



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

Crl.M.P.No.20/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000021-2024)

Balaguru, (aged 52/2024),
S/o.Markandan,

....Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Sayalgudi P.S.,
Cr.No.82/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.V.Dharmaraj, B.Sc., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent : Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L.,
Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is th2e accused in Cr.No.82/2023 on the file of the
respondent police for alleged offences U/s. 447 IPC r/w section 3(1) of PPDL
Act seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the



petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend² that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 14.03.2024. He would further submit that investigation has been completed and charge sheet has be²en filed. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor would contend that on 13.03.2024 the petitioner entered into the school campus and damaged the cameras worth about Rs.20,000/- installed by the school authorities. The petitioner who entered into the school and abe used unparliamentary words against the students and the teachers in a drunken mood. Thereafter the defacto complainant has lodged a complaint against the petitioner before the Superintendent of Police. The Superintendent of police instructed to install the CCTV Cameras in side the school. The petitioner was arrested and remand²ed to judicial custody on 14.03.2024. He would further submit that investigation has been completed and charge sheet has been filed. One previous case is pending against the petitioner. Earlier bail application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1318/2024 dated 27.03.2024.

5. According to the Prosecution, on 13.03.2024, the petitioner entered into the school in an inebrated condition and damaged the cameras worth about



Rs.20,000/-, that were installed by the school authorities. Further the petitioner also abused the students and the teachers in a drunken mood. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 14.03.2024. One previous case is pending against the petitioner. Investigation has been completed and charge sheet has been filed. Considering the above said facts and circumstances and period of custody, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to the following conditions:

i) The petitioner shall execute a bond for Rs.20,000/- with two sureties for the like sum to the satisfaction of the learned District Munsif-cum- **Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi;**

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall remit a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) to the Credit of Crime No.82/2024 before the learned District Munsif-cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi without prejudice to his defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.**

iii) that the petitioner shall appear before the learned **District Munsif-cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi every day at 10.30 a.m until committal**

TNRM000000212024



of the case;

iv) that the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses during trial;

v) if the petitioner fails to comply the above said conditions, the bail order shall stand cancelled automatically;

In the result, the petition is allowed on the above terms.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH
Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:27:07 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,I/c.
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:-

To
The District Munsif -cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Sayalgudi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.
The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.31/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000032-2024)

Palaninathan, (aged 30),
S/o.Kandhan.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Sayalgudi P.S.,
Cr.No.227/2017
PRC No.8/2019.

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.K.Muthuduraisamy, B.A., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent : Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.227/2017 on the file of the respondent police for alleged offences U/s. 395 IPC seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further



contend that the petitioner is under judicial custody from 23.02.2024. The case was taken on file in PRC No.8/2019 and the same is pending before the learned District Munsif -cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi. Further he has submitted that the case was posted for hearing on 22.04.2022 on that day, the petitioner was unable to appear before the Court, hence NBW has been issued against him. Further he would submit that NBW was executed on 23.02.2024 and he was produced on Fresh Warrant instead of PT Warrant and he is under judicial custody. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail, no prejudice will be caused to the prosecution, the above said absence is neither willful nor wanton by the petitioner. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that there are totally 6 accused in the case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. NBW is pending against A5 and A6. The occurrence took place on 20.09.2017 and FIR was registered on 21.09.2017. Further he has contended that the case was taken on file as PRC No.8/2019 and same is pending before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi. The case was posted for hearing on 22.04.2022 and on that day the petitioner did not appear before the Court. Hence NBW was issued against him and it was executed on 23.02.2024 and he is under judicial custody. Further he would submit that 22 previous cases are pending against the petitioner



and his name is in History Sheet. The case is pending for long period for committal proceedings. In the circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond. Hence this petition is to be dismissed

5. Considering the both side submissions and perused the case records it found that The case was taken on file in PRC No.08/2019 due to non-appearance of the petitioner, NBW was issued against him and it was executed on 23.02.2024. Totally 6 accused in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A4. NBW is pending against A5 and A6. A2 and A3 are appeared before the court regularly. A1 is in judicial custody. NBW was executed on 23.02.2024 and since then he is in judicial custody. The case is pending for long period for committal. The learned public prosecutor has stated that 22 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and his name is in History Sheet. Considering the above facts and circumstances and period of custody, bad antecedents, stage of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

**B C
GOPINATH**

Digitally signed by
B C GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:27:18 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Ramanathapuram.

TNRM000000322024



Copy sent through e-mail:-

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Sayalgudi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM000000162024



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.**,
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.15/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000016-2024)

Gnanavel, (aged 38),
S/o.Senthooran.,

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kovilangulam P.S.,
Cr.No.26/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.M.Radhakrishnan, B.A., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent : Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.26/2024 on the file of the respondent police for alleged offences U/s.379 IPC and section 21(1) of MMDR Act seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that the petitioner is under judicial custody from



01.05.2024. Properties involved in this case have already been secured by the police. Most of the investigation has been completed. He would further submit that there is no possibility to tamper with the evidence. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner. 2

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor would contend that the defacato complainant is the Revenue Inspector. At the time of vehicle inspection on 30.04.2024 the petitioner and another have illegally transported 4 ½ unit of river sand without getting any permission from the competent authorities concerned in a Tipper Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN 65 BX 7443 at Primary Health Centre, Kovilangulam. There are totally 2 accused involved in this case and A2 was escaped from the occurrence place. The petitioner² is arrayed as A1 and he is helper of the vehicle. A2 moved anticipatory bail before this Court in CrI.M.P.No.54/2024. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 01.05.2024. He would further submit that the properties involved in this case have been secured. Investigation is yet to be completed. Two previous cases of similar nature are pending against the petitioner.

5. According to the Prosecution, at the time of vehicle inspection conducted by the defacto complainant and her Assistant on 30.04.2024, they found that the petitioner and another person illegally transported 4 ½ unit of river sand without getting any permission from the competent authorities in a

TNRM000000162024



Tipper Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN 65BX 7443 at Primary Health Centre, Kovilangulam. The petitioner is arrayed as A1 and he is helper of the above said vehicle. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 01.05.2024. The properties involved in this case have been seized by the police. Further, investigation is yet to be completed. Two previous cases of similar kind are pending against the petitioner. Considering the above said facts and circumstances, period of custody and bad antecedents, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

B C Digitally signed by
GOPINATH B C GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:27:29 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:-

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.

The Inspector of Police, Kovilangulam P.S.,

The petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM000000192024



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.**,
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

Crl.M.P.No.18/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000019-2024)

Ramachandran, (aged 36/2024),
S/o.Shanmugasundaram, ..Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Theriruveli P.S.,
Cr.No.34/2024 ...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner :Tr. S.Sheik Ibrahim, M.A., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent :Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Public
Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner who is A1 in Cr.No.34/2024 on the file of the respondent police for alleged offences U/s.273, 328 IPC r/w section 24(1) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 02.05.2024. Properties



involved in this case have already been recovered by the police. There is no specific overt-act against the petitioner. Most of the investigation has been completed. He would further submit that there is no possibility to tamper with the evidence. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor would contend that totally 2 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 is in judicial custody. Based on an information, the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 02.05.2024 and found that the petitioner has hoarded 30,675 Pockets of Prohibited tobacco products (Ganesh 701, Vimal Pan Masala, Vimal Black, Happy Holi) in the bathroom of his house without getting any licence, for selling higher price and the same have been recovered. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.05.2024. He would further submit that the investigation is not yet completed.

5. According to the Prosecution, on 02.05.2024, the petitioner was found in possession of 30,675 Pockets of Prohibited tobacco products (Ganesh 701, Vimal Pan Masala, Vimal Black, Happy Holi) hoarded in his bathroom without any licence. He intended to sell those at a higher price and the same have been seized by the police. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.05.2024. Further, the investigation is yet to be completed. Considering the above said facts and circumstances, period of custody and large

TNRM000000192024



quantity of the Tobacco products, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH

Digitally signed by
B C GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:27:43 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,I/c.
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:-

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Theriruvveli P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.19/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000020-2024)

Muthupandi @ Sewak, (aged 24),
S/o.Palpandi.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kadaladi P.S.,
Cr.No.29/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner :Tr. M.Raja Sahul Hameed, B.Sc., B.L.,
Advocate.

For Respondent :Tr.B.Karthikeyan,B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is A1 in Cr.No.29/2024 on the file of the respondent police for alleged offences U/s. 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 307 IPC @ U/s. 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 307 IPC seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He



would further contend that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 11.04.2024. Substantial investigation has been completed. He would further submit that co-accused were either been granted anticipatory bail or enlarged on regular bail. He would further submit that there is no possibility to tamper with the evidence. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed granting bail on the ground that although the co-accused have been released on bail, the petitioner cannot be granted anticipatory bail. He would further contend that marriage arranged between the petitioner's sister and the defacto complainant's brother was dropped and this is the motive for the occurrence. There are totally four accused involved in this case and petitioner is arrayed as A1. Further he has contended that the petitioner was arrested on 11.04.2024. The injured was discharged from hospital on 23.03.2024. He would further submit that the petitioner name is found in History Sheet and he has 10 previous cases are against him and he is a habitual offender. He would also contend that release of co-accused cannot be taken into account to grant the same relief to the petitioner. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. Earlier bail application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court on 30.04.2024



5. According to the Prosecution, the defacto complainant's brother was spoken in marriage to the petitioner's sister. But the marriage proposal was dropped due to some dispute between them. Driven by that motive, on 15.03.2024 at about 1.00 p.m, when the defacto complainant was at home along with his family members, the petitioner and 3 others came there in a vehicle TATA Sumo bearing Reg.No.TN 04 M 7929 and abused the defacto complainant in obscene words and A1 assaulted with sickle on the right side of the head, while the other accused (A2 to A4) assaulted using sickle on his shoulder and backside of the defacto complainant's brother and also criminally intimidated them. Considering the fact circumstances, the bad antecedents and no change of circumstance since dismissed of earlier bail application on 30.04.2024 in CrI.M.P.No.1806/2024 dated 30.04.2024 by the Principal Sessions Court, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH

Digitally signed by
B C GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:28:02 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,I/c.
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

TNRM000000202024



Copy sent through e-mail:-

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Kadaladi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM000000252024



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.24/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000025-2024)

Saravanan, (aged 40),
S/o.Ramu.

....Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Thiruppalaikkudi P.S.,
Cr.No.92/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.K.Anbuezhayan, B.A., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent :Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.92/2024 on the file of the respondent police for alleged offences U/s. 379 IPC and section 21(4) of MMDR Act seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that the petitioner is under judicial custody from

TNRM000000252024



02.05.2024. Properties involved in this case have already been secured by the police and most of the investigation has been complete. He would further submit that co-accused has already been released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6949/2024 dated 08.05.2024 and there is no possibility to tamper with the evidence. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor would contend that the defacto complainant is the VAO. Based on information of the VAO, the police officials went to the occurrence place on 02.05.2024 at about 3.50 a.m and found that the petitioner and another have illegally transported one unit of river sand without getting any licence from the competent authorities in a Tractor along with Trailer bearing Reg.No.TN 65 L 6121 at Kottakkarai river bed. Totally 2 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A2 and he is the driver of the vehicle. A1 has already been released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6949/2024 dated 08.05.2024. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.05.2024. He would further submit that the properties involved in this case have been secured. Major part of the investigation is over. 2 previous cases are pending against the petitioner out of which one is same type of offence.



5. According to the Prosecution, on the date of occurrence, the petitioner and A1 have illegally transported one unit of river sand without getting any licence from the competent authorities in a Tractor along with trailer at Kottakkarai riverbed. The petitioner is the driver of the vehicle. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.05.2024. The properties involved in this case have been secured. Major part of the investigation has been completed. 2 previous cases are pending against the petitioner out of which one is same type of offence. Further, A1 has been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court. Considering the above said facts and circumstances and period of custody and release of co-accused, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly the petitioner is ordered to be released subject to the following conditions:

i) The petitioner shall execute a bond for Rs.20,000/- with two sureties for the like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai;**

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall remit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit in favour of the District Legal Services Authority, Ramanathapuram, who shall receive the said amount as “Environmental Fund;**

TNRM000000252024



iii) that the petitioner shall appear before the **Investigating Officer every day at 10.30 a.m until further orders;**

iv) that the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses during the trial;

v) if the petitioner fails to comply the above said conditions, the bail order shall stand cancelled automatically;

In the result, the petition is allowed on the above terms.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

**B C
GOPINATH**

Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:28:14 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:-

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Thiruppalaikkudi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.
The District Legal Services Authority, Ramanathapuram,
The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.

TNRM000000342024



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.33/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000034-2024)

Abdul Ali, (aged 54),
S/o.Seeni Mohammed.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Theriruveli P.S.,
Cr.No.34/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.K.Gunasekaran, M.A., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent : Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.34/2024 on the file of the respondent police for alleged offences U/s. 273, 328 IPC r/w section 24(1) Cigarettes and Tobacco Products Act seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 03.05.2024. Properties



involved in this case have already been seized by the police. Based on confession the petitioner name is implicated in FIR. Property has not been sent to the chemical Test. Most of the investigation has been completed. He would further submit that there is no possibility to tamper with the evidence. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor would contend that totally 2 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 is in judicial custody. Based on information the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 02.05.2024 and found that the petitioner and A1 have hoarded 30,675 Pockets of Prohibited tobacco products (Ganesh 701, Vimal Pan Masala, Vimal Black, Happy Holi) in A1's bathroom of his house without getting any licence for selling higher price and the same have been secured by the police. Further he would submit that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 03.05.2024. Investigation is not yet completed. Two previous cases of similar kind are pending against the petitioner.

5. According to the Prosecution, on the date of occurrence on 02.05.2024 and found that the petitioner and A1 have hoarded 30,675 Pockets of Prohibited tobacco products (Ganesh 701, Vimal Pan Masala, Vimal Black, Happy Holi) in A1's bathroom of his house without getting any licence for selling at higher price and the same have been seized by the police. The petitioner was arrested

TNRM000000342024



and remanded to judicial custody on 02.05.2024. Further more the investigation is yet to be completed. Two previous cases of the same nature are pending against the petitioner. Considering the above said facts and circumstances, period of custody, bad antecedents and huge quantity of the Tobacco products, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

**B C
GOPINATH**

Digitally signed by
B C GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:28:28 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,I/c.
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:-

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Theriruvveli P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.**,
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.36/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000037-2024)

Prabakaran, (aged 39),
S/o.Sivanandham.

....Petitioners/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Rameswaram Town P.S.,
Cr.No.92/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.K.Muthuduraisamy, B.A., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent : Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is the sole accused in Cr.No.92/2024 on the file of the respondent for alleged offences U/s. 294(b), 452 and 307 IPC seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that the petitioner is under judicial custody from 24.04.2024. Most of the



investigation has been completed. He would further submit that there is no possibility to tamper with the evidence. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed granting bail to the petitioner on the ground that the injured was sustained hand injury and she is taking treatment as in-patient at Madurai Rajaji Govt. Hospital

5. In view of the submission made by the learned Public Prosecutor that the injured person in this case is taking treatment as in-patient at Madurai Rajaji Govt Hospital, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

6. Accordingly the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH

Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:28:41 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,I/c.
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:-

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.

The Inspector of Police, Rameswaram Town P.S.,

The petitioner through his Counsel.



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.45/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000046-2024)

Muniasamy @ Kunjumuniasamy, (aged 39),
S/o.Gurusamy.

....Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kadaladi P.S.,
Cr.No.54/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.K.Gunasekaran, M.A., B.L., Advocate.

For Respondent :Tr.B.Karthikeyan,B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for Bail U/s.439 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.54/2024 on the file of the respondent police for alleged offences U/s. 379 IPC and section 21(1) of MMDR Act seeks bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He



would further contend that the petitioner is under judicial custody from 25.04.2024. Prosecution is not clear as to the quantity of the illegal sand which was allegedly found in possession of the petitioner. He would further submit that the beneficiary of the illegal sand has not been implicated in this case and the petitioner has been in custody for the past 15 days. The vehicle involved in this case has been secured by the police. Most of the investigation has been completed. Earlier bail application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1802/2024 dated 30.04.2024. He would further submit that there is no possibility to tamper with the evidence. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed granting bail to the petitioner on the ground that he has 4 previous cases against him and among those 2 cases are under MMDR act. However he has fairly conceded that illegally quarried sand has not been recovered and only the vehicle has been recovered. The Investigation Officer has not taken steps to recover the sand.

5. According to the Prosecution, on 25.04.2024 at about 6.30 a.m, at the time of patrolling, the petitioner was unloading river sand from his tractor bearing Reg.No.TN 65 BX 3956 along with trailer and was dumping the sand



in front of the house of one Kanaga at Punavasal without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. On enquiry, the petitioner did not produce any proper licence for transporting⁴ river sand and he had illegally quarried river sand from river bed at Appanur. Therefore he was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 25.04.2024. The vehicle involved in this case has already been secured. 5 previous cases are pending against the petitioner out of which 2 cases are of similar nature. Considering the stage of the investigation and that this scope of investigation has narrowed down, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is entitled to bail.

6. Accordingly the petitioner is ordered to be released subject to the following conditions:

i) The petitioner shall execute a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for the like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **District Munsif -cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi;**

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall remit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit in favour of the District Legal Services Authority, Ramanathapuram, who shall receive the said amount as “Environmental Fund;**



iii) that the petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer **every day at 10.30 a.m until further orders;**

iv) **that the petitioner shall file an affidavit that he shall not involve in similar kind of offence in future at the time of furnishing sureties;**

v) that the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness during the trial;

vi) if the petitioner fails to comply the above said conditions, the bail order shall stand cancelled automatically;

In the result, the petition is allowed on the above terms.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

**B C
GOPINATH**

Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:28:54 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,I/c
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:-

To
The District Munsif -cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladli,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Kadaladi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.
The District Legal Services Authority, Ramanathapuram,
The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, (PRINCIPAL
SESSIONS COURT) RAMANATHAPURAM.**

Present: **Thiru. B.C.Gopinath, M.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 09th day of May 2024

Crl.M.P.No. 84/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000088-2024)

Navaneethan @ Navaneethapandiyan, (aged 20/2024),
S/o.Kumaran @ Thirukkumaran., Petitioner/Accused No.5.

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kadaladi P.S.,
Cr.No.29/2024. ...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr. A.Ramalingam, B.Sc., B.L., Advocate.
For Respondent : Tr.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

This is a petition for anticipatory bail U/s.438 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner/accused who apprehends arrest for alleged offences U/s. 294(b),
323, 324, 506(ii) and 307 IPC @ U/s. 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 307
IPC seeks Anticipatory Bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the
petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. He



would further submit that the petitioner is not named in FIR and he is roped in on the confession of A1. He would further contend that there is no specific overt-act attributable to the petitioner. Further he would contend that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and major part of the investigation has been completed. He would further contend that co-accused were enlarged on bail and anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram on various days. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Therefore he prays for anticipatory bail stating that he will not tamper the witnesses and abscond.

4.The Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the weapon allegedly used by A1 in the occurrence was recovered from the backyard of the petitioner. The petitioner also assaulted the defacto complainant. Therefore the specific overt-act against the petitioner is not clear. He would further contend that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. He would however oppose granting anticipatory bail on the ground that the investigation is still pending and he may abscond.

5. Considering both side submissions made by the Counsel and fact that the investigation has been narrowed down and also that A2 to A4 have



already been enlarged on bail, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with conditions:-

6. Accordingly the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail and he is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance before learned **District Munsif-cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi** on executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate concerned within 30 days from the date of this order, failing which the order shall stand cancelled automatically. Further the petitioner shall adhere to the following conditions:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required,

ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the accusation against them so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer,

iii) that the petitioner shall appear and sign before the Investigating Officer **every day at 10.30 a.m until further orders,**

iv) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during the investigation or trial,



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

8. If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 09th day of May 2024.

**B C
GOPINATH**

Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
20:29:07 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge, I/c.
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Kadaladi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.