



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.**

Thursday the 16th day of May 2024

**CrI.M.P.No.85/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000089-2024)**

Muniasamy, (aged 45/2024),
S/o.Alagulingam

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
**Uchippuli P.S.,
Cr.No.191/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 07.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.V.Sunil Malhotra, the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru. B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.191/2024 of Uchipuli P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 379 IPC and Section 21(1) of MMDR Act, has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution case is that on 04.05.2024 at about 00.45 hrs. at the time of patrolling by the police party, the petitioner and others have illegally transported 1 unit of sand in unnumbered Tractor with unnumbered Trailer without getting any permission from the concerned authorities and on seeing the police, the accused left the vehicle and fled away from the occurrence place. Properties have been secured by the respondent police. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. Most of the investigation has already been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, on the date of occurrence the petitioner and others illegally transported one unit of sand in unnumbered Tractor with unnumbered Trailer without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. The petitioner is a owner of the vehicle. Further he has contended that the properties have been secured by the respondent police. Further he has contended that 2 witnesses examined by the respondent police. Further he has contended that 6 previous cases are pending against the petitioner. Investigation is yet to be completed. If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper



the investigation. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, it is found that on the date of occurrence the petitioner and others have illegally transported 1 unit of sand in unnumbered Tractor with unnumbered Trailer without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. The petitioner is owne of the vehicle. The properties secured by the respondent police. Investigation is yet to be completed. Further more 6 previous cases are pending against the petitioner. Nature and circumstances, bad antecedents of the petitioner are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is not entitled to get any relief at this stage. Hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed
by S
KUMARAGURU KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:31:59 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Uchipuli P.S.
The Petitioner through his Counsel.



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.**

Thursday the 16th day of May 2024

**CrI.M.P.No.164/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000147-2024)**

Rajeshwaran, (aged 27/2024),
S/o.Kadhiravan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
**Uchippuli P.S.,
Cr.No.191/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.V.Sunil Malhotra, the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru. B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.191/2024 of Uchipuli P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 379 IPC and Section 21(1) of MMDR Act, has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution case is that on 04.05.2024 at about 00.45 hrs. at the time of patrolling by the police party, the petitioner and others have illegally transported 1 unit of sand in unnumbered Tractor with unnumbered Trailer without getting any permission from the concerned authorities and on seeing the police, the accused left the vehicle and fled away from the occurrence place. Properties have been secured by the respondent police. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. Most of the investigation has already been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, on the date of occurrence the petitioner and others illegally transported one unit of sand in unnumbered Tractor with unnumbered Trailer without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. The petitioner is a driver of the vehicle. Properties have been secured by the respondent police. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. One previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records and petition averments, it is found that the petitioner has



involved in sand theft. Properties involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police. Material part of the investigation has already been completed. Further more one previous case is pending against the petitioner. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, no prejudice will cause to the prosecution side. Nature and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to get anticipatory bail on payment of cost with the following conditions:-

i) that in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the respondent police or on his surrender before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram** within 15 days from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on anticipatory bail on his execution of a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) **with two sureties** for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate concerned**; If the petitioner/accused is not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stand cancelled automatically;

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit to the Credit of District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram;**



iii) that the petitioner shall produce undertaking affidavit that he shall not involve in same type of offence due to the environmental resources in future at the time furnishing sureties;

iv) that the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass book to ensure their identity;

v) that the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m. until further orders and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

vi) that the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses either during investigation or trial;

vii) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

viii) that 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 released on 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**);

TNRM000001472024



ix) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered

U/s.229 A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

S
KUMARAGURU
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

Digitally signed by
S KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:31:42 +0530

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram.
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Uchipuli P.S.
The Petitioner through his Counsel.



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.**

Thursday the 16th day of May 2024

**CrI.M.P.No.136/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000160-2024)**

1. Mullaivendan, (aged 26/2024),
S/o.Shanmuganathan.

2. Suriya @ Jeyasurya, (aged 21/2024)
S/o. Soundrapandi.

3. Mukesh @ Mukesh Kannan, (aged 19/2024)
S/o. Shanmuganathan.

...Petitioners /Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
**Chathirakudi P.S.,
Cr.No.83/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S.J.Sheik Ibrahim, M.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and Thiru.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioners are the accused in Cr.No.83/2024 of Chathirakudi P.S. The



petitioners who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act, have filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, there is some wordy quarrel between the defacto complainant and the petitioners. On 12.05.2024 at about 6.00 p.m. when the defacto complainant's husband and his father were going to the temple, the petitioners were drinking the wine nearby the temple. At that time the defacto complainant's husband questioned about the act of petitioners. Following which, on the same day at about 7.00 p.m. when the defacto complainant, her husband and her sister were sitting outside of the home, the petitioners came there and abused them in filthy language and A2 assaulted the defacto complainant with hand on her cheek and A1 assaulted the defacto complainant's sister who is pregnant with hand on her cheek and pushed down and also threatened them with dire consequences. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners has contended that, the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected with the case. The injured has discharged from the hospital. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioners. Hence this petition is to be allowed.



4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, totally 3 accused involved in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A1 to A3. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant and her family members in filthy language and assaulted the defacto complainant and her sister with hands and caused injuries. Injured not yet discharged from the hospital. Further he has contended that police interrogation is very necessary in this present case hence the petitioners are yet to be arrested by the respondent police. No previous case is pending against the petitioners. Investigation is yet to be completed. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, prejudice will cause to the prosecution. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, it is found that, the petitioners are arrayed as A1 to A3. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant and her family members in filthy language and assaulted the defacto complainant and her sister with hands and caused injuries. Injured not yet discharged from the hospital. No previous case is pending against the petitioners. Investigation is yet to be completed. Further more police interrogation is very necessary in the present case. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances, attitude of

TNRM000001602024



the petitioners, bad antecedents of the petitioners are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioners are not entitled to get any relief at this stage, hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed by
S KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:31:28 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.
The Inspector of Police, Chathirakudi P.S.
The Petitioners through their Counsel.

TNRM000001622024



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.**

Thursday, the 16th day of May 2024

**CrI.M.P.No.162/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000162-2024)**

Kumaraguru, (aged 28/2024)
S/o.Muthuramalingam,

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Pamban P.S.,
Cr.No.80/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.T.M.Arunkannan, B.A.,B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.80/2024 of the respondent P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 4(1)(aaa) TNP Act has filed this petition for seeking



anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, based on an information, the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 11.04.2024 at about 7.00 a.m, and found that the petitioner was in illegal possession of 565 brandy bottles (each 180 ml) in an auto to sell those at higher prices without any licence. On seeing the police, the petitioner escaped from the occurrence place. Properties have already been seized by the respondent police. Hence the charge.

3. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the above case. Properties involved in this case have already been seized by the police. He would further submit that earlier application was dismissed by this Court. Material part of the investigation has already been completed. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that the petitioner was in illegal possession of 565 brandy bottles (each 180 ml) in an auto to sell those at higher prices without any licence. On seeing the police, the petitioner escaped from the occurrence place. The properties have already been secured by the respondent police. He would further submit that earlier application was dismissed by this Court. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police.



Further he has contended that 4 previous cases are pending against the petitioner . If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to commit similar offence again and also to tamper and hamper the witnesses.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of the records, it is found that the illegal possession of 565 brandy bottles (each 180 ml) in an auto to sell those at higher prices without any licence The properties have already been secured by the respondent police. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. Further more 4 previous cases are pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to commit similar offence again and also to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances and bad antecedents are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to get anticipatory bail with the followeing conditions:-

i) that in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the respondent police or on his surrender before the learned **District Munsif -Cum-Judicial Magistrate , Rameswaram within 15 days** from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on anticipatory bail on his execution of 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 concerned; If the petitioner/accused is not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stands cancelled automatically;**

ii) Before execution of bond, the 1st petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit to the Credit of District Mediation Centre, Ramathapuram;

iii) that the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass book to ensure their identity;

iv) that the petitioner shall **report before the District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m., until further orders** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

v) that the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses either during investigation or trial;

vi) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vii) that 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

TNRM000001622024



released on 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);**

vii) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

S
KUMARAGURU
Digitally signed by
S KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:31:16 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The District Munsif -Cum-Judicial Magistrate , Rameswaram
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Pamban P.S,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.
The District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram

TNRM000001482024



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.**

Thursday, the 16th day of May 2024

**CrI.M.P.No.160/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000148-2024)**

Ajithkumar, (aged 25/2024),
S/o.Angusamy,

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Nainarkoil P.S.,
Cr.No.177/2023.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S.Chellamani, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.177/2023 of the respondent P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 379 IPC r/w 21(1) MMDR Act, has filed this petition for



seeking anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, the defacto complainant is the VAO of Vallam group. On 23.12.2023 at night the petitioners and another have illegally transported 8 unit of sand in Survey No.252/1 without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Further he has contended that the VAO has lodged a complaint on suspicion. There is no specific overt act against the petitioner and he is in no way connected with the offence. Most of the investigation has already been completed. Earlier bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.40/2024 dated 06.01.2024. Co-accused were already released on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.154/2024 dated 11.01.2024. If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, the occurrence took place on 23.12.2023 and FIR was registered on 24.12.2023 against the petitioner and 2 others. After conducting the investigation by the Investigation Officer, the petitioners and another have involved in this case and they are illegally transported 8



unit of sand from Survey No.252/1 in a TATA Tipper Lorry bearing Registration No.TN 22CZ3873 and unnumbered Tractor along with trailer with the help of JCB without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. Earlier application was dismissed by this this court.. Co-accused were already released on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.154/2024 dated 11.01.2024. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. There is substantial changes from the earlier dismissal orders. The properties involved in this case have secured by the respondent police. No previous case is pending against the petitioners.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records and petition averments, it is found that the petitioner and 2 others have involved in sand theft. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contention is that the defacto complainant has lodged a complaint on suspicion. This aspect is not acceptable one. The occurrence took place on 23.12.2023 and FIR was registered against the petitioner and others on 24.12.2023. After conducting the investigation by the investigation officer which shows that all the accused have illegally transported 8 unit of sand in Survey No.252/1 without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. There is substantial changes from the earlier dismissal orders. The properties involved in this case have already been secured. Material



part of the witnesses has already been examined. Nature and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to get anticipatory bail on payment of cost with following conditions:-

i) that in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the respondent police or on his surrender before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi** within 15 days from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on anticipatory bail on his execution of a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi**; If the petitioner/accused is not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stand cancelled automatically;

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit to the Credit of District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram ;**

iii) **that the petitioner shall produce undertaking affidavit that he shall not involve in similar type of offence in future at the time of furnishing sureties;**

iv) that the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass book to ensure their identity;



v) that the petitioner shall **report before the respondent police station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m until further orders** and on further condition that they shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

vi) that the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

vii) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

viii) that 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 released on 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**);

ix) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed
by S
KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:31:03 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

TNRM000001482024



Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Nainarkoil P.S,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM000001562024



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

PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday the 16th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.159/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000156-2024)

Sagubar Sathick (aged 40)
S/o.Ibrahim

...Petitioner/Accused No.5

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.V.Sunil Malhotra, B.Com., B.L., Learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.107/2024 of Thondi P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences U/s.147, 148, 294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC and section 4 of TNPHW Act has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, on 3.5.2024 at 4.00 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. Hence the charge.

4. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the above case. The injured has been discharged from the hospital. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

5. The Learned Public Prosecutor has contended that there are totally 6 accused are involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A5. A1 to A4 already granted on anticipatory bail by the principal Sessions Court. A4 is Juvenile in conflict law. 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.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, it is found that, totally 6 accused are involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A5. A1 to A4 already granted on anticipatory bail by the principal Sessions Court . A4 is Juvenile in conflict law. The injured has already been discharged from the hospital. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, no prejudice will cause to the prosecution side. Nature and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to get anticipatory bail with the following conditions:-

i) that in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the respondent police or on his surrender before the learned **Judicial Magistrate , Thiruvadanai within 15 days** from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on anticipatory bail on his execution of 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 concerned; If the petitioner/accused is not**



surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stands cancelled automatically;

ii) that the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass book to ensure their identity;

iii) that the petitioner shall **report before the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai daily at 10.30 a.m until further orders** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

v) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vi) that 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 released on 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);**

TNRM000001562024



vii) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A
IPC.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed
by S
KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:30:47 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

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.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday the 16th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.148/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000172-2024)

Pandi, (aged 43)
S/o.Ramanathan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thondi P.S.,
Cr.No.111/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.K.Gunasekaran, M.A., B.L., Learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., Learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.111/2024 of Thondi P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences U/s. 294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution case is that on 05.05.2024 at about 8.45 a.m., the defacto complainant ready to go go for his work the petitioner came to the front of his home and the defacto complainant abused him in filthy language and assaulted with hands and caused injuries. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the case. The injured was discharged from the hospital. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, some dispute between the both parties. On the date of occurrence the petitioner and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him by way of hands and caused injuries. The injured has already been discharged from the hospital. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, . The occurrence was happened between them due to some dispute. The injured has already been discharged from the hospital. No



previous case is pending against the petitioner. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, no prejudice will cause to the prosecution side. Nature and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to get anticipatory bail with the following conditions:-

i) that in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the respondent police or on his surrender before the learned **Judicial Magistrate , Thiruvadanai within 15 days** from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on anticipatory bail on his execution of 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 concerned; If the petitioner/accused is not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stands cancelled automatically;**

ii) that the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass book to ensure their identity;

iii) that the petitioner shall **report before the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai daily at 10.30 a.m until further orders** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the

TNRM000001722024



investigation Officer;

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

v) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vi) that 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 released on 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**);

vii) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

S
KUMARAGURU Digitally signed by
S KUMARAGURU Date: 2024.05.16
19:30:31 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

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.

TNRM000001792024



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

PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday the 16th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.142/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000179-2024)

Sivakumar @ Guna (aged 21)
S/o.Sekar.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Paramakudi Taluk P.S.,
Cr.No.123/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S.Gopinath, BBA., LLB., the Learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the Learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.123/2024 of Paramakudi Taluk P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences U/s. 294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution case is that the defacto complainant and petitioner and other in front of one Karuppasamy house, at the time of the petitioners and others abused him in filthy language and assaulted with beer bottle on his head and caused injuries and also threatened with dire consequences . Hence the charge.. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the case. The injured was discharged from the hospital. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, totally 2 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 in juvenile conflict. On the date of occurrence the petitioner and A1 abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him by way of beer bottle and caused injuries. The injured has already been discharged from the hospital on 10.05.2024. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, it is found that, totally 2 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 in juvenile conflict.. The occurrence was



happened between them due to running the motor by the defacto complainant. The injured has already been discharged from the hospital. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, no prejudice will cause to the prosecution side. Nature and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to get anticipatory bail with the following conditions:-

i) that in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the respondent police or on his surrender before the learned **Judicial Magistrate , Paramakudi within 15 days** from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on anticipatory bail on his execution of 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 concerned; If the petitioner/accused is not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stands cancelled automatically;**

ii) that the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass book to ensure their identity;

iii) that the petitioner shall **report before the respondent Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m until further orders** and on further condition that he shall make

TNRM000001792024



available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

v) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vi) that 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 released on 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**;

vii) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

S
KUMARAGURU
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

Digitally signed by
S KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:30:18 +0530

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Judicial Magistrate , Paramakudi
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Paramakudi Taluk P.S,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM000001672024



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

PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 16th day of May 2024
CrI.M.P.No.139/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000167-2024)

1. Pitchai, (aged 43/2024),
S/o.Govindan.

2. Kokila, (aged 23/2024),
W/o.Manikandan.

3. Selvarani, (aged 37/2022)
W/o.Pitchai.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Rameswaram Jetty P.S.,
Cr.No.49/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.M.Raja Sahul Hameed, B.Sc., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and Thiru. B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioners are the accused in Cr.No.49/2024 of Rameswaram Jetty P.S. The petitioners who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the



offences punishable U/s.294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC, have filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, there is a family dispute between the both parties. Following which, on 25.04.2024 at about 8.00 p.m. while the defacto complainant was sleeping in his house, the petitioners came there and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and all the accused assaulted him with knife and caused injuries and also threatened him with dire consequences. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners has contended that, the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected with the case. This is a case and case in counter. The injured has been discharged from the hospital. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioners. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, there is a family dispute between the both parties. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant and caused injuries. Further he has contended that counter case has also registered in Cr.No.48/2024. The injured was discharged from hospital on 04.05.2024. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioners.



5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant and caused injuries. Counter case has also been registered. The injured has already been discharged from hospital. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioners. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, no prejudice will cause to the prosecution side. Nature and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioners are entitled to get anticipatory bail with the following conditions:-

i) that in the event of arrest of the petitioners by the respondent police or on their surrender before the learned **District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram within 15 days** from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on anticipatory bail on their execution of 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 concerned; If the petitioners/accused are not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stands cancelled automatically;**

ii) that the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank

TNRM000001672024



pass book to ensure their identity;

iii) that the **petitioners shall report before the respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m. until further orders** on further condition that they shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

iv) that the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses either during investigation or trial;

v) that the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vi) that 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 released 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**);

vii) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A IPC.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed
by S
KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:30:06 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

TNRM000001672024



Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.

The Inspector of Police, Rameswaram Jetty P.S.

The Petitioners through their Counsel.

TNRM000001432024



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

PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday the 16th day of May 2024

CrI.M.P.No.130/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000143-2024)

1. Muthukumar,(aged 52)
S/o.Ramachandran.

2. Ganesan, (aged 55/2024),
S/o.Ramachandran.

3. Ramani, (aged 76/2024),
W/o.Ramachandran.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police

D.C.B.Ramanathapuram.,

Cr.No.2/2024

...Respondent/Complainant.

Petition dated: 14.05.2024 U/s.438 Cr.P.C. to grant anticipatory bail.

These petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.A.Raja Hussain, B.A., B.L., the Learned Counsel for the petitioners and Thiru. B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioners are the accused in Cr.No.2/2024 of D.C.B.Ramanathapuram.

The petitioners who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the



offences punishable U/s. 465, 468, 471, 420 r/w 120(b) IPC, have filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, the defacto complainant is Legal Advisor of one Baby Kanjana's husband properties were situated at Melamudukulathur in Survey No. 259/2 and 257/3. The Baby Kanjana husband Elangovan was died on 2012.. The said Baby Kanjana after knowing the E.C of the properties, her husband brother namely Udhayakumar (A4) was executed a power deed for selling the properties on 24.11.2006. A4 along with A1 and A2 were created bogus death certificate of the real owner Elangovan. Based on the power, A1 executed sale deed in favour of one Mohandoss on 03.10.2008 before the Sub-Registrar, Mudukulathur. Further A1 executed one Inaam settlement deed in respect of the properties in favour his mother A3 in document No.203/2016. In that document A1, A2 and A4 jointly created bogus life certificate for A1. The said life certificate was given by one Dr.Murugesan, who died during the year 2007, but the certificate was given in the year 2016. The above said matter was known at the time of enquiry. Hence the complaint was lodged against the petitioners. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners has contended that, the petitioners are in no way connected with the offence and they are falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A1 to A3. A3 is mother of A1 and A2. The defacto complainant has lodged a complaint against the petitioner as false contention against



A1 to A3. A3 is aged about 76 years and she is heart patient. Further he has contended that the Survey No.259/2 and 257/3 was purchased by the petitioners from A4 during the year 2006 and 2008. There is no necessary to create the bogus document for executing the sale deed by impersonation. No value was mentioned in the FIR regarding the property. It is civil nature. Further he has contended that if the petitioners are arrested by the respondent police, they will harassed by them. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. No previous case is pending against the petitioners. Earlier application were dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.1032/2024 and CrI.M.P.No.1493/2024 dated 13.03.2024 and 29.04.2024 respectively. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor has reiterated the prosecution version. Further he has contended that the petitioners are arrayed as A1 to A3. The properties belongs to one Elangovan, who was husband of Baby Kanjana. A4 is brother of Elangovan. The defacto complainant is legal advisor of Baby Kanjana who is wife of late.Elangovan. A3 created power of attorney in respect of the properties to A1. A1, A2 and A4 jointly created bogus documents and impersonation of the real owners and created bogus life certificate in the name of death person and sold the properties to A3 and one Mohandoss. Further he has contended that the investigation is in not yet completed. The police interrogation is very necessary against all the petitioners. There is no change of circumstances from

TNRM000001432024



the earlier dismissal orders. If all the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will be possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses and also difficult to find other accused. Hence the petition is to be dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of both petitioners learned Counsels arguments and petitions averments, it found that the offences are serious in nature. The petitioners and A4 have involved in this offence. The occurrence was happened on 24.11.2006. The FIR was registered on 06.02.2024. Further more investigation is yet to be completed. The learned Public Prosecutor contention is that the police interrogation of the petitioners are very necessary to find out various aspects. Other accused involved in this case yet to be find out by the police. Since the petitioners are absconding, the investigation officer is not able to conduct the interrogation. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, prejudice will cause to the prosecution. There is no change of circumstances from the earlier dismissal orders. Nature of offence and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioners are not entitled to get any relief at this stage, hence both the petitions are to be dismissed.

In the result, both anticipatory bail petitions are dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed by
S KUMARAGURU
KUMARAGURU Date: 2024.05.16
19:29:26 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

TNRM000001432024



Copy sent through e-mail:

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, DCB, Ramanathapuram,
The petitioners through their Counsel.

TNRM000000472024



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.**

Thursday, the 16th day of May 2024

**Crl.M.P.No.46/2024
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000047-2024)**

Udhayakumar, (aged 33),
S/o.Pulendran.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Forest Ranger,
Ramanathapuram Forest Range,
WLOR.No.2/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 07.05.2024 U/s.439 Cr.P.C. to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.K.Anbuechhiyan, B.A., B.L., the Learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru. B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner who was arrested on 20.04.2024 in WLOR No.2/2024 on the file of the respondent for the offences punishable U/s. 9, 39, 51, 52 of Wild Life Act 1972 and section 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 25 of Arms Act 1959, has filed this petition



for seeking bail.

2. According to the prosecution, based on information the respondent went to the occurrence place on 01.05.2024 and collected information from the public that a venison curry bags laid at Peravur road, the 2 persons came in a two wheeler and taken away from the occurrence place. After investigation the petitioner and 4 others committed the offence and the same was admitted by the petitioner on confession. The respondent went to the petitioner's hose and seized the hunting properties like torch light, country made gun-2, and venison head-2, 8 legs and TVS bike and other articles. All the accused have committed deer hunting and buried skin of venison. Hence the charge.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and he is in no way connected in this case. Further he has contended that the petitioner was arrested on 01.05.2024 and he is in judicial custody for the past 16 days. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. Properties have already been secured. Hence, if the petitioner is released on bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence the petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor has reiterated the prosecution version. Further he has contended that totally 5 accused involved in this



case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 is in judicial custody. Others are still absconding. All the accused have involved in deer hunting. The petitioner was arrested on 01.05.2024 and he is in judicial custody. Properties involved in this case have already been secured and the venison curry sample was sent to Advanced Institute for Wildlife Conservation, (AIWC), Chennai. Other accused yet be arrested. Investigation is yet to be completed. Report yet to be received from AIWC, Chennai. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses and also to commit same type of offence again. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of both side learned counsels arguments and on perusal of the case records, it found that totally 5 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 is in judicial custody. Others are still absconding. All the accused have involved in deer hunting. The petitioner was arrested on 01.05.2024 and he is in judicial custody. Properties involved in this case have already been secured and the venison curry sample was sent to Advanced Institute for Wildlife Conservation, (AIWC), Chennai. Other accused yet be arrested. Investigation is yet to be completed. Report yet to be received from AIWC, Chennai. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses and also to commit same type of offence again. Hence this

TNRM000000472024



petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 16th day of May 2024.

S
KUMARAGURU
Digitally signed by
S KUMARAGURU
Date: 2024.05.16
19:28:34 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
16.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Forest Ranger, Ramanathapuram Forest Range,

The petitioner through his Counsel.