them, thereby allegedly

outraging the modesty of the women concerned. The nature of the allegations made against the accused appears to be serious in nature, particularly since the offences alleged are against women and are stated to have occurred in a public place, thereby affecting not only the victims but also public order and decency. The allegations disclose repeated acts of intimidation and harassment. Prima facie materials collected during investigation also indicate the involvement of the petitioner along with the other accused.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application on the ground that the investigation is still in progress. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the occurrence had taken place on 04.04.2026 and that the complaint was lodged only after a delay of twelve days, this Court is unable to attach much significance to the said delay at this stage, considering the nature of the allegations and the surrounding circumstances. Mere delay in lodging the complaint cannot, by itself, be a ground to discard the prosecution case at the threshold while considering an application for anticipatory bail.

8. Further, the investigation is at a preliminary stage and the role played by each of the accused persons is yet to be fully ascertained. In the event of granting anticipatory bail at this stage, there is every possibility

of the petitioner interfering with the course of investigation or influencing the witnesses, who appear to be known to the parties. Considering the gravity of the accusations, the manner in which the occurrence is alleged to have taken place, and the requirement of a free and fair investigation, this Court is not inclined to exercise the discretionary relief under Section 482 BNSS in favour of the petitioner.

9. In the result, this Criminal Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the petitioner is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail. The Investigating Officer is at liberty to proceed with the investigation in accordance with law.

10. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. 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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 12/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000025 -2026)

1. T. Vinu S/o. Thangaraj (A1)
2. Thankarajan S/o. Ponnumani (A2) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Puthukadai Police Station,
Crime No. 63/2026 of Puthukadai 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 petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged 126(2), 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 06.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.761/2026 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 26.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.975/2026 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 30 .03.2026 onwards 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 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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai (through e-Mode)
The Sub 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. Paramasivadosh, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge/ Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Padmanabhapuram.

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 13/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000030 -2026)

Sindhu W/o. Byju (A1)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station ,

Crime No. 2/2026 of Kulasekharam 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 sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 04.02.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.384/2026 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

16.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.889/2026 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 23.03.2026 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 23.03.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Sub Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.

(through court cell e- Mode)

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 14/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000031-2026)

Ramkumar S/o. Thangeshwaran

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Kaliyakkavilai Police Station,

Crime No.24/2026 of Kaliyakkavilai 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 324(4) and 326(f) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 10.02.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.450/2026 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 12.02.2026 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 12.02.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Kaliyakkavilai 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 20/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000039-2026)

Karthick @ Karthigai Selvan

S/o. Gangatharan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No. 26/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 06.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1124/2026 with condition

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 17.04.2026 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 condition only from 17.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 48/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000079-2026)

Manoj S/o Mohan Dhas (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Karungal Police Station,
Crime No. 53/2026 of Karungal Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Paul Raj, praying to
condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioner on 15.04.2026 to
03.05.2026.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 123 of BNS and Sec. 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(A) and
25 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 02.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.721/2026 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 04.03.2026 and he did not comply the condition from 15.04.2026 to 03.05.2026 since he is suffering from jaundice and taking country treatment in his hamlet and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner did not comply the condition from 15.04.2026 to 03.05.2026 and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the reason stated by the petitioner and also considering the duration of compliance of condition, this court is inclined to condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioner from 15.04.2026 to 03.05.2026.

7. In the result, non compliance of condition by the petitioner from 15.04.2026 to 03.05.2026 is condoned on condition that the petitioner pays a sum of Rs.500/- (Rupees Five Hundred only) before the Mediation Center, Nagercoil and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 22/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000042-2026)

1. Nirmala W/o. Selvaraj (A1)
2. Jino Rohith S/o. Selvaraj (A2)
3. Kingsly Jebasingh S/o. Thanganadar (A3)
4. Vasantha W/o. Thanganadar (A4) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Vadasery Police Station,
Crime No. 94/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 17.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1049/2026 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 26.04.2026 onwards and due to the condition, they are 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 petitioners have been complying the condition only from 26.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadoss

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 60/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000069-2026)

Mukesh S/o. Kathiresan,

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eraniel Police Station,

Crime No. 652/2025 of Eraniel Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru J. Bergin Jeba Kumar, praying to
extend the time to appear before the court concerned.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the Petition.

2. Offence alleged u/s 296(b), 326 (g) and 351(3), BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions
Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 27.01.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.237/2026 with
condition that the petitioner should appear before the court concerned within 15 days
from the date of order and he shall deposit sum of Rs. 75,000/- from the date of the
order and he shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivakasi daily

twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was suffering from viral fever and in the meantime, he was involved in another one case and he was arrested by the police and subsequently, he was released on bail and he could not able to surrender before the court concerned within the stipulated time and prayed for extension of time to appear.

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

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

7. In the result, this court directs the petitioner to surrender before the court concerned within one week from today on condition that the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.2000/- (Rupees Two Thousand only) before the Mediation Centre, Nagercoil and accordingly, this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge.
Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 28/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000041-2026)

K.S. Vinu Kumar (A5)

S/o Kuttappan Pillai

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Palugal Police Station,

Crime No. 57/2026 of Palugal Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 3(1), 3(2) (a), 3(2)(b), 5(1)(a), 4(2)(c) and
7(1)(a) of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 08.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1134/2026 with condition

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 17.04.2026 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 17.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 27/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000047-2026)

Manoj S/o Mohan Dhas (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Karungal Police Station,
Crime No. 53/2026 of Karungal Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 123 of BNS and Sec. 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(A) and
25 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court on
02.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.721/2026 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 04.03.2026 to till date except from 15.04.2026 to 03.05.2026 since he is suffering from jaundice and taking country treatment in his hamlet 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 04.03.2026 except from 15.04.2026 to 03.05.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadoss
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.45/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000077-2026)

1. Antony Messiah S/o. Peter Claiar (A 1)
2. Peter Claiar S/o. George pastin (A 2)
3. G.Vijaya rani W/o. Peter (A 3) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

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

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Trigin Sahaya Thanees,
praying to relax the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 85, 115(2), 118(l), 296(b), 316(2), 318(4) and
351(3) of BNS and Sec. 3,4 and 6 of DP Act and Sec.4 of TNPHW Act.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 30.03.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1020/2026 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 16.04.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition only from 16.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.
(through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Kanyakumari.
(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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 30/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000050-2026)

Geetha W/o. Selvakumar (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Vadasery Police Station,

Crime No. 103/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 318(4), 296(b) and 351(2) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil, on 18.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1258/2026 with condition that the
petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00
A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by the

Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1386/2026 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.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 30.04.2026 to till date 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 30.04.2026 to 07.05.2026.

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

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To

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

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 23/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000049-2026)

Vithyadhnan S/o. Ramaswamy (A1)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Kaliyakkavilai Police Station,

Crime No. 58/2026 of Kaliyakkavilai Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Suresh Babu, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 406, 420, 468 and 34 of IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 30.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1029/2026 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 11.04.2026 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 11.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

In the Court of Principal 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 34/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000016 -2026)

R. 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 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 from 28.04.2026 to till date and he did not comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026, due to sudden and serious medical emergency involving his daughter 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 28.04.2026 to 07.05.2026 and he is did not comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner did not comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026 and also considering the duration of compliance of condition, this court is not inclined to relax the condition.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 35/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000017 -2026)

R. 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 Court, 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 10.00 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 involving his daughter and the petitioner's daughter fell gravely ill and was admitted in a 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 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 been complying the condition from 30.03.2026 to 13.04.2026 and thereafter, he did not comply the condition from 14.04.2026 to 27.04.2026 and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the reason stated by the petitioner for her non compliance of condition is not acceptable one and also considering the objection of the learned Public Prosecutor, this court is not inclined to condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioner.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 42/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000057-2026)

T. Jeyachandran S/o. Thangappan (A2)

...Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

Kulasekaram Police Station,

Crime No.76/2026 of Kulasekaram Police Station,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru D. Sinju, praying to modify the condition imposed on the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.1257/2026, dated 18.04.2026.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 18.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1257/2026 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 surrendered before the Judicial Magistrate No.II at Padmanabhapuram on 30.04.2026 and after release, the petitioner went to police station in order to comply the condition, the respondent police threatened him to implicate himself in another one case and therefore, he did not comply the condition and he is ready to comply the condition before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram and the condition may be modified.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has not complied the condition even in a single day and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the objection of the learned Public Prosecutor and also considering the nature of the offence and the petitioner has not complied the condition even in a single day, this court is not inclined to modify the condition and accordingly this petition is dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 55/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	08.05.2026
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

ஒப்பம்/-பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்

(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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 55/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000037-2026)

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 D. Prabin Babu, 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 from that date onwards and this is the 2nd bail application 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 all the stolen properties have been recovered by the police and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that 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 gold 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.1354 of 2026 was dismissed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 27.04.2026, 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 the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil seeking bail in CrI.M.P.No.1354 of 2026 and the same was dismissed on 27.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivados
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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 44/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000076 -2026)

P. Shibu @ Bencier S/o. Paul Raj

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Cyber Crime Police Station,

Crime No.11/2026 of Cyber Crime Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 75(1)(ii) and 79 of BNS and Sec. 67 and
67A of Information Technology Act and Sec.4 of TNPHW Act, 2002.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 12.03.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.845/2026 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 03.04.2026 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 from 03.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 11/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000026-2026)

Arun Selvan @ Vijay

S/o. Selvakumar

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Forest Range Officer,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No. 44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Offences alleged u/s 61(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 324(2)
and 109 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 8th day of May, 2026.

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 46/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000082-2026)

Sujin, S/o. Kanakaraj (Al)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kaliyakkavilai Police Station,

Crime No. 44/2026 of Kaliyakkavilai Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS r/w Sec.21(l) of Mines and
Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 11.03.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.578/2026 with condition
that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at
10.00 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by

the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 02.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1102/2026 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 06.04.2026 onwards and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the modified condition only from 06.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kaliyakkavilai 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 40/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000059-2026)

P. Balakrishnan S/o. Perumal

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Aasaripallam Police Station,
Crime No. 29/2026 of Aasaripallam Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Lawrence Peter Shaw,
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) and 351(2) of BNS and Sec. 4
of TNPHW Act.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court on 18.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1207/2026 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 22.04.2026 onwards and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 22.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Aasaripallam 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 63/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000078-2026)

Aneesh, S/o. Valsalam

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Forest Range Officer,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No. 56/2025 of Marthandam Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

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

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 53/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	08.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	சுதன், த/பெ தங்கராஜா
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

ஒப்பம்/- பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்

(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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 53/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000036-2026)

Suthan, S/o. Thangaraja

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kottar Police Station,
Crime No. 144/2025 of Kottar Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru B. Ganesha Moorthy, 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
under Section 103(1), 126(2), 3(5), 238(a), 61(2)(a) and 309(6) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the deceased is the younger

brother of the defacto complainant. The deceased was running a provisional shop at Bharathi Nagar and he has a two wheeler bearing Reg. No. TN74 BE 5954 and he was a bachelor and lived along with his mother. Now his mother was stayed along with her another son. The deceased usually got a dosa flour from his younger sister at Vaithiyanathapuram and sell in his shop and returned back at 11.00 P.M. to his sister's house and then to his house. On 07.03.2025 the deceased as usual at morning he went to his shop and on that day he was not returned back to his sister's house. Therefore, the sister of the deceased called the defacto complainant and informed that her brother was not come to his house from shop even after 11.00 P.M. So the defacto complainant and his brother in law were searched and found that on 08.03.2025 at 5.00 A.M. as his body was half burnt with his two wheeler. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not involved in this case and he has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no enmity between the petitioner and the deceased and the petitioner has been in judicial custody from 09.03.2025 and the investigation of the case is over and the case has been charge sheeted and taken on file as SC No.199/2025 pending on the file of Additional Sessions Court, Nagercoil and the co-accused A3 was released on bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil and the petitioner is under judicial custody for the past 425 days and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application and

submitted that Accused Nos.1 and 2 are close associates and were in the habit of threatening the deceased and forcibly extracting money from him for consumption of liquor. According to the prosecution, such acts were a routine practice on the part of A1 and A2. The deceased was running a grocery shop and on 07.03.2025 at about 11.45 P.M., while the deceased was closing his shop and proceeding towards his house on his two-wheeler, A1 and A2, who had allegedly been waiting behind an autorickshaw, intercepted him.

6. It is alleged that A2 strangled the deceased by holding his neck and closed his mouth, while A1 removed a sum of Rs.650/- from the pocket of the deceased and A2 took away the key of the shop. When the deceased informed them that he would lodge a complaint before the police against their repeated acts, A1 and A2 allegedly attacked him with a cement brick on his head and the backside of his head, causing him to fall unconscious.

7. The prosecution further alleges that thereafter A1 purchased petrol from a nearby petrol bunk, poured the same on the deceased and A2 set him on fire while he was still alive, resulting in his death. The petitioner was arrested on 09.03.2025 and A2 surrendered before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil on 10.03.2025 and was subsequently taken into police custody.

8. It is further submitted that after the commission of the offence, the petitioner returned home wearing a blood-stained shirt. When questioned by A3, who is the mother of the petitioner, he allegedly confessed before her that he had robbed and murdered the deceased. Thereafter, A3 allegedly washed the blood-stained shirt and

thereby caused disappearance of evidence, for which she was arrested on 14.03.2025.

9. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the investigation has been completed, final report has been filed and the case has been taken on file in S.C.No.199 of 2025 on the file of the learned Additional Sessions Court, Nagercoil. It is also submitted that the co-accused/A2 had earlier approached this Court seeking bail and the same was dismissed, and thereafter he approached the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.8716 of 2026, which is presently pending.

10. It is further contended that the petitioner is involved in eight previous criminal cases, including a murder case, and due to his criminal antecedents, he has also been detained under the provisions of the Goondas Act in P.D.No.8 of 2025 dated 04.04.2025. Therefore, the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that considering the gravity of the offence, the antecedents of the petitioner and the likelihood of threatening witnesses, the petitioner is not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

11. Heard the submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The case of the prosecution is that the deceased, who was running a grocery shop, was intercepted by A1 and A2 while returning home after closing the shop on the night of 07.03.2025. It is alleged that the accused robbed the deceased, brutally assaulted him with a cement brick and thereafter poured petrol on him and set him ablaze while he was alive, resulting in his death. The allegations, as projected by the prosecution, disclose a grave, brutal and heinous offence committed in a calculated manner.

12. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there existed prior enmity between the deceased and several persons in the locality and that the petitioner has been falsely implicated, such defence cannot be gone into in detail at the stage of considering a bail application. The materials collected during investigation, the nature of overt acts attributed to the petitioner and the filing of the final report prima facie disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the offence

13. It is true that the petitioner has been in judicial custody for more than 425 days and that the period of preventive detention under the Goondas Act is also stated to have been completed. However, mere long incarceration by itself cannot be a sole ground for granting bail in a case involving offences of such grave nature, particularly when the accusations relate to murder committed in an extremely brutal manner after robbery.

14. This Court also cannot lose sight of the criminal antecedents attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner is stated to be involved in eight other criminal cases, including a murder case. The antecedents of the petitioner indicate a tendency towards habitual criminal conduct. The apprehension expressed by the prosecution that, if enlarged on bail, the petitioner may threaten or intimidate witnesses cannot be brushed aside lightly, especially when the case is presently pending before the Sessions Court for framing of charges.

15. Further, the possibility of tampering with prosecution evidence and influencing material witnesses also cannot be ruled out at this stage. The gravity of

the offence, the manner in which the occurrence is alleged to have taken place, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner and the larger interest of society are all relevant considerations while deciding a petition for bail.

16. Considering the seriousness of the allegations, the prima facie materials available against the petitioner, the criminal antecedents attributed to him, and the likelihood of interference with the trial process, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

17. In the result, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 18/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-00029-2026)

Shayo Mimson Sham S/o. Maria John (A3)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Vellichanthai Police Station,

Crime No.34/2026 of Vellichanthai Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by the Advocate Thiru Prasath .V, 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 309(6) of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 26.03.2026 at about

02.30 A.M., near Muttom DX Petrol Pump, three unknown persons came in a single motorcycle, committed robbery from the defacto complainant of an amount of Rs. 10,900/- voluntarily causing hurt to him using hands. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offence alleged against him and he has no connection with the alleged occurrence and the respondent police implicated the petitioner as an accused in this case and the petitioner was arrested on 26.03.2026 and is in judicial custody from that date onwards and the earlier bail petition in CrI.M.P.No.266/2026 was dismissed by the Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel on 10.04.2026 and this is the 2nd application and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No.1241/2026 was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 20.04.2026 and the co-accused/A2 was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1304/2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are three accused in this case and the present petitioner is A3. The defacto complainant is working as Pump operator in a private petrol bunk. On 26.03.2026, this petitioner and A1 and A2 went to the petrol bunk to fill petrol, but they hidden a number plate of the motorcycle and

A1 and A2 get down from the motorcycle and standing near the defacto complainant and all the accused wearing helmet and they asked petrol for Rs.100 and at that time, A1 and A2 assaulted the defacto complainant and then, this petitioner trespassed into the office room and stolen Rs.10,900/- kept in the almirah and immediately, they escaped from the scene of occurrence and the criminal antecedents of the accused is concerned, A1 is having 7 previous case and A2 is having 3 previous cases and the petitioner/A3 is having 2 previous cases. Though they committed stolen of Rs.10,900/-, only Rs.8000/- recovered from the petitioner and the co-accused/A2 was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1304/2026 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 argument of the learned Public Prosecutor that part of the stolen amount recovered from the petitioner and also considering the fact that the co-accused was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1304/2026 and also considering the period of incarceration of the petitioner (i.e.) for the past 43 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, Eraniel and after release the petitioner shall stay at Ramanathapuram, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-Mode)
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram.
The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil,
(through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Vellichanthai 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	Crl.M.P.Nos. 10/2026 & 19/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	08.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	தவசிலிங்க மணி, த/பெ பத்மனாபன் .. Crl.M.P.10/2026-ன் மனுதாரர் அருண்செல்வன், த/பெ செல்வகுமார் .. Crl.M.P.19/2026-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. உதயகுரியா, 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

ஒப்பம்/- பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்

(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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 10/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000015-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.19/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000028-2026)

Thavasilingamani S/o. Pathmanaban ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.10/2026

Arun Selvan S/o. Selvakumar (A7) ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.19/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No.44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. K. Pon Muthu Pandian
and C. Balamurugan 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 filed by the different accused, but in the same crime number.

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

4. CrI.M.P.No.10 of 2026 has been filed by A5 and CrI.M.P.No.19 of 2026 has been filed by A6 seeking enlargement on bail.

5. 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.

5. The learned counsel appearing for A5 would contend that the petitioner 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.

6. Similarly, the learned counsel appearing for A6 submitted that the petitioner was not originally named in the FIR and that he has been falsely implicated after obtaining statements under coercion. It is further submitted that both the petitioners are innocent and are prepared to abide by any condition imposed by this Court.

7. In support of the contention relating to illegal detention, the petitioners have produced a pen drive said to contain photographs and video recordings to establish that the petitioners were apprehended much prior to the officially recorded time of arrest. However, the authenticity, source and evidentiary value of such electronic materials cannot be conclusively examined at this stage of consideration of bail. Such disputed factual aspects necessarily require proper proof during the course of investigation or trial.

8. It is also pertinent to note that no contemporaneous objection appears to have been raised before the learned Judicial Magistrate at the time of remand regarding the alleged illegal detention or delayed production before Court. In the absence of any immediate protest recorded before the remanding Court and in view of the disputed nature of the factual allegations, this Court is not inclined to record any finding regarding the alleged violation of Section 58 BNSS or the constitutional safeguards at this stage.

9. As regards the nature of the occurrence, the materials available on record prima facie disclose that the defacto complainant sustained grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and both legs and that he continues to undergo treatment. The allegations reveal a premeditated attack allegedly arising out of prior enmity and previous criminal litigation between the parties. The investigation is still at a crucial stage and the role played by each accused is yet to be fully ascertained.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the principal accused are involved in several other criminal cases and are history sheeters within the jurisdictional police limits. The criminal antecedents attributed to the co-accused, coupled with the allegation that the present petitioners are their close associates and active participants in the occurrence, prima facie strengthen the apprehension of the prosecution that, if enlarged on bail, the petitioners may interfere with the investigation, influence witnesses or disturb public peace. This Court finds substance in the said apprehension, especially considering that the investigation is still in progress and the injured witness continues to undergo treatment.

10. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the nature of injuries sustained by the defacto complainant, the stage of investigation, the alleged involvement of the petitioners along with the principal accused, and the possibility of interference with the prosecution witnesses, this Court is of the view that the petitioners are not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail at this stage.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
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.Nos. 10/2026 & 19/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்.	08.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	தவசிலிங்க மணி, த/பெ பத்மனாபன் .. Crl.M.P.10/2026-ன் மனுதாரர் அருண்செல்வன், த/பெ செல்வகுமார் .. Crl.M.P.19/2026-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. உதயகுரியா, 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

ஒப்பம்/- பி. பரமசிவதாஸ்

(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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 10/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000015-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No.19/2026

CNR.No.TNKK0V-000028-2026)

Thavasilingamani S/o. Pathmanaban ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.10/2026

Arun Selvan S/o. Selvakumar (A7) ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.19/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eathamozhy Police Station,

Crime No.44/2026 of Eathamozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. K. Pon Muthu Pandian
and C. Balamurugan 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 filed by the different accused, but in the same crime number.

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

4. CrI.M.P.No.10 of 2026 has been filed by A5 and CrI.M.P.No.19 of 2026 has been filed by A6 seeking enlargement on bail.

5. 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.

5. The learned counsel appearing for A5 would contend that the petitioner 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.

6. Similarly, the learned counsel appearing for A6 submitted that the petitioner was not originally named in the FIR and that he has been falsely implicated after obtaining statements under coercion. It is further submitted that both the petitioners are innocent and are prepared to abide by any condition imposed by this Court.

7. In support of the contention relating to illegal detention, the petitioners have produced a pen drive said to contain photographs and video recordings to establish that the petitioners were apprehended much prior to the officially recorded time of arrest. However, the authenticity, source and evidentiary value of such electronic materials cannot be conclusively examined at this stage of consideration of bail. Such disputed factual aspects necessarily require proper proof during the course of investigation or trial.

8. It is also pertinent to note that no contemporaneous objection appears to have been raised before the learned Judicial Magistrate at the time of remand regarding the alleged illegal detention or delayed production before Court. In the absence of any immediate protest recorded before the remanding Court and in view of the disputed nature of the factual allegations, this Court is not inclined to record any finding regarding the alleged violation of Section 58 BNSS or the constitutional safeguards at this stage.

9. As regards the nature of the occurrence, the materials available on record prima facie disclose that the defacto complainant sustained grievous injuries including fractures in both hands and both legs and that he continues to undergo treatment. The allegations reveal a premeditated attack allegedly arising out of prior enmity and previous criminal litigation between the parties. The investigation is still at a crucial stage and the role played by each accused is yet to be fully ascertained.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the principal accused are involved in several other criminal cases and are history sheeters within the jurisdictional police limits. The criminal antecedents attributed to the co-accused, coupled with the allegation that the present petitioners are their close associates and active participants in the occurrence, prima facie strengthen the apprehension of the prosecution that, if enlarged on bail, the petitioners may interfere with the investigation, influence witnesses or disturb public peace. This Court finds substance in the said apprehension, especially considering that the investigation is still in progress and the injured witness continues to undergo treatment.

10. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the nature of injuries sustained by the defacto complainant, the stage of investigation, the alleged involvement of the petitioners along with the principal accused, and the possibility of interference with the prosecution witnesses, this Court is of the view that the petitioners are not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail at this stage.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivados
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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 50/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000064-2026)

P. Revathi W/o. R. Prabhu @ Kutty Prabhu (A2)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

South Thamaraikulam Police Station,

Crime No.65/2026 of South Thamaraikulam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 296(b), 115(2), 74 and 351(2) of BNS and Sec. 4 of TNPHW
Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity, on
07.04.2026 at about 10.15 P.M., on the instigation of the relatives, the

husband of the petitioner abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and threw stone on him and he escaped and when the mother of the defacto complainant tried to rescue him, the accused pushed her down and outraged her modesty and abused her in filthy language 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 her and she is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and she has been falsely implicated in this case and the defacto complainant and others assaulted the petitioner and her husband and caused injuries to them and the case in Crime No.64/2026 has been registered against them and the husband of the petitioner/A1 was arrested on 09.04.2026 when he was under treatment in the Asaripallam Medical College Hospital and he was released on bail by the Judicial Magistrate on 05.05.2026 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 1st accused is the husband of this petitioner and he is a rowdy element. Already the 1st accused assaulted the defacto complainant and a case in Crime No.47/2026 was registered by the South Thamaraiikulam Police and A1 was arrested by the police. So there is a previous enmity

between them. On 07.04.2026 A1 and A2 talked with A3 to A5 and then at the instigation of A3 to A5, A1 assaulted the defacto complainant with stick. So the mother of the defacto complainant came to rescue her son. At that time, the 1st accused and this petitioner assaulted her with hand and pushed her down and this case is registered and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the 1st accused was arrested by the police on 08.04.2026 and released on bail on 05.05.2026 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 and the co-accused was released on bail, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on her appearing before the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate, 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 herself 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadoss
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.
(through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, South Thamaraikulam 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 49/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000083-2026)

Vishnu,

S/o. Rajakumar,

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No.90/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru P. Michael, 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), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 22.04.2026, the accused used filthy words and caused injury using weapon and thereby threatened him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the petitioner is no way connected with the alleged occurrence 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 there is a previous enmity between the accused and the defacto complainant and on 22.04.2026, this petitioner was in drunken mood and demanded money from the defacto complainant, but he refused to give money. So the petitioner abused the defacto complainant and assaulted on his chin and head and pushed him down from the motorcycle and then the petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant all over his body with leg and inflicted cut injury on his head with aruval and threatened him and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the 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, 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.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 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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadoss
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli.
The Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioner.

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.39/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000075-2026)

1. Muthukrishnan S/o. Nadarajan (A1)
2. Nirmala W/o. Muthukrishnan (A2) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No.203/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru T. Veludhas, 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 the defacto complainant is working as collection agent in Kalaimagal Finance and the 1st petitioner did not repay the loan obtained from the above finance hypothecating his vehicle bearing Regn. No.TN65 M 4710. So, on 02.05.2026 at about 9.15 A.M., the defacto complainant came to the house of the petitioners and demanded to repay the loan and at that time, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant in filthy words and assaulted him with iron rod on his head and kicked him with leg 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 they are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and the false case has been foisted against the petitioners and the 1st petitioner had not obtained any loan and the vehicle was also not belong to him 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 petitioners are husband and wife. The defacto complainant is working as a collection agent of private finance and the 1st petitioner availed vehicle loan from the said finance and he did not remit the monthly instalment. On 02.05.2026, the defacto complainant

demanded monthly instalments from the 1st accused. So, these petitioners abused the defacto complainant and A1 assaulted on the head of the defacto complainant and A2 assaulted the defacto complainant with hand and leg and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and though the learned Public Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 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, 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 shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. and the 2nd petitioner 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadosh,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirunelveli.
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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.36/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000072-2026)

Ratheesh S/o. Raveendran (A2)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Kulasekaram Police Station,

Crime No.75/2026 of Kulasekaram Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru D. Sinju, 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 189(2), 296(b), 132 and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 05.04.2026, while the
police party were on rounth duty, they found that the accused persons were
consuming alcohol in a public place and when the defacto complainant

questioned, they quarreled with him and used obscene language against him and prevented him from discharging his official duty and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has no connection with the alleged occurrence and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged and this is the 2nd application and the earlier application in CrI.M.P. No.1321/2026 was dismissed on 25.04.2026 and another one case in Crime No.76/2026 has been registered against the petitioner and he was arrested on 07.04.2026 and in that case, the petitioner was granted bail by the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram on 15.04.2026 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 4 accused in this case. The petitioner is A2. The defacto complainant is the police official. On 05.04.2026, when the defacto complainant and another one police personnel went on patrolling duty and at that time, the petitioner and other accused were consuming alcohol in a public place and disturbing the public by making noise in obscene language. So, the defacto complainant questioned the petitioner and other accused and asked them to disperse, but the petitioner and other accused abused the police officials and threatened them with stone. Then, they restrained the defacto

complaint from discharging his official duty. The petitioner is having one previous case and the investigation is not yet over and the earlier petition in CrI.M.P. No.1321/2026 was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Judge and there is no change in circumstances and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor. It is submitted that the petitioner had earlier filed an anticipatory bail application before the Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil, which was dismissed by an order dated 25.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1321/2026. No change in circumstances has been shown by the petitioner in the present application. Hence, the present application is devoid of merits and as such, this petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadosh
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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 58/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000055-2026)

Rajesh @ John Rajesh (A2)

S/o. John Nelson

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eraniel Police Station,

Crime No. 129/2023 of Eraniel Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 392 of IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Nagercoil on 07.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1023/2026 with condition that the
petitioner should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel 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 17.04.2026 to till date and the case has been charge sheeted and taken on file as CC No.323/2023 pending before the Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. Report received from the Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel through g-mail. A perusal of report shows that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 17.04.2026 to 07.05.2026.

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

7. In the result, condition is modified that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To

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

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

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

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.33/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000067-2026)

1. Vai. Selvakumar S/o. Vaikundaperumal (A1)
2. M. Mahesh S/o. Muthuswamy (A4)
3. C. Jeyakrishnan S/o. Sivalingam (A6) .. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No.147/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Tmt. A. Prabha, 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 126(2), 191(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 25.04.2026 at 3.12 hours, when the defacto complainant and other devotees were coming to Temple, the accused persons waylaid them and abused them in filthy language and assaulted the defacto complainant with aruval and caused blood injury and also abused the grandmother of the defacto complainant and pulled her saree and the other accused assaulted the defacto complainant and one Vishwa with wooden log 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 1st petitioner is a practicing Advocate and he is 52 years old and the petitioners have no way connected with the alleged occurrence and no such occurrence had happened as alleged in the FIR and A4 and A6 are coolies and the injured was discharged from the 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 there are two groups in the hamlet. So they wanted to celebrate the festival of the temple. One person approached the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No. CrI.(MD) No. 1756/2026 and obtained an order that the festival is to be conducted by the Executive Officer of HR&CE Department. So on 25.04.2026, A1 to A6 and other persons were

conducted the festival. The defacto complainant and his friends were went to the temple, at that time, the 1st accused abused him and inflicted cut injury on his head with aruval. So the grandmother of the defacto complainant came to rescue to the defacto complainant, the petitioners and others abused her and A2 and A3 assaulted the defacto complainant with stick and A4 to A6 assaulted the friend of the defacto complainant with stick 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 though the learned Public Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are 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 petitioners 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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivados
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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.32/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000066-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.66/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000087-2026)

1. Stalin Jose S/o. Nadesan (A1)

2. Ajith Kumar @ Ajith S/o. Appu (A2)

3. Malini.M W/o. Stalin Jose (A3)

... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.32/2026

/Vs./

Ebenezer S/o. Sathyanesan

... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No.211/2026 of Marthandam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.32/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T. Santhosh
Kumar, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners

and the intervening petition in CrI.M.P. No.66/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Venkatesh, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petition filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.32/2026.

ORDER

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

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

3. The case of prosecution is that the accused persons are residing on the either side of pathway leading to the house of the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant purchased the property of the paternal uncle of the 1st and 2nd petitioners for using the same as pathway and there was enmity between them and while the defacto complainant was using the said pathway, they used to insult him saying his disability and on 29.04.2026 at about 4.30 P.M., the defacto complainant was removing the branches of the trees which were causing obstructions to the compound wall of the school and so, the 3rd petitioner came into the school and abused the defacto complainant and at about 6.35 P.M., while the defacto complainant came to close the gate, the 3rd accused abused him and threatened that she will kill him and trespassed into the compound of the defacto complainant

by pulling the gate and assaulted him and the 1st petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod and while he attempted to run away from the place of occurrence, the 2nd petitioner abused him and thrown stones on him and sustained injuries 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 they never caused any offence as alleged and they are poor coolie workers and the defacto complainant is settled and he is harassing the petitioners and their family members continuously and to wreak vengeance, the defacto complainant lodged a false complaint against the petitioners and nothing was happened as alleged and the petitioners are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is almost over and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as CrI.M.P. No.66/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the defacto complainant is working in Maldives and he has returned home town in vacation and he is handicapped person and the

accused have previous enmity against him regarding the land purchased near his house. On 25.04.2026, when the defacto complainant was cutting trees in his house, A3 comment his disability and abused and threatened him and A1 kicked him on his stomach with his leg and also assaulted him with iron rod and A3 assaulted him with stone on his neck and the occurrence was recorded in a CCTV footage and the same was handed over to the police and the investigation of the case is in the initial stage and if the accused were granted anticipatory bail, his family will be in trouble and they will try to threaten him and the witnesses and prayed that the petition may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there are three accused in this case and there is a pathway dispute between the defacto complainant and the petitioners. On 29.04.2025, the defacto complainant has cut the branches of tree. At that time, A3 threatened and abused him. A1 abused the defacto complainant and trespassed into the compound of the defacto complainant and assaulted him on his stomach with leg and A1 assaulted the defacto complainant on his left shoulder with iron rod and A2 abused the defacto complainant and pelted stone at him and caused bleeding injuries and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the

petition may be dismissed.

8. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel for the intervenor. 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.

9. 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 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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadosh,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai.
The Inspector of Police, Marthandam 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 47/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000080-2026)

Mohammed Basheer (A1)

S/o. Sheik Mohammed

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Aralvoimozhi Police Station,

Crime No. 93/2026 of Aralvoimozhi Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 18.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1039/2026 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 is a senior citizen aged 71 years and he has been complying the condition from 22.04.2026 onwards and due to the condition, he is unable to do his daily works and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 22.04.2026 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 also considering the age of the petitioner, 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.32/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000066-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.66/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000087-2026)

1. Stalin Jose S/o. Nadesan (A1)

2. Ajith Kumar @ Ajith S/o. Appu (A2)

3. Malini.M W/o. Stalin Jose (A3)

... Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.32/2026

/Vs./

Ebenezer S/o. Sathyanesan

... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No.211/2026 of Marthandam Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.32/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru T. Santhosh
Kumar, u/s 482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners

and the intervening petition in CrI.M.P. No.66/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Venkatesh, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the anticipatory bail petition filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.32/2026.

ORDER

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

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

3. The case of prosecution is that the accused persons are residing on the either side of pathway leading to the house of the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant purchased the property of the paternal uncle of the 1st and 2nd petitioners for using the same as pathway and there was enmity between them and while the defacto complainant was using the said pathway, they used to insult him saying his disability and on 29.04.2026 at about 4.30 P.M., the defacto complainant was removing the branches of the trees which were causing obstructions to the compound wall of the school and so, the 3rd petitioner came into the school and abused the defacto complainant and at about 6.35 P.M., while the defacto complainant came to close the gate, the 3rd accused abused him and threatened that she will kill him and trespassed into the compound of the defacto complainant

by pulling the gate and assaulted him and the 1st petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod and while he attempted to run away from the place of occurrence, the 2nd petitioner abused him and thrown stones on him and sustained injuries 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 they never caused any offence as alleged and they are poor coolie workers and the defacto complainant is settled and he is harassing the petitioners and their family members continuously and to wreak vengeance, the defacto complainant lodged a false complaint against the petitioners and nothing was happened as alleged and the petitioners are in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is almost over and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. During enquiry, the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as CrI.M.P. No.66/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the defacto complainant is working in Maldives and he has returned home town in vacation and he is handicapped person and the

accused have previous enmity against him regarding the land purchased near his house. On 25.04.2026, when the defacto complainant was cutting trees in his house, A3 comment his disability and abused and threatened him and A1 kicked him on his stomach with his leg and also assaulted him with iron rod and A3 assaulted him with stone on his neck and the occurrence was recorded in a CCTV footage and the same was handed over to the police and the investigation of the case is in the initial stage and if the accused were granted anticipatory bail, his family will be in trouble and they will try to threaten him and the witnesses and prayed that the petition may be dismissed.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there are three accused in this case and there is a pathway dispute between the defacto complainant and the petitioners. On 29.04.2025, the defacto complainant has cut the branches of tree. At that time, A3 threatened and abused him. A1 abused the defacto complainant and trespassed into the compound of the defacto complainant and assaulted him on his stomach with leg and A1 assaulted the defacto complainant on his left shoulder with iron rod and A2 abused the defacto complainant and pelted stone at him and caused bleeding injuries and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the

petition may be dismissed.

8. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel for the intervenor. 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.

9. 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 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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadosh,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai.
The Inspector of Police, Marthandam 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 26/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000040-2026)

Madhavadhas S/o. Padmanapha Pillai (A1)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Eraniel Police Station,
Crime No. 167/2026 of Eraniel Police Station
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 223, 289 and 303(2) of BNS and Sec. 4(1)(a), 21(1) and 25 of MMDR Act and Sec. 3, 4 and 5 of Explosive Substance Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 30.03.2026 at 2.00 P.M., the Assistant Director of Mines and Minerals Department, Kanyakumari visited the stone quarry of the petitioner, which was already stopped the quarry work and found that 500 cubic meter of stone worth Rs.2,35,375/- were exploded from the quarry using explosive substances. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is having a valid license to run the quarry in the alleged location and the proceedings of the Kanyakumri District Collector dated 15.07.2024 extended the license of the quarry for a period of 24 months and no notice was issued to the petitioner to stop the quarry work and the period of extension by the District Collector has also not expired and on the date of alleged occurrence, no quarry work took place in the quarry and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the respondent police with an ill motive, falsely implicated the petition in this case and this is the 2nd application and the earlier petition in CrI.M.P. No.1139/2026 was dismissed on 29.04.2026 and the petitioner is ready to

abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant is the Assistant Director, Mines and Minerals, Nagercoil, and that the petitioner/A1 is the owner of the quarry in question. On 30.03.2026, upon receipt of information regarding illegal mining activities being carried on in Survey No.10/4A of Aloor 'B' Village, the defacto complainant along with other officials proceeded to the place of occurrence. During inspection, it was found that about 500 cubic metres of stones, valued at Rs.2,35,375/-, had been illegally blasted and that 35 bore holes had been filled with explosives. An Atlas Copco compressor and two Hitachi machines were also found at the quarry site. It is alleged that the quarry operations were being carried on without valid permission from the Government. The vehicles used for the illegal activity were seized. According to the prosecution, a loss of Rs.2,35,375/- has been caused to the Government. The investigation is still pending. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the earlier anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.1139 of 2026 was dismissed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026, and that no change in circumstances has arisen thereafter. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and prayed for

dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard the submissions of the learned Public Prosecutor and perused the materials available on record. It is seen that the petitioner had earlier filed an application for anticipatory bail before the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil in CrI.M.P.No.1139 of 2026, and the same was dismissed on 29.04.2026. In the present petition, no subsequent change in circumstances has been shown warranting reconsideration of the relief sought. The allegations pertain to illegal quarrying activities causing loss to the Government, and the investigation is still in progress. In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivados
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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 21/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000044-2026)

1. Thaneshkumar S/o. George (A1)
 2. Vanitha .A W/o. Thanesh Kumar (A2) ... Petitioners
- /Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Karungal Police Station,
Crime No.139/2026 of Karungal 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 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the 1st accused and the complainant are brothers and the complainant is working in Chennai as a hotel labour. On 23.04.2026, the complainant and the accused met each other in a funeral house and the accused provoked the complainant by saying he has taken all their ancestral property and assaulted him with iron rod and the 2nd accused aided the whole attack and both the accused used filthy language against the defacto complainant 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 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 there is a property dispute between the 1st accused and the defacto complainant and they are brothers. The 2nd petitioner is the wife of 1st accused. On 23.04.2026, the 1st accused assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod on his head. On seeing the another brother of the defacto complainant, came to rescue his brother. So, A1 assaulted him with iron rod on his left eyebrow, back side of the head, shoulder and caused

bleeding injuries. A2, the wife of A1 instigated A1 to assault his brothers and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. It is the case of the prosecution that on the instigation of A2, A1 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 the dispute was family partition, for which, the occurrence was happened. Considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, 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 them 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadoss,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Karungal Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 16/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000034-2026)

Vijay S/o Nadarajan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Cyber Crime Police Station,

Crime No.32/2026 of Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil,

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 petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 296(b), 192, 351(2), 352, 353(1)(b) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the accused has an Instagram ID in the name and style of (mt wild animal) and on 15.04.2026 at about 10.00 P.M., the complainant noticed a video in the accused's instagram page, where the accused using filthy language criticized the current Prime Minister of India as well as the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu and he used obscene words and criminally intimidated the political leaders and also made statements conducing to public mischief and also wantonly gave provocation with the intent to cause rioting and also intentionally insulted them to provoke breach of peace. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and all the allegations are false and the petitioner has no connection with the above matter and he never any act as alleged and the complainant has given a false complainant before the respondent police to file this case against the petitioner 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 had created a fake Instagram account in the name of "mt wild animal" and uploaded videos in social media containing abusive remarks against the Hon'ble Prime Minister of India and the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, with an intention to provoke breach

of peace and public mischief. On the basis of the said allegations, the present case came to be registered. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly essential for effective investigation and that the investigation is still in progress. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. The defacto complainant, who is the Sub Inspector of Police attached to the Cyber Crime Police Station, registered the present FIR for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 192, 351(2), 352 and 353(1) (b) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. The allegation against the petitioner is that he created a fake Instagram account in the name of “mt wild animal” and circulated videos in social media using abusive language against the Hon’ble Prime Minister of India and the Hon’ble Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, besides making derogatory criticisms against them. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary and that the investigation is at a preliminary stage.

7. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the stage of investigation, and the requirement of custodial interrogation, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition deserves to be dismissed.

8.In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.59/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000084 -2026)

Lingesh S/o. Narayanan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Vellichanthai Police Station,
Crime No. 39/2026 of Vellichanthai Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 20.04.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.1229/2026 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 22.04.2026 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 22.04.2026 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode)
The Sub Inspector of Police, Vellichanthai 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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.15/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000033-2026)

Akash S/o. Pushkaran (A2)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No.73/2026 of Kulasekharam 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 petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity between the accused and the complainant, on 04.04.2026 at about 4.00 P.M., the accused persons waylaid the defacto complainant and abused him in filthy language and A1 assaulted him with sickle 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 never committed any offence as alleged and the co-accused/A2 was granted bail by the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram in CrI.M.P. No.402/2026, dated 15.04.2026 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 there is a previous enmity between the defacto complainant and A1. On 03.04.2026, A1 called the defacto complainant over phone to come to a particular place. So, the defacto complainant went there. At that time, A1 and this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and abused him. A1 assaulted the defacto complainant on his head with aruval and this petitioner and other accused assaulted the friends of the defacto complainant with stick and hand repeatedly. Now, the injured was

discharged from the hospital. A1 was arrested on 03.04.2026 and released on bail and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and though the learned Public Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram, 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 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadosh,
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)
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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.9/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000027-2026)

1. Bharath S/o Mahesh (A1)
2. Premkumar S/o. Sathiyavel (A2)
3. Vino @ Vinu Pravin S/o. Aruldhass (A3) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No.121/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Jany, 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 191(2), 329(4), 296(b), 324(4), 131 and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that there is a previous enmity between the defacto complainant and petitioners and on 30.03.2026 at about 11.30 P.M., the accused persons unlawfully assembled together with deadly weapons and trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and abused the defacto complainant with filthy words and assaulted him and damaged the household articles and panchayat pipe 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 in fact, the defacto complainant obstructed the pathway of accused 2 and 4 by dumping waste and abused their children in filthy language. So, the 2nd accused lodged a complaint before the respondent police on 28.03.2026. Due to that, on 30.03.2026 at about 11.30 P.M., the son of defacto complainant along with others went to the house of the petitioners and abused them in filthy language and criminally intimidated them and again on 31.03.2026, the 2nd accused lodged police complaint and registered as CSR No.405/2026 and subsequently, the case in Crime No.122/2026 has been registered against the defacto complainant's son and others and on the false complaint given by the defacto complainant, this case has been registered against the petitioners and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged and there is no injury to the defacto complainant and the injured has not taken any

treatment 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 there are totally eight accused in this case and that the present petitioners are arrayed as A1 to A3. According to the prosecution, there existed previous enmity between the defacto complainant and the petitioners with regard to the construction of a compound wall and pathway dispute. It is alleged that on 30.03.2026, the petitioners along with the other accused criminally trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, abused her in filthy language and assaulted her. It is further alleged that A1 to A3 attacked the defacto complainant with hands and legs, pulled her hair, pushed her down, damaged household articles and window panes causing loss to the tune of Rs.20,000/-, and also criminally intimidated her. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that though the injured has subsequently been discharged from the hospital, the investigation is still in progress. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and submitted that, in the event of granting bail, this Court may impose appropriate conditions including deposit of compensation amount.

6. The defacto complainant lodged the present complaint alleging trespass and assault by the accused persons, namely A1 to A8. It is the case of the prosecution that there existed a dispute between the parties

relating to pathway rights and construction of a compound wall, and owing to the said dispute, the accused persons, including the present petitioners, allegedly entered into the house of the defacto complainant, assaulted her and caused damage to household articles worth about Rs.20,000/-. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that a counter case in Crime No.122 of 2026 is pending on the file of the very same police station. The learned Public Prosecutor fairly submitted that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital.

7. Considering the nature of the dispute between the parties, the existence of a counter case, and the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused subject to appropriate conditions.

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

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail and also they are directed to deposit a sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivados
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 petitioners.

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 8th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 65/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000014-2026)

D.J. Abercot Dyfen (A1)

S/o. Dalstoy

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub 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. Subashkumar, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner 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 petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Nagercoil on 06.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.1907/2026 with condition
that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at

10.00 A.M. until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 17.04.2026 to till date, except on 01.05.2026 and 05.05.2026 and it is a matrimonial dispute between the parties and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/- P. Paramasivadosh
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumar at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, 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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 4/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000018-2026)

N. Chandrasekaran Nair
S/o. Narayana Pillai

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Marthandam Police Station,
Crime No.183/2026 of Marthandam Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru S. Eliza, 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) and 118(1) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 06.04.2026 at about 2.30
P.M., the accused used filthy language against the defacto complainant and
assaulted him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner and defacto complainant are close relatives and neighbours and he is an Ex-Serviceman having an age of 75 years and suffering from various ailments of old age and on the date of occurrence, the defacto complainant assaulted the accused with weapon and the petition pending before the respondent police and the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and false case has been foisted against the petitioner and he is in no way connected with the alleged offence 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 there is a property dispute between the defacto complainant and the petitioner. On 26.03.2026, this petitioner abused the defacto complainant and assaulted the defacto complainant on his left upper arm and left ear with weapon and caused bleeding injuries and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and though the learned Public

Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner 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, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivadosh,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Marthandam 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 8th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 1/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000009-2026)

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(1), 118(2), 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 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 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 and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and though the learned Public Prosecutor objected that the investigation is not yet over, considering the

fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.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 petitioner 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 8th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-P. Paramasivados
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.