

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 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 268/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000321-2026)

Dhanesh, S/o Nagarajan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Eraniel Police Station,
Crime No. 209/2026 of Eraniel Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Legal Aid Defense Counsel Thiru
D.R. Bright Joel, u/s 483 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the petition and the materials available on
record.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 298, 326(3) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution is that, on 18.04.2026 at about 10.30 P.M., the petitioner/accused criminally trespassed into the Sree Vignavinayakar Temple situated at Chakkiyancode and damaged the idols/statues kept inside the temple premises. When the defacto complainant questioned the petitioner regarding the said incident, the petitioner allegedly abused him in filthy language and criminally intimidated him with dire consequences. Hence, the present case has been registered against the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody from 19.04.2026 onwards. The learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner is suffering from serious psychiatric ailments and has been diagnosed with polysubstance dependence, bipolar affective disorder (mixed episode), antisocial personality disorder and borderline personality disorder. It is also submitted that the petitioner has severe suicidal tendencies and requires continuous psychiatric evaluation and treatment.

According to the learned counsel, the investigation is almost complete and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, the learned counsel prayed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner trespassed into a temple and intentionally damaged the idols kept therein, thereby affecting public peace and religious sentiments. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the petitioner has three previous criminal cases to his discredit. Out of the said cases, one case was registered under the POCSO Act, in which the petitioner was convicted by the Special Court and sentenced to undergo 28 years of imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.15,000/-. It is further submitted that the petitioner had approached the Hon'ble High Court seeking suspension of sentence and, pursuant to suspension of sentence, he was enlarged on bail. However, after being released on bail, the petitioner allegedly committed the present offence. It is also submitted that the investigation is still pending and therefore the learned Public Prosecutor raised serious objection to the grant of bail.

6. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. The present application has been filed in

connection with Crime No.209 of 2026 on the file of Eraniel Police Station relating to the alleged incident of damaging idols in Sree Vignavinayakar Temple, Chakkiyancode on 18.04.2026 at about 10.30 P.M.

7. It is seen from the records that, during the course of remand from 19.04.2026 onwards, the petitioner was referred before the District Medical Board for psychiatric evaluation. The medical records prima facie reveal that the petitioner is suffering from polysubstance dependence with bipolar affective disorder (mixed episode), antisocial personality disorder and borderline personality disorder and that he also possesses severe suicidal tendencies. It is further seen that, considering his deteriorating mental condition, the petitioner has presently been referred for a second occasion to the Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences, Kilpauk, for specialised psychiatric treatment and further assessment.

8. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that an earlier bail application filed on behalf of the petitioner through the Legal Aid Defence Counsel came to be dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel in CrI.M.P. No.209 of 2026 dated 14.05.2026. However, it appears that, at the time of consideration of the said application, the detailed medical assessment relating to the unsoundness of mind and psychiatric condition of the petitioner had not been placed before the learned Magistrate.

9. This Court finds that the present matter requires consideration in the light of the provisions relating to persons of unsound mind under Sections 368 and 369 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. Before taking any final decision on the question of bail, this Court is of the considered view that a fresh and comprehensive psychiatric assessment regarding the mental condition, cognitive capacity, behavioural stability and suicidal tendency of the petitioner is absolutely necessary.

10. Accordingly, this Court directs the Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences, Kilpauk, Chennai, to furnish a fresh psychiatric assessment report regarding the present mental condition and soundness of mind of the petitioner.

11. In the meantime, the Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil, is directed to identify and contact the near relatives of the petitioner, if any, who are willing to take responsibility for the care, treatment and overall wellbeing of the petitioner upon any future release or transfer.

12. The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil, shall coordinate with the Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences, Kilpauk, and facilitate the process for obtaining the fresh psychiatric assessment

report within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Call on 08.06.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 202/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000269-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000270-2026)

V. Selvakumar,
S/o. Vaikundaperumal ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.202/2026

/Vs./

C. Azhagesan S/o. Chellathurai ... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No.172/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.202/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Jayakumar,
u/s 483 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner and the intervening

petition in CrI.M.P. No.203/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Regu, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the bail petition filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.203/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that on 15.05.2026 at about 10.45 P.M., while the informant was standing in front of his house, the petitioner along with other accused persons surrounded the informant and assaulted him and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the petitioner and the defacto complainant was having strained relationship with respect of the administration of the temple. The defacto complainant is residing four kilometre away from that place and he came to the village on the date of incident, for the purpose of creating a commotion against the petitioner and his family and the case in crime No.173/2026 has been registered against the informant and his family members. On 15.05.2026 at about 5.45 P.M., when

the defacto complainant was in his house, this petitioner and two others assaulted the defacto complainant and in that assault, both of them sustained grievous injuries. Now the petitioner is undergoing treatment on the Government Hospital and the defacto complainant discharged from the hospital. The petitioner already suffering from liver and lungs complications and he is 54 years old and the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2026 and at the time of arrest, Section 47 of BNSS has not complied by the respondent police. In the counter case in Crime No.173/2026, the defacto complainant was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court. Moreover, the matter is very simple in respect of the administration of the temple and the petitioner is senior lawyer. and the matter may be referred to mediation and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The aforesaid bail application was moved on 22.05.2026 and along with the bail application an urgent application was also filed, which is allowed and the case was heard at the end of the list. While so , the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as Crl.M.P. No.203/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the 1st accused is the President of Melakattuvilai Arulmigu

Kailasanathar Thirukovil for the past 15 years and in the meantime, on 06.02.2026 the defacto complainant and some others gave an application for electing new office bearers and on that basis, new office bearers including defacto complainant were elected by the members of the temple. Due to that enmity, several complaints are pending. The defacto complainant filed Writ Petition WP CrI.(MD) No.1756/2026 before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court regarding administration of the temple and the High Court has directed the 5th respondent HR & CE Department to appoint suitable person to take over the charge. But, the 1st accused had conducted festival by violating the court order and the 1st accused and his associates assaulted some persons and the case in Crime No.147/2026 has been registered. Subsequently, on the instigation of the 1st accused, his sons abused the defacto complainant and his associates in filthy language and published the abusive language in facebook and threatened him through instagram ID. On 15.05.2026, the accused persons abused the parents of the defacto complainant and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him with aruval and stick and when A1 assaulted on the head of the defacto complainant, which was prevented by him and caused injury on his right hand and cut of the little finger and also sustained injuries all over body and if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every

chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and he is a threat to the intervening petitioner and his family members and prayed that either this bail petition may be dismissed or if the petition is allowed, the petitioner may be directed to comply the condition in some other district.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor also opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are cousin brothers and there are rival groups in connection with the administration of the temple at Melakattuvilai. It is submitted that the defacto complainant had already obtained orders from the Hon'ble High Court in relation to administration of the temple by the HR & CE Department. It is further submitted that an earlier occurrence took place on 25.04.2026 in respect of which Crime No.147/2026 was registered and the petitioner had already obtained anticipatory bail in CrI.M.P.No.33/2026. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that totally there are seven accused in this case. On 15.05.2026, the petitioner and other accused went to the house of the defacto complainant, abused the parents of the defacto complainant and thereafter assaulted the defacto complainant, causing grievous cut injuries on his wrist and severing one of his fingers and the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2026 and the injured was discharged from

the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and therefore the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed grant of bail.

8. It is represented before this Court that the petitioner was admitted as an inpatient in the Government Hospital, Asaripallam for his various health complications and now he is in prison.

9. On 22.05.2026, the defacto complainant appeared in person along with his counsel and produced medical records and other supporting documents showing that, in the course of the occurrence, his little finger had been severed and that he had undergone surgical procedures in connection with the said injuries

10. Today, the Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station appeared before this Court and submitted that the dispute has been referred to the Revenue Divisional Officer, since the issue involves maintenance of public peace and harmony in the locality.

11. This Court reminds the Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station, that the present occurrence is not an isolated incident and that this is the second occasion on which disputes have arisen between the parties. It is brought to the notice of this Court that earlier also a criminal case in Crime No.147 of 2026 had been registered against the very same petitioner and others for offences under Sections 191(2), 126(2), 296(b),

115(2) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. Further, based on the complaint lodged by the 1st accused, another case in Crime No.173 of 2026 has also been registered against the defacto complainant and others for offences under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) and 303(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. Thus, it is evident that there exists a case and counter arising out of the same occurrence. In such circumstances, the respondent police are expected to exercise the preventive powers conferred under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita effectively in order to maintain peace and harmony in the locality and to prevent recurrence of such untoward incidents in future. The police shall also ensure that both cases are investigated fairly, impartially, and independently without showing favour to either side.

12. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the defacto complainant in the present case has also been arrayed as an accused in the connected case and counter registered in Crime No.173 of 2026 arising out of the very same occurrence. It is further submitted that the Hon'ble High Court has already granted anticipatory bail in CrI.O.P.(MD). No. 9696 of 2026 dated: 20.05.2026 to the present defacto complainant who was arrayed as accused therein. The existence of a case and counter arising out of the same transaction is also a relevant circumstance to be taken into

consideration while considering the present bail application.

13. Considering the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner/accused, the medical records produced before this Court, the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital, the existence of case and counter, and also considering the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner/accused for the past nine days, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused subject to conditions.

14. In the result, the petitioner/accused is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil.

Upon release, the petitioner shall stay at Egmore, Chennai, and shall appear before and sign before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate No.II, Egmore, Chennai daily at 10.30 A.M. until further orders.

15. This Court makes it clear that the present bail application is being allowed taking into consideration the medical condition of the petitioner/accused, the period of incarceration already undergone, the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, and also the existence of the connected case and counter arising out of the same occurrence.

16. This order has been passed based on the peculiar facts and circumstances placed before this Court and shall not confer any advantage upon the co-accused persons. It is further made clear that this order shall not have any bearing upon any bail applications that may be filed by the co-accused.

If there is any violation of the conditions imposed herein, the Investigation Officer is at liberty to approach the jurisdictional Court seeking cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that bail has been granted by the Sessions Court, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala**.

Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Metropolitan Magistrate No.II, Egmore, Chennai.

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

The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

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

The counsel for the petitioner.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 258/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000335-2026)

1. Aji, S/o Ayyappan (A1)
2. Sreejith @ Mottai Sreejith (A2)
S/o. Selvan
3. Sunil, S/o Rajan (A3)
4. Mahesh, S/o. Nagarajan (A4) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Peachiparai Police Station,
Crime No. 24/2026 of Peachiparai Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that on 10.05.2026 at about 7.30 P.M., the accused persons abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him with stone and hand, caused injuries and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

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

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 10.05.2026, the 1st accused assaulted the defacto complainant with stick on his back, chest and hand, A2 assaulted him with stick and A3 and A4 assaulted him 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 petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

6. It is the case of the prosecution that all the accused assaulted the defacto complainant and caused injuries to him. The learned

Public Prosecutor would state that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. 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 No.II, Padmanabhapuram subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall stay at Madurai, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.
- 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai.
The Inspector of Police, Peachiparai Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners.

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	Crl.M.P.No. 196/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்	29.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	மணிகண்டன் த/பெ ஆறுமுகம்
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

(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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 196/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000253-2026)

Manikandan, S/o Arumugam

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eraniel Police Station,

Crime No. 140/2026 of Eraniel Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Legal Aid Defence Counsel
Thiru. S.P. Ashika Prasad, u/s 483 of BNSS praying to grant bail to the
petitioner.

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the petition and the materials available on
record.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed offences punishable under the relevant provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita pertaining to house trespass, rape, criminal intimidation and allied offences. The case of the prosecution is that, on 15.03.2026 at about 10.30 P.M., the defacto complainant, who is an elderly woman, retired to sleep in her house. According to the prosecution, at about 1.00 A.M. in the midnight, the defacto complainant heard the sound of the front door being opened and found that the petitioner had entered into her house. It is alleged that the petitioner informed the defacto complainant that the police were searching for him and requested permission to stay in her house for the night, which was accepted by the defacto complainant considering their acquaintance and relationship.

3. Thereafter, taking advantage of the situation and the vulnerability of the aged victim, the petitioner allegedly dragged the defacto complainant to her cot, closed her mouth, abused her in obscene language and forcibly committed rape on her against her will. It is further alleged that the petitioner criminally intimidated the defacto complainant with dire consequences in order to prevent her from disclosing the occurrence to others. Hence, the present case came to be registered.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to the petitioner, the defacto complainant and the petitioner are relatives and there existed previous enmity between the families in respect of certain property disputes. It is further submitted that, on the date of occurrence, a temple festival was taking place in the village and during such time, the third son of the defacto complainant, namely Mathan, picked up a quarrel with the petitioner. Due to such previous enmity and with an intention to adversely affect the life and reputation of the petitioner, a false and fabricated complaint has been lodged against him with the assistance of the defacto complainant.

5. The learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 16.03.2026 and has been in judicial custody for more than 65 days. It is also submitted that the investigation has already been completed, final report has been filed and the case has been taken on file in PRC No.18 of 2026 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. The earlier bail application filed by the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.1314 of 2026 before the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil, came to be dismissed on 29.04.2026. Since the investigation has now been completed

and the petitioner is willing to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court, the learned counsel prayed for grant of bail.

6. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application and submitted that the victim in the present case is a woman aged about 72 years, who was residing alone in her house. It is submitted that, during the midnight hours of 16.03.2026, the petitioner criminally trespassed into the house of the victim and forcibly committed sexual assault upon her by penetrating his penis into her vagina. When the victim raised alarm, the petitioner allegedly threatened her with dire consequences. It is further submitted that the victim sustained bleeding injuries on her private parts and was immediately admitted to the hospital for treatment.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 16.03.2026 and that the allegations levelled against him are grave and heinous in nature. Considering the age of the victim, the manner in which the offence was allegedly committed and the seriousness of the allegations, the learned Public Prosecutor raised strong objection to the grant of bail and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

8. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions 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.1314 of 2026 and the same was dismissed by order dated 29.04.2026. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the investigation has since been completed and final report has been filed, this Court is unable to ignore the gravity and seriousness of the allegations levelled against the petitioner.

9. The allegations disclose a heinous offence alleged to have been committed against an aged woman residing alone in her house during midnight hours. The age and vulnerability of the victim, coupled with the specific allegations regarding forcible sexual assault and criminal intimidation, weigh heavily against the petitioner. At this stage, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has not made out any sufficient ground warranting grant of bail. Mere completion of investigation by itself cannot be a sole ground for enlarging the petitioner on bail, particularly having regard to the nature of accusations and the surrounding circumstances of the case.

10. This Court also finds that no substantial change in circumstances has been demonstrated by the petitioner after dismissal of the earlier bail

application so as to take a different view in the present petition. Hence, this Court is of the view that the present petition is devoid of merits.

11. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 165/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000241-2026)

Rabeesh,
S/o Vaikunda Dhas

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Asaripallam Police Station,
Crime No. 55/2026 of Asaripallam Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the petition.
2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the offence u/s 109, 118(1), 126(2), 127(2), 296(b) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity between the accused and the defacto complainant, on 02.05.2026 at about 11.15 P.M. when the defacto complainant along with his friend went to their home, the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy words, made an attempt to cause cut injury on his neck and the same was prevented by the defacto complainant with his hand and sustained injuries in his hand and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 03.05.2026 and the investigation is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 02.05.2026 the petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and attempted to inflict cut injury on the neck of the defacto complainant with aruval, but he restrained the same with his hand and he sustained cut injury on his left wrist and he abused the friend of the defacto complainant and threatened him and the petitioner was arrested on

03.05.2026. The petitioner is a rowdy element in that locality and he is a history sheeter in HS No. 14/2025 of Asaripallam Police Station and he has four previous cases and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the nature of the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and also considering period of incarceration of the petitioner/accused i.e for the past 26 days, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused with conditions.

7. In the result, the petitioner/accused is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Nagercoil.

Upon release, the petitioner shall stay at Thanjavur and shall appear and sign before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thanjavur, daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.

If there is any violation of the above conditions, the Investigation Officer is at liberty to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned for cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that the bail was granted by the Sessions Court, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court

in P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thanjavur.

The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil.

(through e-mode)

The Inspector of Police, Asaripallam Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

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

The counsel for the petitioner.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 182/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000251-2026)

Prabha W/o. Bino V Daniel (A3)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No. 33/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS and 21(1) of Mines and
Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 18.04.2026 in
Crl.M.P.No.1051/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign

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

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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.215/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000228-2026)

1. Sudhagar (A 1)

S/o. Appavu Nadar

2. Kalaiselvan (A 2)

S/o. Subbiah Nadar

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

South Thamaraikulam Police Station,

Crime No. 198/2025 of South Thamaraikulam Police Station,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The 1st petitioner was granted anticipatory bail and the 2nd petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 27.10.2025 in CrI.M.P.No.3911/2025 and CrI.M.P.No.3733/2025 respectively with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and subsequently the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 24.11.2025 in CrI.M.P. No.4434/2025 and CrI.M.P. No.4431/2025 respectively 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 and thereafter, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 23.01.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.228/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police monthly once i.e on first day of every month 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 01.02.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners have been complying the modified condition from 01.02.2026.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition, this court is inclined to 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.276/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000327-2026)

Jose S/o. Sundarraaj (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Thiruvattar Police Station,
Crime No. 7/2026 of Thiruvattar 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 296(b), 118(l) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1376/2026 with
condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police

daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 277/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000328-2026)

1. Uthayaprakash S/o. Chandraperumal (A1)
3. Sanjay S/o. Azhagesan (A3)
3. M. Thanu Moorthy S/o. T. Manoharan (A4) ... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Nesamony Nagar Police Station,
Crime No.86/2026 of Nesamony Nagar Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. .. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS.

3. The petitioners 1 and 2/A1 and A3 were granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1378/2026 and the 3rd petitioner/A4 was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1375/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police station daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 and due to their illness, the 1st petitioner/A1 did not comply the condition on 14.05.2026, and the 2nd petitioner/A3 did not comply the condition on 15.05.2026 and the 3rd petitioner/A4 did not comply the condition 23.05.2026 and prayed that the non compliance of condition by the petitioners may be condoned.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application submitted that the 1st petitioner/A1 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 14.05.2026 and 2nd petitioner/A3 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 15.05.2026 and the 3rd petitioner/A4 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 23.05.2026.

6. Considering the reason stated by the learned counsel for the petitioners/accused, this court is inclined to condone the non compliance of condition by the petitioners.

7. In the result, non compliance of condition by the petitioners is condoned and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 248/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000189-2026)

1. Sajjad S V, S/o. Sasi
2. Sonusimon S.M, S/o. Simon
3. Manu S/o. Mani
4. Sajin S V, S/o. Sasi ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Arumanai Police Station,
Crime No. 51/2026 of Arumanai Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru D. Prabin Babu, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal

Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 11.03.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.

814/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thoothukudi daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified on 17.04.2026 in CrI.M.P.No.1133/2026 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., and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the modified condition from 20.04.2026 onwards and the 1st petitioner is working as a school van driver and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

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

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and the stage of investigation and also considering the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners, this court is inclined to relax the condition in respect of 1st petitioner and in respect of other petitioners, condition is modified.

7. In the result, in respect of 1st petitioner, condition is totally relaxed and in respect of petitioners 2 to 4, condition is modified that the petitioners 2 to 4 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Inspector of Police, Arumanai Police Station.

(through court cell e-mode)

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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.274/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000326-2026)

1. Uthayaprakash S/o. Chandraperumal (A1)
2. Manikandan S/o. Krishnan (A2)
3. Sanjay S/o. Azhagesan (A3)
4. M. Thanu Moorthy S/o. T. Manoharan (A4)
5. Krishnan .B, S/o. Balaji (A5) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Nesamony Nagar Police Station,
Crime No.86/2026 of Nesamony Nagar Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS.

3. The petitioners 1 to 3 and 5/A1 to A3 and A5 were granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1378/2026 and the 4th petitioner/A4 was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1375/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 1st petitioner/A1 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 14.05.2026, and the 3rd petitioners/A3 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 15.05.2026 and the 4th petitioner/A4 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 23.05.2026 and the petitioners 2 and 5/A2 and A5 have been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st petitioner/A1 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 14.05.2026 and 3rd petitioner/A3 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 15.05.2026 and the 4th petitioner/A4 has been complying the condition from 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 except on 23.05.2026 and the petitioners 2 and 5/A2 and A5 have been complying the condition 05.05.2026 to 26.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.263/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000292-2026)

1. Brabhu S/o. Nagamani (A 1)

2. Stebin S/o. Kumar (A2)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No.67/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 296(b), 329(3), 324(4) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 17.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1224/2026 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 02.05.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition only from 02.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.262/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000347 -2026)

Starwin Jebaraj S/o. Jebaraj (A6)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Vadasery Police Station,
Crime No. 69/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru 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 49, 191(2), 191(3), 329(4), 324(5), 296(b),
115(2), 118(1), 74, 303(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1126/2026 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 an advocate and he has been complying the condition from 11.05.2026 except on 23.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 11.05.2026 except on 23.05.2026.

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 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 233/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000303-2026)

Albert S/o. Joseph (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Eraniel Police Station,
Crime No. 168/2026 of Eraniel 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 223, 289, 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 petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1150/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 06.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.214/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000274-2026)

1. Joseph Singh.T S/o. Thangaiyan (A 1)
2. Vijaya W/o. Joseph Singh.T (A 2)
3. Lawrence S/o. Chellapan (A4)
4. M. Jeba Singh S/o. Muthu Nayagam (A5) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Crime No. 522/2025 of Thuckalay Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru K. Justin Christoper, praying
to relax the condition imposed on the petitioners previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 191(2), 329(3), 324(4), 303(2), 296(b) and
351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 17.09.2025 in Crl.M.P. No.3480/2025 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 25.10.2025 in Crl.M.P. No. 4015/2025 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 and subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 23.01.2026 in Crl.M.P. No. 245/2026 with condition that the petitioners should 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.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the modified condition from 01.02.2026 to 01.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners have been complying the modified condition from 01.02.2026 to 01.05.2026.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition, this court is inclined to 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.255/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000338-2026)

Pranav, S/o. Aju

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Palugal Police Station,
Crime No. 88/2026 of Palugal Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 329(3), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 11.05.2026 at about 12.15 P.M., when the defacto complainant and her daughter were in their house, the accused trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant armed with a knife, abused them in filthy words and criminally intimidated them by forcing the daughter to marry him and assaulted them. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he is suffering from adjustment disorder and is undergoing treatment at CSI Medical College Hospital, Thiruvananthapuram and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the occurrence was happened on 11.05.2026 and the FIR has been registered only on 18.05.2026 and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 11.05.2026 the petitioner trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and strangulated her neck and subsequently, the petitioner trespassed into the bedroom and strangulated the neck of the

daughter of the defacto complainant and tore her nighty and threatened her and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the petitioner has no previous cases 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 submissions made by the learned Public Prosecutor and the materials available on record. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner/accused, particularly the specific allegation relating to outraging the modesty of the woman victim and tearing of her nighty during the occurrence, this Court is of the view that adequate safeguards are required to ensure a fair investigation and to prevent any possibility of intimidation or interference with the victim. At the same time, considering the fact that the injured persons have already been discharged from the hospital and having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to stringent conditions. In order to ensure the safety and confidence of the victim and to prevent any undue influence or contact with the prosecution witnesses, this Court is also of the view that a condition restraining the petitioner from entering/staying within the limits of the concerned town for a specified period, except for the purpose of

investigation or appearance before the Court, is necessary.

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 stay at Kanchipuram, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kanchipuram 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kanchipuram

The Inspector of Police, Palugal Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioner.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.220/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000296 -2026)

Alon Jino S/o. Mathias (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Karungal Police Station,
Crime No. 131/2026 of Karungal 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) 127(2), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of
BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1396/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 06.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode)
The Sub 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 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 269/2026

CNR.No.TNKKOV-000325-2026)

Jeya Bharath, S/o. Sudar

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing, Nagercoil,
Crime No. 74/2026 of P.E.W. Nagercoil,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru D. Mathi, 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 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(A) and 25 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic
Substances Act and Sec. 123 of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that based on secret
information, on 11.05.2026 at about 12.30 P.M. the Head Constable of
respondent police received secret information that the accused was standing
near Chadayapuram river at Thirupathisaram with a two wheeler KTM
Duke 390 bearing Reg. No. TN74 BE 9984 and was selling Ganja.

Thereafter, the police party approached the accused and found that the accused is in possession of Ganja intended for sale. Upon searching the two wheeler, the police found a plastic cover kept under the seat and on opening the cover, it was found to contain 50 grams of ganja. Subly, the police seized the two wheeler, one iPhone, 16 Pro mobile phone and the money alleged to have been received from the e of ganja. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is a college student and he is in no way connected with this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 11.05.2026 and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 11.05.2026 this petitioner was found in possession of 50 grams of Ganja and the petitioner was arrested by the police and seized the contraband and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The petitioner has been remanded to judicial custody alleging that he has committed offences punishable u/s 123 of BNS and Sec. 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(A) and 25 of NDPS Act He is in custody since 11.05.2026.

7. Section 8(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act provides that no person shall produce, manufacture, possess, sell any narcotic drug or psychotropic substance, except for medical or scientific purposes and in the manner and to the extent provided by the provisions of the said Act or the rules or orders made thereunder.

8. Section 20(b)(ii)(A) of NDPS Act provides for punishment of rigorous imprisonment for a term which may extend to one year or with fine which may extent to Rs.10,000/- or with both. Section 123 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, provides that whoever administers to, or causes to be taken by, any person any poison or any stupefying, intoxicating or unwholesome drug or other substance, with intent to cause hurt to such person, or with intent to commit or facilitate the commission of an offence, or knowing it to be likely that hurt may thereby be caused, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years and shall also be liable to fine.

9. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions and the materials available on record. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the contraband allegedly seized from the petitioner falls within the category of “small quantity”. This Court also takes into consideration the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner/accused. Having regard to the nature of allegations, the quantity of contraband involved and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the considered view that continued custodial

detention of the petitioner is not necessary at this stage. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused subject to stringent conditions in order to secure his presence during investigation and trial

10. In the result, the petitioner/accused is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Boothapandy.

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

Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy. (through e-Mode)
The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil.
(through e-Mode)
The Inspector of Police, Prohibition Enforcement Wing, Nagercoil.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The Superintendent, District Jail, Nagercoil.(through e-mode)
The counsel for the petitioner.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.211/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000267 -2026)

Jefin @ Jebin S/o. Justin Kumar (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Kulasekharam Police Station,

Crime No. 79/2026 of Kulasekharam Police Station,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS and Sec. 21(1) of Mines and
Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1235/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram. (through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Kulasekharam Police Station.
(through court cell e-mode)

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

C.C. No. 221/2018 of the Judicial Magistrate,
Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.

CrI.M.P. No.279/2026 in CA No. 5/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000354 -2026)

1. Sindhu Margret (A1)

W/o. Vinoth

2. Renjith Kumar (A2)

S/o Lakshmanan

... Petitioners/Appellants

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Rep. by the Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station, Nagercoil,

through the Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Suresh Babu, u/s 430 of BNSS,
praying to suspend the sentence imposed on the petitioners in C.C. No. 221/2018 of
the Court of Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil by Judgment
dated 30.04.2026 till the disposal of appeal.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners seek suspension of sentence pending disposal of appeal.

3. It appears that the petitioners have been convicted by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil in C.C No.221/2018 by Judgment dated 30.04.2026 and the 1st petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year for the offence u/s 75 of Juvenile Justice (Care & Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and the 2nd petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year for the offence u/s 323 of IPC.

4. Aggrieved by the Judgment and conviction, the petitioners/A1 and A2 have filed this appeal and this petition to suspend the sentence.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners were on bail during trial and they have every chance to win the appeal and the trial court has suspended the sentence till 29.05.2026 and prayed to suspend the sentence.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and prays for dismissal of this application.

7. Considering the fact that the arguable points are available to the petitioners to challenge the conviction, this court is inclined to suspend the substantive sentence alone and the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail.

8. In the result, the substantive sentence of imprisonment imposed on

the petitioners by the lower court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their surrendering before the court concerned within 15 days from the date of this order and on their executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil and accordingly this petition is allowed.

On the failure of the petitioners to comply with the above said condition, the suspension granted to them shall stand automatically cancelled.

Appeal stands posted on 01.07.2026.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.280/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000316-2026)

1. Sekharan S/o. Chellappan (A 1)
2. Rajish S/o. Thanka Nadar (A 2)
3. Vinojith S/o. William (A 3) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Thiruvattar Police Station,
Crime No.135/2026 of Thiruvattar Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1385/2026 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition only from 06.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 219/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000297-2026)

1. John Poll (A1)
S/o. John Bosco
2. Sharmi (A3)
C/o. Anu
3. Pouli (A4)
W/o. John Bosco
4. Siluvai Dhasan (A5)
S/o. Peter
5. Sahayarani (A6)
W/o. Siluvai Dhasan

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kollencode Police Station,
Crime No. 111/2026 of Kollencode 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 petitioners.

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 79 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution is that, on 14.05.2026 at about 8.00 P.M., the accused persons abused the defacto complainant and his family members in filthy language, caused injuries by using deadly weapons and criminally intimidated them. Hence, the present case has been registered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. It is submitted that the injured persons were discharged from the hospital and that a counter case in Crime No.111 of 2026 has also been registered against the defacto complainant and others arising out of the same occurrence. It is further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court and therefore prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant and A3, namely Sharmi, were earlier in a love relationship. Subsequently, the defacto complainant married another woman, who has been arrayed as A1 in the counter case. Even thereafter, the defacto complainant is alleged to have continued sending obscene messages to A3/Sharmi. Therefore, on 14.05.2026, when the issue

was questioned, the petitioners allegedly abused the defacto complainant and assaulted him and his relatives. It is specifically alleged that A1 attacked the brother-in-law of the defacto complainant with an iron rod on his head, A2 assaulted with a wooden rod, A5 assaulted with a knife and A3, A5 and A6 assaulted the wife, sister and aunt of the defacto complainant, pulled their hair and criminally intimidated them. It is further submitted that, though the injured persons were discharged from the hospital, the investigation is still pending and therefore the learned Public Prosecutor raised serious objection to the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. It is seen that both the present case and the counter case have arisen out of the very same occurrence and that allegations have been made by both groups against each other. Though specific overt acts have been attributed against the petitioners and the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application on the ground that the investigation is still pending, this Court also takes note of the fact that all the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital and no material has been placed before this Court to show that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is absolutely necessary at this stage.

7. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused, the existence of case and counter

case, the fact that the injured persons have already been discharged from the hospital and balancing the requirements of investigation with the personal liberty of the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused subject to stringent conditions.

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

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil.
(through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Kollencode Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 241/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000342 -2026)

Ramkumar S/o. Murugan (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No. 133/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Suresh Gobi, 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.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1335/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 07.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 07.05.2026 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 240/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000312-2026)

Thanga Ruban, S/o. Thamothiran Issac (A5)

..Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Puthukadai Police Station,
Crime No. 2/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

..Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s 420 and 468 of IPC.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant's husband executed a settlement deed in favour of his own son who is the 2nd accused through the Munchirai Sub-Registrar office on 16.04.2013. In the settlement deed, a condition was stipulated that the son should not exchange or transfer the property during the lifetime of the settlor. Meanwhile, 2nd accused, the son of the defacto complainant obtained a loan by mortgaging the property, with his wife (1st accused) acting as guarantor for the said loan. The 3rd and 4th accused signed as witnesses in the Memorandum of deposit of title deeds (MOD). The 5th accused was an employee working in Bajaj Finance Limited and so the defacto complainant stated that all the accused cheated the defacto complainant's husband. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is working in Bajaj Finance Ltd., and was unaware of the alleged incidents and he has not involved in obtaining signatures from clients in connection with loan transactions and he has been falsely implicated in this case. The defacto complainant and her husband have jointly filed a civil suit in OS No.89/2025 which is pending before the Principal District Munsif Court, Kuzhithurai. The present criminal case has been filed only with an intention to evade repayment of loan EMI amounts.

The defacto complainant and her son have colluded together and lodged this false case against the petitioner and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 2nd accused is the son of the defacto complainant. The mother is the complainant and A2 is the son. Wife of A2 is arrayed as A1. Actually, the father of A1 and husband of the defacto complainant executed a settlement deed in favour of his son A2 and there is some condition that the defacto complainant is having life estate. She can reside in the house till her death (i.e.) one of the condition. A2 is the government servant and he is working in Panchayat Office. But, he executed a mortgage deed in favour of Bajaj Finance Limited forging the signature of his mother. She did not put any signature. A2 did not pay the loan amount. So, the defacto complainant received a notice from the finance company and she came to know that the forged signature of her. The petitioner is the Branch Manager of the Bajaj Finance Private Limited. A3 and A4 are attesting witnesses and the investigation of the case is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The case of the prosecution is that A1 and A2, being the daughter-in-law and son of the defacto complainant, had committed the alleged acts constituting the offences complained of. The husband of the defacto complainant, who is the father of the 2nd accused, had executed a settlement deed in favour of the 2nd accused while reserving a life estate in respect of the property in favour of the de facto complainant. Suppressing the existence of such life estate and by allegedly impersonating the defacto complainant, the 2nd accused, along with his wife, namely the 1st accused, is stated to have executed a Memorandum of Deposit of Title Deeds (MOD) in favour of Bajaj Finance Limited for securing a loan of Rs.18,70,000/- and that too before the Sub-Registrar Office, which warrants serious concern. Thereafter, since A1 and A2 had allegedly failed to repay the loan amount, the finance company initiated proceedings and issued notices to the concerned parties, through which the defacto complainant came to know about the loan transaction as well as the mortgage created by allegedly impersonating her in the documents executed in favour of the finance company.

7. Insofar as A3 and A4 are concerned, they are alleged to be the attesting witnesses to the transaction. A5, being an employee of Bajaj Finance Limited and the petitioner herein, is alleged to have acted in

connivance with A3 and A4 in facilitating the loan transaction. Prima facie, the role attributed to A5 appears to be significant, since he was an officer attached to the concerned financial institution and is alleged to have actively participated in the creation of the loan documents and mortgage deed by suppressing material particulars. The allegations levelled against A5 are serious in nature. Hence, this Court is of the view that the application deserves to be dismissed.

8. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 228/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000305-2026)

1. Hari Ram S/o. Ashokan (A4)
 2. Prabu S/o. Mani (A5)
 3. Ashik Sam @ Atchu (A6)
- S/o. Nelson

... Petitioners

/Vs./

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

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that on 24.04.2026, the accused
persons waylaid the informant at 3.00 P.M., near Thengamputhur Murugan

Temple and caused injuries with aruval and hands due to a previous motive at a parotta stall. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused were granted bail and anticipatory bail by this court on 22.05.2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that totally there are six accused in this case. The 1st accused is running a hotel. Two days prior to the occurrence, the defacto complainant went to the hotel of 1st accused and there was a wordy quarrel between them regarding the supply of gravy. So there is a previous enmity between the defacto complainant and 1st accused. Then A1 and A2 to A6 conspired together to do away the defacto complainant. On 24.04.2026, A1 to A6 were waiting for defacto complainant with deadly weapon. The defacto complainant came to the spot and A1 identified him to other accused and escaped from there. Then accused Prabhu inflicted cut injury with aruval on the head of the defacto complainant and then the 3rd accused inflicted cut injury with aruval and then the accused Ashik Shiam assaulted the friend of the defacto complainant with stone. A2 to A4 instigated the other accused

to assault the defacto complainant and the injured were discharged from the hospital and the 3rd accused was arrested on 08.05.2026 and the weapon and one motor cycle were recovered from the 3rd accused and the investigation is not yet over and one of the co-accused was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P. No.121/2026 and some of the co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.Nos. 114/2026 and 52/2026 on 22.05.2026 and in the event of considering this application, same condition is to be imposed.

6. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused were released on bail, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

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

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.

- ii. After release, the petitioners shall 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 29th day of May, 2026.

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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 266/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000309-2026)

V. Selvakumar S/o. Vaikundaperumal (A1) ... Petitioner

/Vs./

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

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Jayakumar, praying to extend
the time to appear before the court concerned.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the Petition.

2. Offence alleged u/s 191(2), 126(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(3) of
BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court on 08.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.33/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear before the court concerned within 15 days from the date of order.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that on 15.05.2026, the petitioner appeared before the respondent police and has co-operated for the investigation and the respondent police only given a medical memo to the petitioner as to take necessary medical treatment before the competent authority and significantly, the alleged injured person also enlarged on bail and also he has been discharged from the hospital and the informant lodged a false complaint against him and a case was registered against him in Crime No.172/2026, in which the petitioner has been arrested and placed before the government hospital for taking treatment. Therefore, 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 submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner is not able to execute the surety within the stipulated time, since he has been arrested in another case in Crime No.172/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station 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 and this court directs the petitioner to surrender before the court concerned within one week from today and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge.
Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 208/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000278-2026)

Eswaramoorthy (A1)
S/o. Lakshamanan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Aralvaimozhy Police Station,

Crime No. 160/2026 of Aralvaimozhy Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Sahaya Arasu, 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) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the defacto complainant and
the accused are doing flower business at Thoivalai. On 10.05.2026, a quarrel

arose between the accused and the defacto complainant at the Murugan temple ground near the church at Thovalai and during that dispute, the accused abused the defacto complainant and assaulted him with stick and beaten the defacto complainant and also stabbed him on his back with scissors and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and a counter case in Crime No.162/2026 is registered against the defacto complainant u/s 115(2) and 118(1) of BNS and after the occurrence, the petitioner was admitted in the Government Hospital, Boothapandy from 10.05.2026 to 13.05.2026 and for further treatment, again he was admitted in the Government Medical College Hospital, Asaripallam from 13.05.2026 to 18.05.2026 and the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 10.05.2026 this petitioner and two other accused abused the defacto complainant and assaulted him 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 petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab* reported as *AIR 1980 SC 1632*, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

7. In the present case, considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused, this court finds

that it would be appropriate to adopt the said approach of Hon'ble Supreme Court, so that both the rights referred above are balanced. As such, this petition deserves to be allowed with conditions.

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

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the SHO, Aralvaimozhy Police Station on 02.06.2026 before 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which he shall be in the custody of the Investigation Officer of Crime No.160/2026 of Aralvaimozhy Police Station till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be used by the Investigation Officer for investigation, after which he shall be released from custody.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- iii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iv. The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.

- v. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- vi. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.235/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000329 -2026)

Manikandan S/o. Sornappan (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Vadasery Police Station,
Crime No. 270/2025 of Vadasery Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 194 of BNSS @ Sec. 191(2), 296(b) and
103(1) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 18.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1211/2026 with

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 21.04.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 21.04.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.261/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000319-2026)

Jeyachandran S/o. Ponniah Nadar (A21)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,
Crime No. 7/2026 of DCB, Nagercoil,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 420, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 08.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1165/2026 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 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1388/2026 that the petitioner should appear and sign before the Kanyakumari Police Station 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 25.04.2026 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 25.04.2026 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 Sub Inspector of Police, Kanyakumari Police Station 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 265/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000346-2026)

Starwin Jebaraj, S/o. Jebaraj (A6)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Vadasery Police Station,
Crime No. 69/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 49, 191(2), 191(3), 329(4), 324(5),
296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 74, 303(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1126/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police station daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 11.05.2026 and due to viral fever, on 23.05.2026 he did not comply the condition 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 only from 11.05.2026, except on on 23.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

7. In the result, non compliance of condition by the petitioner on 23.05.2026 is condoned and accordingly this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 226/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000311-2026)

Shafi @ Bisinul Shafi (A2)
S/o. Mohamed Faleel

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Colachel Police Station,
Crime No. 152/2026 of Colachel Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 296(b), 131, 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 21.05.2026 at about 2.00 P.M., the informant and his friend came near TASMAC at Colachel, at the time the accused persons pushed the informant's friend and abused them in filthy words and assaulted the informant by using stone and also 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 he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as stated in the complaint and the injured person has been discharged from the hospital and already the co-accused was released on bail by the lower court and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 21.05.2026 the defacto complainant and his friends consumed alcohol in a tasmac bar, at that time, this petitioner and A1 assaulted the defacto complainant with stone on his head and A1 was arrested by the police and released on bail and the 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 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/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, Eraniel, subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioner shall stay at Pudukkottai, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Pudukkottai daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.
- iii. The 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Pudukkottai
The Inspector of Police, Colachel 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 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 230/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000301-2026)

Vasan @ Vasagarajan

S/o. Chellappan

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

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

Crime No. 82/2026 of C.S.C.I.D. Kuzhithurai at Nagercoil,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s 6(3) and 6(4) of Scheduled Commodities Order and Sec. 7(i)(a)
(ii) of Essential Commodities Act of 1955.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on secret information, the respondent police found 3000 kgs of rice and 2000 kgs of wheat were found at the coconut grove of one Anandakrishnan at Kovilvilai. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is the innocent and working at a ration shop No.Y88 Pallam Meenavar Co-operative Sangam as helper and he is innocent and he is in no way connected with this case and the vehicle along with contraband seized by the respondent police and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application and submitted that on 16.05.2026, A1 to A10 conspired together and stolen 3000 kgs of rice and 2000 kgs of wheat from the Civil Supply Godown and illegally transported the same and handed over the same to A1. A1 wanted to smuggle the same to Kerala. On 17.05.2026 the CSCID Police recovered the contraband from a coconut garden. A1 is a purchaser of rice, A2/present petitioner is an employee in a ration shop, A3 is working as an Assistant Quality Inspector of Civil Supply Corporation, A4 is working as a Bill Collector in Civil Supply Corporation, A5 is working as a Junior Assistant of Civil Supply Corporation, A6 is a loadman, A7 and A8 are acted as mediators, A9 is the person who drove the lorry, A0 is the watchman of the Civil Supply Corporation. A1, A7 and A8 were arrested on

17.05.2026, A9 was arrested on 19.05.2026, A3 and A9 were arrested on 22.05.2026 and A10 was arrested on 23.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over and Goondas proceedings initiated against A1, A3 and A4 and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. According to the prosecution, the present seizure is only a small portion of the illegal activity and appears to be merely the “tip of the iceberg”. The learned Public Prosecutor would emphasize that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is absolutely necessary to achieve a major breakthrough in the investigation, including the identification of the principal offenders storage points, procurement channels, and the larger conspiracy behind the organised diversion of PDS rice.

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

8. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. It is the specific case of the prosecution that 2000 kilograms of rice and 3000 kilograms of wheat meant exclusively for the Public Distribution System were recovered in connection with the present occurrence. Though the quantity seized may not by itself be the sole deciding factor, the apprehension expressed by the prosecution regarding the possible existence of a larger organised racket engaged in the illegal diversion and transportation of PDS commodities cannot be lightly brushed aside at this stage of investigation.

9. The materials placed before this Court indicate that the investigating agency is attempting to ascertain whether the present occurrence forms part of a wider chain of illegal procurement, diversion and interstate transportation of PDS commodities, particularly in view of the huge quantity of rice and wheat allegedly recovered near the interstate border area. The investigating agency is also attempting to examine whether the present occurrence has any nexus with earlier instances relating to missing PDS commodities and to identify the persons, if any, involved in such activities. At this stage, the investigation is still in progress and the possibility of a larger conspiracy or organised illegal activity is a matter that requires thorough investigation.

10. According to the prosecution, the present recovery may only be a

preliminary lead and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effectively investigating the source, movement, storage and intended destination of the seized commodities, as well as to ascertain the involvement of other persons, if any. Considering the serious nature of the allegations, the larger public interest involved in safeguarding commodities intended for distribution to economically weaker sections through the Public Distribution System, the stage of investigation, the alleged interstate movement of huge quantities of essential commodities, and the specific stand taken by the prosecution that custodial interrogation is necessary for a proper and effective investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

11. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 247/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000291-2026)

1. Sango, S/o.Philip (A1)
2. Panitha, W/o. Vinu (A2)
3. Sarji, W/o Sekar (A3)
4. Fredy, S/o Albert (A4)
5. Vineesh, S/o Vinu (A5)
6. Divya M.S, W/o Sango (A6)
7. Sekar, S/o Kilimans (A7)

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kollencode Police Station,
Crime No.112/2026 of Kollencode Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 191(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 79 and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the 1st accused sent text messages to the sister of the defacto complainant, which was questioned by the mother of the defacto complainant, resulting in a dispute between the parties. Subsequently, the accused persons are alleged to have unlawfully assembled, abused the defacto complainant, assaulted him with an iron rod and criminally intimidated him. Hence, the present case has been registered. It is also seen that the defacto complainant and his relatives have been arrayed as accused in Crime No.112 of 2026 on the basis of similar allegations arising out of the very same occurrence.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. According to the petitioners, five years ago, the sister of the defacto complainant and the 1st petitioner were in a love relationship, but due to lack of consent from both families, the relationship was terminated. Thereafter, both of them married different persons and settled in their respective matrimonial lives. It is further submitted that, about six months ago, the sister of the defacto complainant contacted the 1st accused and started discussing their past relationship, which created animosity on the

side of the defacto complainant and his family members against the accused persons. Due to such previous enmity, on 14.05.2026 at about 8.00 P.M., the defacto complainant along with his family members allegedly unlawfully assembled with deadly weapons, abused the petitioners and assaulted them. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the petitioners' side, a case in Crime No.111 of 2026 was registered against the defacto complainant and five others for offences under Sections 79, 115(2), 118(1), 191(2), 296(b) and 351(3) of BNS. It is further submitted that the injured persons were discharged from the hospital and that the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition imposed by this Court. Hence, the learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st accused had earlier been in a love relationship with A3 in the counter case. Subsequently, the 1st petitioner/A1 married another woman and A3 in the counter case also married another person. Even thereafter, the 1st accused allegedly continued to send obscene messages to A3 in the counter case. Therefore, on 14.05.2026, when the mother of the defacto complainant questioned the conduct of the 1st accused, A1 to A3 allegedly abused her. Thereafter, when the defacto complainant and his relatives intervened to rescue the mother of the defacto complainant, A1 to A7 allegedly abused and assaulted them with iron rods and knives. It is

further submitted that totally six persons sustained injuries in the occurrence, though they were later discharged from the hospital. Since the investigation is still pending, the learned Public Prosecutor raised serious objection to the grant of anticipatory bail and sought dismissal of the petition.

6. Sango has been arrayed as the 1st accused and the allegations against him are that, despite the earlier relationship having ended, he continued to send obscene messages to his erstwhile lover, which ultimately culminated in the present occurrence and the assault alleged on either side. The 1st petitioner is stated to be the prime accused in the present case. Considering the specific overt acts attributed to him and the nature of the allegations, this Court is of the view that the application insofar as the 1st petitioner/A1 is concerned deserves to be dismissed.

7. Insofar as petitioners 2 to 7 are concerned, taking into consideration the nature of the offences alleged against them, the fact that the case and counter case arose out of the same occurrence, and also considering that the injured persons have already been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to petitioners 2 to 7 subject to conditions.

8. In the result, in the event of arrest or on their appearing before the court concerned the petitioners 2 to 7 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties

each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioners 2 to 7 shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners 2 to 7 shall appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Valliyoor daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners 2 to 7 shall also make themselves available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioners 2 to 7 shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioners 2 to 7 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.***

Petition is dismissed in respect of the 1st petitioner/A1.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Judicial Magistrate, Valliyoor.

The Inspector of Police, Kollencode Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

The counsel for the petitioners.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 206/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000280-2026)

1. Kavitha (A1)

W/o. Saravanan

2. Sabeetha (A2)

D/o. Saravanan

3. Sabith (A3)

S/o. Saravanan

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Crime No. 79/2026 of Nesamony Nagar Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Sahaya Arasu, 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 318(4), 296(b) and 351 (3) of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that the petitioner approached the defacto complainant and demanded Rs.4,90,000/- for the study purpose of his son namely 3rd accused and also he executed a promissory note in favour of the defacto complainant. The defacto complainant is suffered from heart disease and so on 27.10.2024, the defacto complainant came to his house and demanded her amount and thereby the 1st accused used filthy languages against the defacto complainant and lodged a false complaint against her and the complainant was enquired by the respondent police. Again on 06.02.2025, the defacto complainant came to his house and demanded her amount, at that time, the accused persons joined together and abused the defacto complainant in filthy languages and criminally intimidated her. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that based on the direction of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil, this case has been registered against the petitioners and the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and it is a purely civil matter 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 A2 is the mother and A3 is the sister of A1. On 03.01.2023, A2 borrowed a sum of Rs.4,90,000/- from the defacto complainant for the engagement expenses of A3. Subsequently, the defacto complainant demanded to return the amount, but the petitioners abused and threatened her. So, the FIR has been registered and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The allegation against the petitioners is that A2 had borrowed a sum of Rs.4,90,000/- from the defacto complainant for meeting the engagement expenses of A3 and that, when the defacto complainant demanded repayment of the said amount, the petitioners abused and threatened her. Though the learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application on the ground that the investigation is still in progress, this Court is of the view that the allegations primarily arise out of a monetary transaction between the parties. At this stage, no material is placed before this Court to indicate that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is absolutely necessary. The apprehension of the prosecution regarding the progress of investigation can be sufficiently safeguarded by imposing appropriate and stringent conditions to secure the petitioners'

cooperation with the investigating agency. Considering the nature of the allegations, the relationship between the parties, the stage of investigation and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to 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 and also they are directed to deposit a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 205/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000273-2026)

1. Dharshini (A1)

D/o. Suyambulingam

2. Krishnathangam P (A2)

W/o. Suyambulingam

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil,

Crime No. 7/2026 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 petitioners.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 79 of BNS and Sec. 4 of TNPWH Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that the complainant on 10.12.2025, while using Instagram received a follow request from an account of user ID(004277), when she accepted it, she found her pictures and her family pictures into it causing insult to the modesty of the complainant. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and the 1st petitioner is a daughter of 2nd petitioner and due to previous enmity, this false case has been foisted against the petitioner and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and no such incident was happened and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st petitioner opened the fake instagram id by using the mobile phone of the 2nd petitioner and published the photograph of the defacto complainant along with the photograph of another one person and put a word “ இப்ப எத்தனாவது புருஷன் கூட இருக்க ”. So this case is registered against the petitioners and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly essential 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. The learned Public Prosecutor objected that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is highly essential. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions including the decision in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab*** reported as ***AIR 1980 SC 1632***, by noting that the court has to strike a balance between the individuals right to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, had pointed out to its earlier orders of anticipatory bail, wherein while granting such orders to many a person had imposed conditions set out in Section 438(2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of Cr.P.C., (now Section 482 (2) (i) (ii) and (iii) of BNSS), in addition to the direction in most of those cases, that the applicant should surrender himself to the police for a brief period if a discovery is to be made u/s 27 of the Evidence Act (now Section 23 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) or that he should be deemed to have surrendered himself, if such discovery is to be made. In other words, the Supreme Court, in order to balance the right of an individual to personal freedom and the investigational rights of the police, even while granting anticipatory bail, has allowed, custody of the accused for a brief period for facilitating discovery u/s 27 of the Evidence Act.

7. In the present case, considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused, this Court finds that it would be appropriate to adopt the approach laid down by the Hon'ble

Supreme Court, so that both the rights referred to above are balanced. As such, this petition deserves to be allowed subject to conditions.

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

i) The 1st petitioner/A1 shall surrender before the SHO, Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil, on 02.06.2026 at 9.00 A.M. without fail, upon which she shall remain in the custody of the Investigation Officer in Crime No.7 of 2026 on the file of Cyber Crime Police Station, Nagercoil, till 6.00 P.M. The said period shall be utilised by the Investigation Officer for the purpose of investigation, after which she shall be released from custody.

ii) The petitioners shall appear before the Court concerned within 15 days from the date of this order without fail.

iii) After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil, daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of two weeks, and thereafter the said condition shall stand automatically relaxed without any further orders from this Court.

iv) The petitioners shall also make themselves available before the respondent police as and when required for the purpose of investigation.

v) The petitioners shall not tamper with witnesses or evidence, nor in any manner interfere with or put any obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.

vi) The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional limits of the respondent police without obtaining 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 29th day of May, 2026.

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)
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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 237/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000313-2026)

Kamaraj S/o. Kuzhanthaivel (A1)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Thuckalay Police Station,

Crime No. 16/2026 of Thuckalay Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru Prasath V, praying to extend the
time to appear before the court concerned.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the Petition.

2. Offence alleged u/s 303(2) of BNS and Sec. 21(1) of MMDR Act.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions
Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 06.03.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.775/2026 with
condition that the petitioner should appear before the court concerned within 15 days
from the date of order and subsequently, one week time is extended by the Principal

Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 25.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1326/2026 .

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that due to his repeated illness, the petitioner 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.1,500/- (Rupees Thousand Five Hundred only) before the Mediation Centre, Nagercoil and accordingly, this petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge.
Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.213/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000276-2026)

1. J. Stalin Anose S/o. Joseph Stalin (A3)
2. A. Bharbanchan S/o. Arockiya Stalin (A4)
3. L. Anish S/o. Lavins (A6) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Inspector of Police,
Colachel Police Station,
Crime No.83/2026 of Colachel Police Station,
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 189(2), 115(2), 296(b) and 109(1) of BNS.

3. The petitioners 1 and 2/A3 and A4 were granted bail by the
Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1210/2026 and the 3rd petitioner/A6 was granted bail by the Principal Sessions

Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1254/2026 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 01.05.2026 to till date and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.234/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000324-2026)

Nagarajan .K, S/o. Kakkandi (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
through the Sub Inspector of Police,
Kottar Police Station,
Crime No. 124/2026 of Kottar Police Station
Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 30.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1333/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 07.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 07.05.2026 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 209/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000281-2026)

Saran S/o. Dennis (Al)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Puthukadai Police Station,

Crime No. 72/2026 of Puthukadai Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

BNS.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 13.03.2026 in CrI.M.P.No.880/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders and subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 01.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 1092/2026 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

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

தீர்ப்பு/உத்தரவுடன் இணைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கவர் ஷீட்

1.	நீதிமன்றத்தின் பெயர்	விடுமுறை கால அமர்வு நீதிமன்றம், நாகர்கோவில்.
2.	வழக்கு எண்	CrI.M.P.No. 242/2026
3.	பிணை மனு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நாள்	29.05.2026
4.	பிணை மறுக்கப்பட்ட நபரின் பெயர்	1. ரம்யா, க/பெ டேவிட்ராஜ் (எ 1) 2. ஸ்ரீகலா, த/பெ தங்கராஜ் (எ 2) 3. அபிஷ், த/பெ விஜயன் (எ 4)
5.	உத்தரவு வழங்கிய நீதிமன்றம் அமைந்துள்ள வளாகத்தில் உள்ள இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையத்தை தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய முகவரி.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், A.D.R. பில்லிங், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம்.
5a.	தொடர்பு கொள்ளவேண்டிய நபரின் பதவி	செயலாளர், மாவட்ட இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம் -629 001.
6.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி மைய தொலைபேசி எண். (நேரம்.....மு.ப.....பி.ப)	04652-220090 (காலை 10 மணி முதல் மாலை 5.45 மணி வரை)
7.	இலவச சட்ட உதவி முகுவின் மாற்று தொலைபேசி எண்கள்.	1. திருமதி சி. கலையரசி ரீனா, எம்.எல்., சிறப்பு நீதிபதி (வனவழக்குகள்), நாகர்கோவில்/செயலாளர் (FAC), இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.9500211010 2. திருமதி ஆர். இராஜேஸ்வரி, முதுநிலை நிர்வாக உதவியாளர், இலவச சட்ட உதவி மையம், நாகர்கோவில், கன்னியாகுமரி மாவட்டம். தொலைபேசி எண்.7708382983

(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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 242/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000334-2026)

1. Ramya, W/o David Raj (A1)
2. Sreekala, D/o Thankaraj (A2)
3. Abish, S/o Vijayan (A4)

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,
Crime No. 3/2026 of District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Dhinesh Kumar, u/s 483
of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioners.

ORDER

1. Heard both sides. Perused the bail petition and the materials
available on record.

2. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed offences
punishable under Sections 61(2) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023.

3.The case of the prosecution is that the accused persons jointly induced the defacto complainant to believe that they were running a welfare organisation and persuaded her to invest huge sums of money in the said scheme. It is alleged that the accused assured the defacto complainant that, if she invested a sum of Rs.1 Crore in the scheme, she would receive a return amount of Rs.6 Crores within a period of six months. Believing such representations and assurances, the defacto complainant is stated to have parted with various amounts totalling Rs.1,30,00,000/- to the accused persons. Thereafter, the accused persons allegedly failed to return either the principal amount or the promised returns and thereby cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the present case came to be registered.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. According to the learned counsel, A1, A2 and the defacto complainant have been acquainted with each other for the past nine years. It is submitted that, on 27.06.2024, the defacto complainant borrowed a sum of Rs.9,50,000/- from A1 and subsequently, on 10.12.2024, borrowed another sum of Rs.9,00,000/- from A2 and executed separate promissory notes in favour of A1 and A2 respectively. However, despite repeated demands, the defacto complainant allegedly failed to repay the said amounts.

5. It is further submitted that, thereafter, legal notices dated 02.01.2026 were issued by A1 and A2 through their counsel calling upon the defacto complainant to repay the borrowed amounts within fifteen days. Since the defacto complainant failed to comply with the demand, A1 filed O.S.No.62 of 2026 and A2 filed O.S.No.63 of 2026 before the learned Additional District Judge, Kuzhithurai, for recovery of the said amounts. According to the learned counsel, due to such previous monetary disputes and vengeance, the present false criminal case has been foisted against the petitioners.

6. The learned counsel further submitted that A2 and A4 are former husband and wife and that they have been living separately from 22.05.2023 and were granted divorce by the Family Court, Padmanabhapuram in I.D.O.P.No.566 of 2025 dated 04.12.2025. It is specifically contended that there was absolutely no financial transaction between A4 and the defacto complainant. It is also submitted that the petitioners have been in judicial custody from 21.05.2026 onwards and that an earlier bail petition in Crl.M.P.No.795 of 2026 was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kuzhithurai on 25.05.2026. The learned counsel submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition imposed by this Court and prayed for grant of bail.

7. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the application and submitted that there are totally six accused involved in the present occurrence. According to the prosecution, the petitioners and the other accused induced the defacto complainant to invest huge amounts in the fraudulent scheme by falsely promising that an investment of Rs.1 Crore would yield Rs.6 Crores within six months.

8. It is further submitted that A6 introduced himself to the defacto complainant as an employee working in Tamil Nadu Grama Bank and thereby gained her confidence. A2 allegedly represented herself as the President of the scheme and A3 was also projected as a key office bearer. Believing such representations, the defacto complainant allegedly transferred and paid a total sum of Rs.1,30,00,000/- to the accused persons.

9. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted the details of the amounts allegedly received by the accused persons as follows:

a) A1 allegedly received a total sum of Rs.42,15,000/-, out of which Rs.18,65,000/- was transferred through bank transactions and the remaining amount was paid by cash.

b) A2 allegedly received a total sum of Rs.69,44,000/-, out of which Rs.47,83,000/- was transferred through bank transactions and the balance amount was paid in cash.

c) A4 allegedly received a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- through bank transaction.

d) A5 allegedly received a sum of Rs.8,41,000/- through bank transaction.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that, despite receipt of such huge amounts, no amount has been recovered so far. It is further submitted that the petitioners had utilised the cheated money for purchase of certain movable and immovable properties and had also issued fake certificates and fabricated documents to the defacto complainant in order to create confidence regarding the alleged scheme.

11. It is further submitted that other accused persons are still absconding and steps are being taken to secure them. The prosecution is also in the process of tracing out the movable and immovable properties acquired by the accused persons and verifying the genuineness of the certificates and documents allegedly issued by them. Since the investigation is still at a preliminary stage and custodial interrogation is necessary for effective investigation and recovery, the learned Public Prosecutor raised serious objection to the grant of bail.

12. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. The allegations levelled against the petitioners disclose serious economic offences involving alleged cheating of the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.1,30,00,000/- by making false promises of exorbitant financial returns.

13. This Court also takes note of the specific submission of the learned Public Prosecutor that substantial portions of the amounts were transferred through banking channels and that the petitioners are unable to satisfactorily explain the receipt of such amounts. Though the learned counsel for the petitioners attempted to contend that no such amount had been received and alternatively submitted that only a sum of Rs.7.5 lakhs was received, no convincing explanation has been offered regarding the bank transactions referred to by the prosecution.

14. Further, the investigation is still at a nascent stage. The prosecution has specifically stated that recovery of the cheated amount is yet to be effected, the movable and immovable properties allegedly purchased from the proceeds of crime are yet to be traced and verified and some of the accused persons are still absconding. At this stage, this Court is of the considered view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners may be necessary for effective investigation.

15. Considering the serious nature of the allegations, the huge amount involved, the stage of investigation and the specific objections raised by the learned Public Prosecutor, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners/accused at this stage.

16. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To
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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.217/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000230-2026)

1. Jesuraj, S/o. Selvaraj (A1)
2. Tharmaraj, S/o. Logendran (A2)
3. Ushendran, S/o. Rajanayagam (A3)
4. Thamilselvan, S/o. Logendran (A4) ... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Kanyakumari Police Station,
Crime No. 419/2025 of Kanyakumari Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil. ... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. Offence alleged u/s 329(4), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(3) of BNS.

3. The petitioners 1 and 2 /A1 and A2 were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.11.2025 in CrI.M.P. Nos. 4090/2025 and 4089/2025 respectively and the petitioners 3 and 4/A3 & A4 were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.11.2025 in CrI.M.P.No. 4091/2025 with condition that the petitioners should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and subsequently the condition was modified by Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 05.12.2025 in CrI.M.P. No.4606/2025 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 and subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 23.01.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 223/2026 with condition that the petitioners should 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.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been complying the modified condition from 01.02.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition from 01.02.2026.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also considering the duration of

compliance of condition, this court is inclined to 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 221/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000306-2026)

Abishek @ Abishek Kumar, S/o. Kathiraven (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Vadasery Police Station,

Crime No. 126/2026 of Vadasery Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 27.04.2026 in
Crl.M.P.No.1352/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign
before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders and
subsequently, the condition was modified by the Principal Sessions Court,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 15.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No. 79/2026 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 is a student studying B.Sc. Nursing in Residence College of Nursing at Bangalore and he has been complying the modified condition from 18.05.2026 and due to the condition, he is unable to attend the class 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 for two days i.e from 18.05.2026.

6. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and also considering the duration of compliance of condition and also considering the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a college student, 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 259/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000349-2026)

Shibu S/o. Raja Gopala Krishnan (A2)

... Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Marthandam Police Station,

Crime No. 431/2025 of Marthandam Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 09.09.2025 in
Crl.M.P.No.3382/2025 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 24.02.2026 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 24.02.2026 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, 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Nagercoil.

To

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 202/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000269-2026)

and

Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P. No.203/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000270-2026)

V. Selvakumar,
S/o. Vaikundaperumal ... Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.202/2026

/Vs./

C. Azhagesan S/o. Chellathurai ... Intervenor/Defacto complainant

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Suchindrum Police Station,
Crime No.172/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

Crl.M.P. No.202/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru R. Jayakumar,
u/s 483 of BNSS, praying to grant bail to the petitioner and the intervening

petition in CrI.M.P. No.203/2026 is filed by Advocate Thiru M. Regu, on behalf of the Intervenor/defacto complainant praying to dismiss the bail petition filed by the accused in CrI.M.P. No.203/2026.

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that on 15.05.2026 at about 10.45 P.M., while the informant was standing in front of his house, the petitioner along with other accused persons surrounded the informant and assaulted him and criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and the petitioner and the defacto complainant was having strained relationship with respect of the administration of the temple. The defacto complainant is residing four kilometre away from that place and he came to the village on the date of incident, for the purpose of creating a commotion against the petitioner and his family and the case in crime No.173/2026 has been registered against the informant and his family members. On 15.05.2026 at about 5.45 P.M., when

the defacto complainant was in his house, this petitioner and two others assaulted the defacto complainant and in that assault, both of them sustained grievous injuries. Now the petitioner is undergoing treatment on the Government Hospital and the defacto complainant discharged from the hospital. The petitioner already suffering from liver and lungs complications and he is 54 years old and the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2026 and at the time of arrest, Section 47 of BNSS has not complied by the respondent police. In the counter case in Crime No.173/2026, the defacto complainant was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court. Moreover, the matter is very simple in respect of the administration of the temple and the petitioner is senior lawyer. and the matter may be referred to mediation and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The aforesaid bail application was moved on 22.05.2026 and along with the bail application an urgent application was also filed, which is allowed and the case was heard at the end of the list. While so , the defacto complainant filed an intervening petition and that petition was numbered as Crl.M.P. No.203/2026. The intervening petitioner is permitted to intervene.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that the 1st accused is the President of Melakattuvilai Arulmigu

Kailasanathar Thirukovil for the past 15 years and in the meantime, on 06.02.2026 the defacto complainant and some others gave an application for electing new office bearers and on that basis, new office bearers including defacto complainant were elected by the members of the temple. Due to that enmity, several complaints are pending. The defacto complainant filed Writ Petition WP CrI.(MD) No.1756/2026 before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court regarding administration of the temple and the High Court has directed the 5th respondent HR & CE Department to appoint suitable person to take over the charge. But, the 1st accused had conducted festival by violating the court order and the 1st accused and his associates assaulted some persons and the case in Crime No.147/2026 has been registered. Subsequently, on the instigation of the 1st accused, his sons abused the defacto complainant and his associates in filthy language and published the abusive language in facebook and threatened him through instagram ID. On 15.05.2026, the accused persons abused the parents of the defacto complainant and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him with aruval and stick and when A1 assaulted on the head of the defacto complainant, which was prevented by him and caused injury on his right hand and cut of the little finger and also sustained injuries all over body and if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every

chance of him tampering the evidence and doing harm to the intervening petitioner and he is a threat to the intervening petitioner and his family members and prayed that either this bail petition may be dismissed or if the petition is allowed, the petitioner may be directed to comply the condition in some other district.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor also opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are cousin brothers and there are rival groups in connection with the administration of the temple at Melakattuvilai. It is submitted that the defacto complainant had already obtained orders from the Hon'ble High Court in relation to administration of the temple by the HR & CE Department. It is further submitted that an earlier occurrence took place on 25.04.2026 in respect of which Crime No.147/2026 was registered and the petitioner had already obtained anticipatory bail in CrI.M.P.No.33/2026. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that totally there are seven accused in this case. On 15.05.2026, the petitioner and other accused went to the house of the defacto complainant, abused the parents of the defacto complainant and thereafter assaulted the defacto complainant, causing grievous cut injuries on his wrist and severing one of his fingers and the petitioner was arrested on 20.05.2026 and the injured was discharged from

the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and therefore the learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed grant of bail.

8. It is represented before this Court that the petitioner was admitted as an inpatient in the Government Hospital, Asaripallam for his various health complications and now he is in prison.

9. On 22.05.2026, the defacto complainant appeared in person along with his counsel and produced medical records and other supporting documents showing that, in the course of the occurrence, his little finger had been severed and that he had undergone surgical procedures in connection with the said injuries

10. Today, the Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station appeared before this Court and submitted that the dispute has been referred to the Revenue Divisional Officer, since the issue involves maintenance of public peace and harmony in the locality.

11. This Court reminds the Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station, that the present occurrence is not an isolated incident and that this is the second occasion on which disputes have arisen between the parties. It is brought to the notice of this Court that earlier also a criminal case in Crime No.147 of 2026 had been registered against the very same petitioner and others for offences under Sections 191(2), 126(2), 296(b),

115(2) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. Further, based on the complaint lodged by the 1st accused, another case in Crime No.173 of 2026 has also been registered against the defacto complainant and others for offences under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) and 303(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. Thus, it is evident that there exists a case and counter arising out of the same occurrence. In such circumstances, the respondent police are expected to exercise the preventive powers conferred under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita effectively in order to maintain peace and harmony in the locality and to prevent recurrence of such untoward incidents in future. The police shall also ensure that both cases are investigated fairly, impartially, and independently without showing favour to either side.

12. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the defacto complainant in the present case has also been arrayed as an accused in the connected case and counter registered in Crime No.173 of 2026 arising out of the very same occurrence. It is further submitted that the Hon'ble High Court has already granted anticipatory bail in CrI.O.P.(MD). No. 9696 of 2026 dated: 20.05.2026 to the present defacto complainant who was arrayed as accused therein. The existence of a case and counter arising out of the same transaction is also a relevant circumstance to be taken into

consideration while considering the present bail application.

13. Considering the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner/accused, the medical records produced before this Court, the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital, the existence of case and counter, and also considering the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner/accused for the past nine days, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused subject to conditions.

14. In the result, the petitioner/accused is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil.

Upon release, the petitioner shall stay at Egmore, Chennai, and shall appear before and sign before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate No.II, Egmore, Chennai daily at 10.30 A.M. until further orders.

15. This Court makes it clear that the present bail application is being allowed taking into consideration the medical condition of the petitioner/accused, the period of incarceration already undergone, the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, and also the existence of the connected case and counter arising out of the same occurrence.

16. This order has been passed based on the peculiar facts and circumstances placed before this Court and shall not confer any advantage upon the co-accused persons. It is further made clear that this order shall not have any bearing upon any bail applications that may be filed by the co-accused.

If there is any violation of the conditions imposed herein, the Investigation Officer is at liberty to approach the jurisdictional Court seeking cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that bail has been granted by the Sessions Court, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala**.

Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To

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

The Metropolitan Magistrate No.II, Egmore, Chennai.

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

The Inspector of Police, Suchindrum Police Station.

(through court cell e-Mode)

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

The counsel for the petitioner.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 163/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000209-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 207/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000279-2026)

1. Kumaresan, S/o. Swamikan Nadar (A1)
2. Ganesan, S/o. Swamikan Nadar (A2)
.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.163/2026
- A. Arul S/o. S. Aathilingam (A3) .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.207/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Anjugramam Police Station,
Crime No.114/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocate Tvl. T. Thanka Raj
and Ajesh J. Dhaj respectively u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant
anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

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

4. Crl.M.P. No.163/2026 has been filed by A1 and A2 and Crl.M.P. No.207/2026 has been filed by A3 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that the informant's family and the temple administration have a pre-existing enmity arising out of civil litigations pending before the Nagercoil Court and the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court regarding administrative irregularities at the Shiva Sudalai Sami Temple in Mettukudiyeruppu and despite a court-directed enquiry pending regarding potential law and order issues, the opposing faction proceeded with the temple festival on 07.05.2026. At around 4.15 P.M., while the informant was standing inside the temple premises, the accused persons intercepted him, abused him in filthy language and questioned his audacity in initiating legal proceedings and specifically, the 1st accused used a penknife to inflict a stab injury on the informant's left ear, while the other accused persons forcefully pushed the

informant and kicked him repeatedly on his chest and stomach and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.163/2026 would contend that the petitioners are brothers. The 2nd petitioner is the present Secreatry of Siva Sudalaimadasami Temple at Mettukudiyiruppu. The 2nd petitioner and one Muthukrishnan are the present office bearers of this temple by virtue of a scheme framed by the II Additional Sub Court in OS No. 330/2014 file by one Thangathurai, who is the brother of the informant and a counter case in Crime No.113/2026 was registered against the informant and four others u/s 189(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS and the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.207/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the investigation is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there are three accused in this case and there is a civil dispute pending between the parties in respect of the administration of the temple and long standing dispute between the parties. Now, on 07.05.2026, the temple festival was going on and at that time, these petitioners abused the defacto complainant and A1 inflicted cut injury on the left ear of the defacto complainant with knife, A2 and A3 caught hold the defacto complainant and pushed him outside and kicked him with leg on his chest and stomach. Now the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over. Counter case in Crime No.113/2026 has been registered and counter case accused was granted bail by this court and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

9. 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 and also this court has granted bail to the accused in counter case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused in both petitions with conditions.

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

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall stay at Karur, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur.
The Inspector of Police, Anjugramam Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners in both petitions.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.232/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000304 -2026)

Albert, S/o. Joseph (A2)

... 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 S. Varatharajan, praying to
relax the condition imposed on the petitioner previously.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. Offences alleged u/s 223, 289, 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 petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.

No.1151/2026 with condition that the petitioner should appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M., until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 06.05.2026 and prayed that the condition may be relaxed.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition only from 06.05.2026 and the investigation is not yet over.

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at 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 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 272/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000320-2026)

Vibin, S/o Varuvel

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Colachel Police Station,
Crime No. 122/2026 of Colachel Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offence u/s 77 of JJ Act and Sec. 115(2), 125, 131, 281, 296(b) and 351(2)
of BNS @ Sec. 75 of JJ Act and Sec. 115(2), 125, 131, 296(b) and 351(2) of
of BNS.

3. The case of prosecution is that on 06.05.2026 at about 6.30 P.M., the accused drove the two wheeler in scary and dashed manner and using filthy words against the informant's children and assaulted the informant's daughter with hand and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and no such occurrence was happened as alleged in the FIR and the petitioner is under judicial custody from 07.05.2026 and the earlier bail petition in CrI.M.P. No.333/2026 was dismissed by the Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel on 19.05.2026 and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that, when the children of the defacto complainant were returning home, the petitioner came on his motorcycle, repeatedly accelerated the vehicle and created loud noise, thereby causing fear and panic to the children. It is further alleged that the petitioner attempted to hit the children with the motorcycle and also assaulted the son of the defacto complainant

with his hands. When the defacto complainant questioned the conduct of the petitioner, the petitioner allegedly abused him in filthy language and criminally intimidated him. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that such conduct is habitual in nature insofar as the petitioner is concerned, though no previous criminal case is registered against him. It is also submitted that the injured person has already been discharged from the hospital, but the investigation is still pending. Therefore, the learned Public Prosecutor raised serious objection to the grant of bail and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. Taking into account the nature of the offences alleged against the petitioner/accused, the fact that the injured person has already been discharged from the hospital and also considering the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, namely about 22 days, this Court is of the considered view that further custodial detention of the petitioner is not necessary at this stage. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused subject to stringent conditions.

7. In the result, the petitioner/accused is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten

Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel and after release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tirunelveli, daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders and accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed.

If there is any violation of the above conditions, the Investigation Officer is at liberty to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned for cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that the bail was granted by the Sessions Court, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala. (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.**

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-Mode)
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tirunelveli.
The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil,
(through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Colachel Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The Superintendent, District Jail, Nagercoil. (through e-mode)
The counsel for the petitioner.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 227/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000310-2026)

Anto Vincent S/o. George Vincent (A1) .. Petitioner

/Vs./

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

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that based on the direction of the Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy, this case has been registered against the accused. The defacto complainant gave donation to the Trust for the appointment of her as Teacher in the Government school and receipt also provided in that connection. Since the defacto complainant stopped going to school, A1 settled a part of amount to the defacto complainant assured to settle the remaining amount within a short period, which was endorsed in the complaint. The petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case and nothing had happened as alleged and the co-accused A2 was granted anticipatory bail by this court on 22.05.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.159/2026 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 this petitioner and the 2nd accused promised the defacto complainant that they can arrange Teacher post to the defacto complainant in the Government school and on believing the words of the petitioner and A2, the defacto complainant paid Rs.1,00,000/- to this petitioner and Rs.1,00,000/- to A2 on 21.12.2022 and 22.12.2022 respectively. Subsequently, the defacto complainant was appointed as a temporary teacher in the Government Adhi Thiravidar Higher Secondary School, Vazhayathuvayal. Subsequently, the petitioner and the 2nd accused demanded another Rs.5 Lakhs to make the post as permanent one. The defacto complainant came to know that the petitioner and the 2nd accused cheated the defacto complainant. So, this case has been registered and the investigation is in the preliminary stage and notice under Section 35(3) of BNSS issued to the petitioner to appear before the Investigation Officer on 17.03.2026 at 10.00 A.M. but the petitioner did not appear before the Investigation Officer and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly essential and the co-accused/A2 was granted bail by this court and in the event of considering this application, the same condition may be imposed.

6. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The allegation

against the petitioner is that, on the promise of securing appointment as a Teacher in a Government School, the defacto complainant was induced to part with a sum of Rs.2,00,000/-. The records further disclose that the defacto complainant was subsequently appointed temporarily in a Government Adi Dravidar Higher Secondary School and that a portion of the amount is stated to have been repaid by the first accused. The truth or otherwise of the allegations are matters to be ascertained during the course of investigation. It is also seen that summons under Section 35(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 have already been issued to the petitioner by the Investigating Officer requiring her appearance for enquiry. The issuance of such summons would indicate that substantial progress has been made in the investigation and that the presence of the petitioner can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions. The specific overtact against the petitioner is that he received Rs.1,00,000/- from the petitioner by giving false promise. Considering the fact that the co-accused/A2 was granted bail by this court and also considering the nature of the allegations, the stage of investigation, the issuance of summons by the Investigating Officer, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to conditions.

7. In the result, in the event of arrest or on his appearing before

the court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate, Boothapandy subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail and also he is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- (Rupees One Lakh Fifty Thousand only) before the court concerned.
- ii. After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioner shall also make himself available before the respondent as and when required.
- iv. The petitioner shall duly respond to all summons/notices issued by the Investigating Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects and make himself available for interrogation as and when required.
- v. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or in any manner interfere with or put obstacle to the smooth progress of investigation.
- vi. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdictional police limit without prior permission.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 176/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000236-2026)
and
CrI.M.P. No. 177/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000239-2026)

Selvakumar,(A2)
S/o. Retnam

.. Petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 176/2026

Mahesh,(A1)
S/o. Sivalingam

.. Petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 177/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Anjugramam Police Station,
Crime No. 121/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. Prasath V, and
M. Subash Nathan respectively, u/s 483 of BNSS praying to grant bail to
the petitioner in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 123 of BNS and r/w 6(a), r/w 24(1) of COTPA Act.

4. The case of prosecution is that on 16.05.2026 at about 9.30P.M. based upon a secret information, the respondent police went to the place of occurrence, where they secured the accused along with the contraband. On investigation, the accused gave an confession that for money they have been selling prohibited tobacco products for months. They confessed that they bought this from Bangalore and were selling it. The respondent police secured 198 Kgs. of Ganesh tobacco and 6 Kgs. of cool lip. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner in both petitions submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they are in no way connected with the alleged offence and the petitioners have been in judicial custody from 17.05.2026 and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioners in both petition.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 16.05.2026, the petitioners were found in possession

of 198 Kgs. of Ganesh Tobacco and 6 Kgs. of Cool Lip. So the petitioners were arrested by the police on 17.05.2026 and the contraband was seized and the petitioners have no previous cases and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

7. The petitioners have been remanded to judicial custody alleging that they have committed the offences punishable u/s 123 of BNS and Section 24(1), 6(a) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act, 2003. They are in custody since 17.05.2026.

8. Section 6(A) of the COTPA Act prohibits any person from selling, offering for selling or permitting the sale of Cigarette or any other tobacco product by any person who is under 18 years of old. Section 24(1) of COTPA Act provides that any person who contravenes the provisions of Section 6 shall be guilty of an offence under the said Act and shall be punishable with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees. Section 123 of BNS which speaks as follows :-

“ Whoever administers to or causes to be taken by any person any poison or any stupefying, intoxicating or unwholesome drug, or other thing with intent to cause hurt to such person, or with intent to commit or to facilitate the

commission of an offence or knowing it to be likely that he will thereby cause hurt, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.”

The arguments of the learned Public Prosecutor shows that the allegations against the petitioners is not to the effect that they administered any such material as mentioned in the above said provision to any individual. The question whether the averments made in the FIR attracts Section 123 of BNS itself is a moot question and also considering the fact that the petitioners are under judicial custody for the past 12 days. Considering the above reasons, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

9. In the result, the petitioners/accused 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 the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil and 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 and accordingly both petitions are 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.***

Accordingly, both Criminal Original Petitions are allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai.
The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil.
(through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Anjugramam Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The Superintendent, District Jail, Nagercoil. (through e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 176/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000236-2026)
and
CrI.M.P. No. 177/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000239-2026)

Selvakumar,(A2)
S/o. Retnam

.. Petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 176/2026

Mahesh,(A1)
S/o. Sivalingam

.. Petitioner in CrI.M.P. No. 177/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Anjugramam Police Station,
Crime No. 121/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocates Tvl. Prasath V, and
M. Subash Nathan respectively, u/s 483 of BNSS praying to grant bail to
the petitioner in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petitions.

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

3. The petitioners/accused are alleged to have committed the offence u/s 123 of BNS and r/w 6(a), r/w 24(1) of COTPA Act.

4. The case of prosecution is that on 16.05.2026 at about 9.30P.M. based upon a secret information, the respondent police went to the place of occurrence, where they secured the accused along with the contraband. On investigation, the accused gave an confession that for money they have been selling prohibited tobacco products for months. They confessed that they bought this from Bangalore and were selling it. The respondent police secured 198 Kgs. of Ganesh tobacco and 6 Kgs. of cool lip. Hence the charge.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner in both petitions submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they are in no way connected with the alleged offence and the petitioners have been in judicial custody from 17.05.2026 and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for bail to the petitioners in both petition.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that on 16.05.2026, the petitioners were found in possession

of 198 Kgs. of Ganesh Tobacco and 6 Kgs. of Cool Lip. So the petitioners were arrested by the police on 17.05.2026 and the contraband was seized and the petitioners have no previous cases and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant bail to the petitioners and both petitions may be dismissed.

7. The petitioners have been remanded to judicial custody alleging that they have committed the offences punishable u/s 123 of BNS and Section 24(1), 6(a) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act, 2003. They are in custody since 17.05.2026.

8. Section 6(A) of the COTPA Act prohibits any person from selling, offering for selling or permitting the sale of Cigarette or any other tobacco product by any person who is under 18 years of old. Section 24(1) of COTPA Act provides that any person who contravenes the provisions of Section 6 shall be guilty of an offence under the said Act and shall be punishable with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees. Section 123 of BNS which speaks as follows :-

“ Whoever administers to or causes to be taken by any person any poison or any stupefying, intoxicating or unwholesome drug, or other thing with intent to cause hurt to such person, or with intent to commit or to facilitate the

commission of an offence or knowing it to be likely that he will thereby cause hurt, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.”

The arguments of the learned Public Prosecutor shows that the allegations against the petitioners is not to the effect that they administered any such material as mentioned in the above said provision to any individual. The question whether the averments made in the FIR attracts Section 123 of BNS itself is a moot question and also considering the fact that the petitioners are under judicial custody for the past 12 days. Considering the above reasons, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners/accused with conditions.

9. In the result, the petitioners/accused 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 the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil and 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 and accordingly both petitions are 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.***

Accordingly, both Criminal Original Petitions are allowed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai.
The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Nagercoil.
(through e-mode)
The Inspector of Police, Anjugramam Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The Superintendent, District Jail, Nagercoil. (through e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioner in both petitions.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 229/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000307-2026)

Krishnammal(A2)

W/o. Jepamani

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station, Marthandam,
Crime No.24/2026 of AWPS, Marthandam,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

...Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru G. Lal, 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 85, 316(2), 115(2), 351(1) of BNS and Sec. 3(1), 4 and 6 of
Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the 1st accused is the
husband of the defacto complainant and all the other accused are the
relatives of the 1st accused and after their marriage, in order to claim more

dowry, the defacto complainant was physically and mentally assaulted by all the accused. On 06.10.2025, all the accused started a quarrel with the defacto complainant stating that the defacto complainant should sell the pledged jewels of her and should give the money to the 2nd accused and all the accused abused the defacto complainant and attacked her. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is the mother of the 1st accused and the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against her and the respondent police has registered this case mechanically without conducting any preliminary enquiry. Further it would be contended that this FIR has been lodged only as a counter blast to the earlier complaint initiated by the 4th accused who is the younger son of this petitioner against the defacto complainant regarding the theft/ misappropriation of jewels and money belonging to their family and there is no specific overt act attributed against the petitioner and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as stated in the FIR. Prior to the alleged occurrence, the marital life between 1st accused and the defacto complainant was cordial and peaceful and they were residing together in the same house and were leading their matrimonial life normally and the co-

accused A1, A3, A4 and A5 were granted anticipatory bail by this court on 22.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 155/2026 and 184/2026 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 A1 is the husband of the defacto complainant and A2/this petitioner is the mother, A3 is the father and A4 is the brother and A5 is the sister of A1. The accused persons demanded additional dowry of Rs.10 lakhs and in connection that, the parents of the defacto complainant gave Rs.8 Lakhs. So, on 06.10.2025, A2, A3 and A5 abused the defacto complainant and A2/this petitioner slapped on both side of her face with hand and assaulted on her with leg, A3 assaulted her with stick on her hand and A5 also assaulted on her stomach and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation of the case is not yet over and it is a matrimonial dispute and the matter may be referred to mediation.

6. The FIR arises out of dispute between husband and wife who are the 1st accused and defacto complainant and other accused are relatives of A1. There are allegations of dowry demand and harassment. The learned Public Prosecutor would state that the injured was discharged from the hospital and in the event of considering this application, the matter

may be referred to mediation. Taking note of the above, this court is of the view that it is not a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner might be necessary. Moreover, the co-accused A1, A3, A4 and A5 were granted anticipatory bail by this court on 22.05.2026 in CrI.M.P. No. 155/2026 and 184/2026. In such circumstances, this petition deserves to be allowed.

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 No.I, 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 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

In 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.210/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000275-2026)

1. R. Sanjai Kumar S/o. Rajaram (A 1)

2. Gokulan S/o. Thangalingam (A2)

... Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

through the Inspector of Police,

Suchindrum Police Station,

Crime No.110/2026 of Suchindrum Police Station,

Rep by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

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

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Principal
Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 20.04.2026 in Crl.M.P.
No.1230/2026 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 29.04.2026 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 29.04.2026 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

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

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.224/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000314-2026)

Sanjay Kumar S/o. Nagarajan

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Manavalakurichi Police Station,

Crime No.47/2026 of Manavalakurichi Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

... Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that due to previous enmity

between the defacto complainant and the accused, on 20.05.2026 at about 4.00 P.M., the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy words, assaulted him with stone, caused injuries and also criminally intimidated her. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he never committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and no such occurrence was happened 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 on 19.05.2026 this petitioner abused the defacto complainant and pulled her chudithar shawl and assaulted her and outraged her modesty and threatened her and the injured was treated as outpatient and the petitioner has two previous cases and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and either this petition may be dismissed or if the petition is allowed, the petitioner may be directed to comply the condition in some other district.

6. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by

the petitioner/accused and also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with conditions. This Court takes serious note of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, particularly the allegation relating to outraging the modesty of a woman and the apprehension expressed by the prosecution regarding the possibility of repetition of similar offences. At the same time, considering the stage of investigation and balancing the liberty of the petitioner with the interest of the prosecution, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail subject to stringent conditions. In order to ensure that the defacto complainant is not disturbed and that there is no interference with the investigation, this Court deems it appropriate to direct the petitioner to comply with the reporting conditions before the Court situated in another district.

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, Eraniel subject to the following conditions:-

- i. The petitioner shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.

- ii. After release, the petitioner shall stay at Karambakkudi, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate, Karambakkudi, Pudukkottai District daily twice at 10.30 A.M. and 5.00 P.M. until further orders.
- 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate, Karambakkudi, Pudukkottai District.
The Inspector of Police, Manavalakurichy 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 179/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000249-2026)

Jegan S/o. Thanudhas (A1)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Eraniel Police Station,

Crime No. 168/2026 of Eraniel Police Station

Rep. by Public Prosecutor,

Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The 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 and 5 of Explosive Substance Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 30.03.2026 at 3.00 P.M. the Deputy Director of Mines and Minerals Department, Kanyakumari visited the quarry run by this petitioner/1st accused at S.F.No. 10/3A of Aloor B Village. Further the Assistant Director has seized a Taurus lorry and Hitachi and 72 jelletin and 25 detanator. The Assistant Director seized the materials and gave a complaint before the respondent police. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he is the owner of the quarry and he is having quarry lease in the said property and the petitioner has been given an extention of time for quarrying as per the order of Hon'ble High Court. The lease period is extended from 02.08.2024 to 01.05.2026 and nothing took place as alleged in the FIR 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 anticipatory bail petition and the earlier petition in CrI.M.P. No.1178/2026 was dismissed by this court on 29.04.2026 and the co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil on 29.04.2026 in CrI.M.P. No.1150/2026 and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory

bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the defacto complainant is a Assistant Director, Mines and Minerals, Nagercoil and the petitioner/A1 is the quarry owner. On 30.03.2026, when the defacto complainant and other officials got an information that illegal mining is going in survey No.10/3A of Aloor 'B' Village. When the officials went there, they found that 200 Cubic Metre of stone worth Rs.94,150/- were exploded and Hitachi seized. Without valid permission from government, this quarry was functioned. Hitachi and Compressor seized. Total loss of Rs.94,150/- to the government. Investigation is not yet over and the earlier petition in CrI.M.P. No.1178/2026 was dismissed by this court only on 29.04.2026 and there is no change in circumstances and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor.6. This Court carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record. The allegation against the petitioner is that, the petitioner illegally run by the quarry. Moreover, the co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by the learned Principal Sessions Court, Nagercoil. Though the learned Public Prosecutor

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

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

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

- i) i) The petitioner shall appear before the Court concerned within a period of 15 days from the date of this order without fail. The petitioner is also directed to deposit a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) before the Assistant Director of Mines and Minerals, Nagercoil who shall issue a challan for the said amount, and the same shall be maintained in a separate account.
- ii) After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 A.M. & 5.30 PM 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, Eraniel Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The Assistant Director of Mines and Minerals, Nagercoil.
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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 154/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000219-2026)

1. Abi Eastus, S/o. Sam Eastus (A3)

2. Viju, S/o. Vincent (A4)

.. Petitioners

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

Karungal Police Station,

Crime No.128/2026 of Karungal Police Station,

Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil.

..Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

3. The case of prosecution is that on 15.04.2026 at about
7.00PM when the informant's son went to the nearby shop, the accused

persons restrained the informant's son, assaulted him with hand and iron rod and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and nothing had happened as alleged in the FIR and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the co-accused was granted bail by the lower court in CrI.M.P. No.374/2026 on 22.05.2026 and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there is previous enmity between the 1st accused and the defacto complainant. On 15.04.2026, the petitioners and two other accused waylaid the son of the defacto complainant and tied him in a tree and naked him and tore his dresses and assaulted him with iron rod, wooden rod and stick all over his body and gave some unwanted water to drink. Then, they escaped from the scene of occurrence and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considered the argument of the learned Public Prosecutor. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by

the petitioners/accused and also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and also considering the argument of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the co-accused was granted bail by the lower court, 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, 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 stay at Erode, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Erode 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Erode.
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 29th day of May, 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 163/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000209-2026)

and

Crl.M.P. No. 207/2026
(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000279-2026)

1. Kumaresan, S/o. Swamikan Nadar (A1)
2. Ganesan, S/o. Swamikan Nadar (A2)
.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No.163/2026
- A. Arul S/o. S. Aathilingam (A3) .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P. No.207/2026

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
Anjugramam Police Station,
Crime No.114/2026 of Anjugramam Police Station,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ..Respondent

These two petitions are filed by Advocate Tvl. T. Thanka Raj
and Ajesh J. Dhaj respectively u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant
anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both petitions.

COMMON ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

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

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

4. Crl.M.P. No.163/2026 has been filed by A1 and A2 and Crl.M.P. No.207/2026 has been filed by A3 seeking enlargement on anticipatory bail.

5. The case of prosecution is that the informant's family and the temple administration have a pre-existing enmity arising out of civil litigations pending before the Nagercoil Court and the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court regarding administrative irregularities at the Shiva Sudalai Sami Temple in Mettukudiyeruppu and despite a court-directed enquiry pending regarding potential law and order issues, the opposing faction proceeded with the temple festival on 07.05.2026. At around 4.15 P.M., while the informant was standing inside the temple premises, the accused persons intercepted him, abused him in filthy language and questioned his audacity in initiating legal proceedings and specifically, the 1st accused used a penknife to inflict a stab injury on the informant's left ear, while the other accused persons forcefully pushed the

informant and kicked him repeatedly on his chest and stomach and also criminally intimidated him. Hence the charge.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in CrI.M.P. No.163/2026 would contend that the petitioners are brothers. The 2nd petitioner is the present Secreatry of Siva Sudalaimadasami Temple at Mettukudiyiruppu. The 2nd petitioner and one Muthukrishnan are the present office bearers of this temple by virtue of a scheme framed by the II Additional Sub Court in OS No. 330/2014 file by one Thangathurai, who is the brother of the informant and a counter case in Crime No.113/2026 was registered against the informant and four others u/s 189(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS and the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and the injured was discharged from the hospital and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CrI.M.P. No.207/2026 would contend that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case and the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the investigation is almost over and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there are three accused in this case and there is a civil dispute pending between the parties in respect of the administration of the temple and long standing dispute between the parties. Now, on 07.05.2026, the temple festival was going on and at that time, these petitioners abused the defacto complainant and A1 inflicted cut injury on the left ear of the defacto complainant with knife, A2 and A3 caught hold the defacto complainant and pushed him outside and kicked him with leg on his chest and stomach. Now the injured was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is not yet over. Counter case in Crime No.113/2026 has been registered and counter case accused was granted bail by this court and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the petition may be dismissed.

9. 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 and also this court has granted bail to the accused in counter case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused in both petitions with conditions.

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

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the court concerned within 15 days from today without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall stay at Karur, appear and sign before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur 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 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil (through e-mode).
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur.
The Inspector of Police, Anjugramam Police Station.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners in both petitions.

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

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

Friday, the 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.70/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000094-2026)

Rajan S/o. Chellaswamy (A1)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Inspector of Police,

District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,

Crime No. 10/2026 of District Crime Branch, Nagercoil,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

.. Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru A. Salin, 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 61(2) and 318(4) of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the accused persons had
pledged fake jewellery in the State Bank of India, Kappiyarai Branch and
during inspection, 10 packets of fake jewellery was detected to be fake and the

petitioner/A1 colluded with A3 jewel appraiser of the bank. Hence the charge.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend the 3rd accused appraiser and the 1st accused are neighbours. The 3rd accused is running a jewelery and jewelery work shop and the 3rd accused made the 1st accused to believe that as he is working in the bank, he cannot pledge jewels in his name and asked for his help. The 1st accused is only a name lender and he is innocent and also the 2nd accused had pledged fake jewels and the 3rd accused had been instrumental in the crime. The 1st accused has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not indulged in or is not associated in any of the acts as alleged in the complaint and nothing of the allegations stated in the FIR happened but it is only a fragment of imagination filed only to harass the innocent accused and the complaint is ill motivated and vague and the petitioner has never involved in the alleged case and the accused has not been involved in any other occurrence till date and no previous case is pending against him 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 A3 is working as gold appraiser of State Bank of India, Kappiyarai Branch. A1 and A2 are customers of the bank. All the accused conspired together and A1 pledged 592.8 grams of spurious gold under 7 gold loans for Rs.23,15,000/- and A2 pledged 136.9 grams of spurious gold under 3 gold loans for Rs.7,86,000/-. So, the case is registered 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.

7. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner/A1 and A2 are customers of the bank and that A3 is the gold appraiser attached to the State Bank of India. It is further alleged that the petitioner, in collusion with A3, who is the appraiser of the bank, pledged 592.8 grams of spurious gold jewels under seven gold loan accounts and thereby obtained a total loan amount of Rs.23,15,000/-. Considering the submissions made by the learned Public Prosecutor and also taking into account the huge quantity of spurious gold involved, the substantial amount said to have been cheated, and the fact that the investigation is still at a preliminary stage, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/accused at this stage.

8. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th 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 29th day of May, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No.61/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK0V-000086 -2026)

1. K.Vijay S/o. Kanagaraj (A1)
2. S.Vasantha Kumari W/o. Kanagaraj (A2)
3. Kanagaraj S/o. Chellian (A3)
4. K.Vijila D/o. Kanagaraj (A4) .. Petitioners
/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Through the Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station, Marthandam,
Crime No.NIL,
Rep. by P.P. Nagercoil. ...Respondent

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

ORDER

Heard both sides. Perused the petition.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 1st petitioner married G.S. Sowbharnika on 07.09.2022 and he is working in the ICICI Bank and the petitioners 2 and 3 are the parents and 4th petitioner is the sister of 1st petitioner and during the time of marriage, the 1st petitioner was working in Chennai and Sowbharnika was studying at Marthandam and staying with her parents and she returned to his house occasionally only when he came home once a month and she was very arrogant and stubborn and she was repeatedly creating problems which made family life with her very difficult and the petitioners, relatives and well-wishers also tried their level best with no other option left and after she refused to come and live with 1st petitioner and so, he sent a suit notice dated 23.06.2025 for restitution of conjugal rights, but she evaded receipt of the notice and has filed a false petition before the All Women Police Station, Marthandam and before the superintendent of police raising allegations of dowry demand. Nothing of that sought happened and hence no FIR was registered. Now, as per the direction given by the Judicial Magistrate No-1, Kuzhithurai in Crl.M.P. No.676/2026, this case has been registered and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

3. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that the 1st petitioner demanded 125 sovereigns of gold jewels from the defacto complainant to start his business and demanded to get 1/3 share of property from her parents and to register the same in the name of the 1st petitioner. Now, the jewels and cash of the defacto complainant are with the petitioners. No FIR has been registered and prayed that the petition may be dismissed.

4. Considering the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioners/accused and also taking into account the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the 1st petitioner is the husband and the other petitioners are the in-laws of the defacto complainant and that the dispute between the parties arises out of matrimonial discord, this Court is of the view that an opportunity should be afforded to the parties to amicably resolve their issues through mediation. Hence, this Court is inclined to refer the matter for mediation and also to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused subject to appropriate conditions.

5. 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 fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order without fail.
- ii. After release, the petitioners shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.
- iii. The petitioners shall make themselves available before the respondent police as and when required for the purpose of enquiry and investigation.
- iv. The petitioners shall not tamper with witnesses or in any manner interfere with or obstruct the smooth progress of investigation.
- v. The petitioners shall not leave the jurisdictional limits of the respondent police without prior permission from the Investigating Officer or the Court concerned.

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

In case of violation of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Investigating Officer is at liberty to approach the jurisdictional Magistrate for cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that the bail has been

granted by the Sessions Court, in the light of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K. Shaji v. State of Kerala***.

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

Pronounced by me in open court this the 29th day of May, 2026.

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kuzhithurai. (through e-mode).
The Mediation Centre, Nagercoil. (through e-mode).
The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Marthandam.
(through court cell e-Mode)
The counsel for the petitioners.