



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.77/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000077-2024)

1. Arunachalam, (aged 27/2024),
S/o.Muniyasamy.

2. Mariselvam, (aged 39/2024),
S/o.Cheepan.

...Petitioners/Accused No.2,3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Kenikkarai P.S.,
Cr.No.214/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : 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 petitioners/accused who apprehend arrest for alleged offences U/s. 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.214/2024 of respondent police seek Anticipatory Bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. According to the prosecution, that there was some previous motive



between the both parties. On 19.04.2024 at about 9.30 p.m., when the defacto complainant was proceeding in a two wheeler, the petitioners and others came there and waylaid him and abused in filthy language and assaulted with iron rod , wooden log and hands and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and the case has been registered.

4. The Learned Counsel for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that there is previous motive between both the parties. Injured was discharged. He would further submit that most of the investigation has been completed. Therefore he prays for anticipatory bail stating that they will not tamper the witnesses and abscond.

5. The Learned Public Prosecutor would submit that 4 accused are involved in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A2 and A3. A4 was already granted anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1813/2024 on 30.04.2024. A1 is in Judicial custody. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners and others assaulted with iron rod , wooden log and hands and caused injuries. He would further submit that the injured has been discharged from hospital and major part of the investigation has been completed. Earlier bail application was dismissed



by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1813/2024 on 30.04.2024. One previous case is pending against the 1st petitioner and two previous cases are pending against the 2nd petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the Counsel and facts and circumstances of the case and that substantial investigation is over, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner alone. Considering the facts and circumstances and bad antecedents of the 2nd petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to him.

7. Accordingly the 1st petitioner is granted anticipatory bail and he is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram** 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 1st petitioner shall adhere to the following conditions:-

i) that the 1st petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required,



ii) that the 1st 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 1st petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer, everyday at 10.30 a.m until further orders;

iv) that the 1st petitioner shall not abscond either during the investigation or trial.

8. On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 1st petitioner in accordance with Law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitions 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).

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

In respect of the 2nd petitioner the petition is dismissed.

TNRM000000772024



Pronounced by me in open Court this the 9th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH
Vacation Sessions Judge(i/c)
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
19:54:44 +0530

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai P.S.,
The Petitioners through their 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.67/2024

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000066-2024)\

Ajmeer Khan, (aged 42)
S/o.Abdulmaseethu

.....Petitioners/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thondi P.S.,
Cr.No.107/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Tr.V.Sunil Malhothra, 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 apprehend's arrest for alleged offences U/s.147,148, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC and section 4 of TNPHW Act in Cr.No.107/2024 of respondent police seeks Anticipatory Bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. According to the prosecution, that on 3.5.2024 at 4. p.m. when the defacto complainant was putting up fence in the backyard of her house, at that time all the accused formed an unlawful assembly with weapon and attacked her with aruval and



wooden log and caused injuries. Further, they pulled saree of the daughter of the defacto complainant with aruval and damaged it also abused them with filthy languages and also threatened them with dire consequences and the case has been registered.

4. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that there is civil dispute between both the parties. He would further submit that most of the investigation has been completed. Therefore he prays for anticipatory bail stating that he will not tamper the witnesses and abscond.

5. The Learned Public Prosecutor would submit that 6 accused are involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. On 3.5.2024 at 4.00 p.m. when the defacto complainant was making fence in the backyard of her house, at that time all the accused formed an unlawful assembly with weapon and attacked her with aruval and wooden log and caused injuries. He would further submit that the injured was discharged from hospital on 07.05.2024 and major part of the investigation has already been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioner.



6. Considering both side submissions and nature of offence and considering the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration of the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and considering the stage of the investigation, this Court is inclined grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner

7. 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 the **learned Judicial Magistrate Thiruvadanai** 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 petitioners 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 before the learned Judicial Magistrate , Thiruvadanai everyday at 10.30 a.m until further orders;

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

8. On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with Law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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).

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

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 9th day of May 2024.

**B C
GOPINATH**

Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
19:54:20 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge(i/c)
Ramanathapuram.

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Judicial Magistrate , Thiruvadanai
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Thondi 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
Cr.I.M.P.No.59/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000059-2024)

1. Raisul @ Mohamed Raisul (aged 23),
S/o.Abdulsappar.

2.Vappisithick @ Sithick Badusha (aged 25),
S/o.Syed Ali

.....Petitioners/Accused No. 3,4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Keelakkarai P.S.,
Cr.No.53/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Tr.K.Anbuchhiyan, B.A., 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 petitioners/accused who apprehend arrest for alleged offences U/s. 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC @ 294(b), 307 IPC in Cr.No.53/2024 of respondent police seeks Anticipatory Bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.



3. According to the prosecution, on 08.04.2024 at about 5.45 a.m, the petitioner and 3 others have assembled at new building in front of Pallivasal for the purpose of consumign Kanja. At that time, the defacto complainant and his friends saw them and so all the accused fled the occurrence place leaving a two wheeler there. After some time all the accused returned to the occurrence place to take the two wheeler. When the defacto complainant questioned about this with his friends, an altacation arose following which all the accused abused them in filthy language and A1 assaulted with knife one Nazeem Bias on his left thigh and A2 assaulted the defacto complainant with knife on his backside right hip and A3 and A4 assaulted one Mohammed Arsath with wooden log and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and the case has been registered.

4. The Learned Counsel for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that the injured was discharged from hospital. He would further submit that most of the investigation has been completed. The Co-accused have already been enlarged on bail by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1804/2024 on 30.04.2024. Therefore they pray for anticipatory bail stating that they will not tamper the witnesses and abscond.



5. The Learned Public Prosecutor would contend that totally 4 accused are involved in this case. The petitioners are A3 and A4. A1 and A2 have already been enlarged on bail on 30.04.2024. Further he would submit that the occurrence took place on 07.04.2024. At the time of occurrence A1 and A2 assaulted the defacto complainant with knife on his left side right hip and assaulted his friend one Nazeem bias with knife on his left thigh and caused injuries. A3 and A4 assaulted on Arsath with wooden log and caused injuries. FIR was initially registered for the offences punishable u/s. 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC and subsequently altered U/s. 294(b), 307 IPC. Injured persons were discharged from hospital on 10.04.2024 and 26.04.2024. 8 witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police.

6. Considering the submissions made by the Counsel and facts and circumstances, release of co-accused and that substantial investigation is over, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail and they are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before **learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram** on executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- each 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 petitioners shall adhere to the following conditions:-

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

ii) that the petitioners 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 petitioners shall appear before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi everyday at 10.30 a.m until further orders;

iv) that the petitioners shall not abscond either during the investigation or trial.

8. On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with Law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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).

9. If the petitioners thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

TNRM000000592024



Pronounced by me in open Court this the 9th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date:
2024.05.09
19:54:01 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge(i/c)
Ramanathapuram.

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram,
The District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Keelakkarai P.S.,
The Petitioners through their Counsel.

TNRM000000672024



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.68/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000065-2024)

1. Mamutha Beevi, (aged 38)
D/o.Ibrahim
2. Barvin Banu, (aged 32)
D/o. Maideen Pitchai.
3. Mohamed Noorthin, (aged 20)
S/o. HasanAli.

.....Petitioners/Accused No.2 to 4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thondi P.S.,
Cr.No.107/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Tr.V.Sunil Malhotra, B.Com., 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 petitioners/accused who apprehend arrest for alleged offences U/s. 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC and section 4 of TNPHW Act in Cr.No.107/2024 of respondent police seek Anticipatory Bail.



2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. According to the prosecution, on 03.05.2024 at 4.00 p.m. when the defacto complainant was putting up fence in the backyard of her house, all the accused formed an unlawful assembly with weapon and attacked her with aruval and wooden log and caused injuries. Further, they pulled the saree of defacto complainant's daughter with aruval and damaged it also abused them with filthy languages and also threatened them with dire consequences and the case has been registered.

4. The Learned Counsel for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that there is civil dispute between both the parties. Injured was discharged. He would further submit that most of the investigation has been completed. Therefore he prays for anticipatory bail stating that they will not tamper the witnesses and abscond.

5. The Learned Public Prosecutor would submit that there is civil dispute between the parties and on 3.5.2024 at 4.00 p.m. when the defacto complainant was fencing in the backyard of her house, the accused formed an unlawful assembly with weapon and attacked her with aruval and wooden log and caused injuries. He would further submit that the injured has been discharged from hospital on 07.05.2024 and



major part of the investigation has already been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioners.

6. Considering the submissions made by the Counsel and facts and circumstances of the case and that substantial investigation is over and A1, A2 are women, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail and they are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the **learned Judicial Magistrate Thiruvadanai** on executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- each 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 petitioners shall adhere to the following conditions:-

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

ii) that the petitioners 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

TNRM000000672024



officer,

iii) that the petitioners shall appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai everyday at 10.30 a.m until further orders;

iv) that the petitioners shall not abscond either during the investigation or trial.

8. On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with Law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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).

9. If the petitioners thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 9th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH
Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
19:54:31 +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, Thondi P.S.,
The Petitioners through their Counsel.

TNRM000000672024



TNRM000000552024



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.57/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000055-2024)

Kamala, (aged 41/2024),
W/o.Panjatcharam.

.....Petitioner/Accused 2

/Vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Chathirakudi P.S.,
Cr.No.76/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.Muneeswaran,B.A., 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 apprehend arrest for alleged offences U/s. 294(b), 323, 427, 506(ii) IPC and section 4 of TNPHW Act in Cr.No.76/2024 of respondent police seeks Anticipatory Bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.



3. According to the prosecution, the defacto complainant's husband and A1 are brothers. There was a civil dispute between them. Both families are using bore well which is installed at the petitioner's house. Subsequently on 28.04.2024 at about 6.30 a.m, A1 disconnected the E.B. line from the bore well connection, which was questioned about by the defacto complainant and her husband. At that time, A1 abused them in obscene words and pushed down the defacto complainant and tried to assault the defacto complainant's husband using a Kadapparai and damaged cycle and also criminally intimidated them. There after the case has been registered.

4. 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 there is civil dispute between both the parties. The injured was discharged from hospital. He would further submit that most of the investigation has been completed. Therefore he prays for anticipatory bail stating that he will not tamper the witnesses and abscond.

5. The Learned Public Prosecutor would submit that totally 3 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 is in judicial custody. A3 is still absconding. There was a civil dispute between both the parties due to



disconnection of E.B.line. Following this, the accused has committed the offence. At the time of occurrence, A1 also damaged the defacto complainant's cycle and its damage value is Rs.500/-. He would further submit that the injured was discharged from hospital and major part of the investigation has already been completed. Major part of the investigation has already been completed. No previous case is there against the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the Counsel and facts and circumstances of the case, that there is no need for custodial interrogation and that substantial investigation is over, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail and he is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance before learned **Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi** 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 herself 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 before the Investigating Officer, everyday at 10.30 a.m until further orders;**

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

8. 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 petitioners 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).

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

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 9th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH

Digitally signed by
B C GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
19:53:45 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge(i/c)
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

TNRM000000552024



Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Chathirakudi P.S.,
The Petitioner through her 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.63/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000062-2024)

1. Senthamil (aged 20),
D/o.Ramanathan.

2. Rajakumari (aged 39),
W/o.Ramanathan

....Petitioners/Accused No. 1,2

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Tr.G.Kunasekaran, M.A., 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 petitioners/accused who apprehends arrest for alleged offences U/s. 294(b), 427, 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.92/2024 of respondent police seek Anticipatory Bail.

2. Heard both side and perused the records.

3. According to the prosecution, on 27.04.2024 at 5.00 p.m., when the



defacto complainant paid money to the revenue department at his native place measured and surveyed his land by placing a stone on it, the accused broke the stone and damaged it. Therefore, when the defacto complainant had questioned the act of the accused, the accused abused them with filthy languages and also threatened them with dire consequences and the case has been registered.

4. The Learned Counsel for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the above case. He would further contend that there is civil dispute between both the parties. No one was injured . He would further submit that a counter case has also been registered. Most of the investigation has been completed. Therefore he prays for anticipatory bail stating that they will not tamper the witnesses and abscond.

5. The Learned Public Prosecutor would submit that there is civil dispute between the both parties. In furtherance of it, on 27.04.2024 at 5.00 p.m., when the defacto complainant paid money to the revenue department at his native place and they had measured and surveyed the land by placing a stone on it, the accused broke the stone and damaged it. The value of named stone Rs.1000/-..Further he would submit counter case has also been registered in Cr.No.91/2024. No one was injured and major part of the investigation has already been completed. No previous case is



pending against the petitioners.

6. Considering the submissions made by the Counsel and facts and circumstances of the case , no one was injured and that substantial investigation is over, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail and they are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before **learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai** on executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- each 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 petitioners shall adhere to the following conditions:-

i) Before execution of bond, **the petitioners shall jointly deposit a sum of Rs.1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only) to the Credit of Crime No.92/2024 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai without prejudice to his defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.**

ii) that the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required,

iii) that the petitioners 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,

iv) that the petitioners shall appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai everyday at 10.30 a.m until further orders;

iv) that the petitioners shall not abscond either during the investigation or trial.

8. On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with Law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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).

9. If the petitioners thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 9th day of May 2024.

B C
GOPINATH
Digitally signed
by B C
GOPINATH
Date: 2024.05.09
19:54:10 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge(i/c)
Ramanathapuram.
09.05.2024

TNRM000000622024



Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.

The Inspector of Police, Thiruvadanai P.S.,

The Petitioners through their Counsel.