



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

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

**Thursday, the 30th day of May 2024**  
Crl.M.P.No.254/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000285-2024)

Gurumoorthy (aged 42/2024)  
S/o.Ramaiah,

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,  
Peraiyur P.S., in Cr.No.41/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated : 28.05.2024 prays to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

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 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, who were granted anticipatory bail vide order of this court in Crl.M.P.No.1803/2024 dated 30.04.2024 with a condition to report before the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., until further orders. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking to relax the anticipatory bail condition

TNRM000002852024



imposed on him.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before the Respondent Police Station from 4.5.2024 to till date. The petitioner is the only bread winner of his family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner has complied with the condition before the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., from 04.05.2024 to 30.05.2024 for the past 26 days.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made on both sides, and the nature of offences, this Court is inclined to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

In the result, the petition is allowed and the condition imposed on the petitioner is totally relaxed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 30th day of May 2024.

S  
KUMARAGURU  
Digitally signed by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:24:05 +0530  
Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through E-Mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Peraiyur P.S.,  
The petitioner through his counsel.

TNRM000002952024



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.S.KUMARAGURU, B.L.,**

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Principal District Judge,  
Ramanathapuram

**Thursday, the 30th day of May 2024**

CrI.M.P.No.264/2024

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000295-2024)

1.Raisul @ Mohamed Raisul (aged 23)

S/o.Abdulsappar

2.Vappisithich @ Sithick Badusha (aged 25)

S/o.Syed ali

...Petitioner/Accused No.3,4

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,

Keelakkarai P.S., in Cr.No.53/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated : 28.05.2024 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioners.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.K.Anbuezhayan,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, who were granted bail vide order of this court in CrI.M.P.No.59/2024 dated 9.05.2024 with a condition to report before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders. The petitioners have filed this petition seeking to relax the bail condition



imposed on them.

1

The Learned Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi daily at 10.30 a.m., from 15.05.2024 to till date. The petitioners are only bread winner of their family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the bail condition imposed on them.

The Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners have complied with the condition before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi daily at 10.30 a.m., from 15.05.2024 to 30.05.2024 for the past 16 days.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made on both sides, and the nature of offences, this Court is inclined to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioners.

In the result, the petition is allowed and the condition imposed on the petitioners is totally relaxed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.

S  
KUMARAGURU

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:24:36 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.

TNRM000002952024



Copy sent through E-Mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Keelakkarai P.S.,  
The petitioners through their counsel.

TNRM000002952024



**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 30th day of May 2024**  
Crl.M.P.No.269/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000304-2024)

Karthik @ Karthi, (aged 28/2023)  
S/o.Bose

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,  
Sikkal P.S., in Cr.No.36/2023

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated : 28.05.2024 prays to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.S.J.Sheik Ibrakim,M.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, who were granted anticipatory bail vide order of this court in Crl.M.P.No.1419/2023 dated 20.03.2024 with a condition to report before the Respondent Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has

TNRM000002952024



been complying the condition before the Respondent Police Station from 27.4.2024 to till date. The petitioner is the only bread winner of his family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner has complied with the condition before the Respondent Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m., from 27.04.2024 to 30.05.2024 for the past 30 days.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made on both sides, and the nature of offences, this Court is inclined to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

In the result, the petition is allowed and the condition imposed on the petitioner is totally relaxed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 30th day of May 2024.

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date:  
2024.05.30  
19:24:52 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through E-Mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Sikkal P.S.,  
The petitioner through his counsel.

TNRM000002412024



**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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024  
Cr.L.M.P.No.221/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000241-2024)**

Muniasamy @ Peeskuty, (A1)  
S/o.Duraisamy,

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
Devipattinam P.S.,  
Cr.No.131/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 21.05.2024 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.Mohanbabu, 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.131/2024 of the respondent P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 379,109 IPC and 21(1) MMDR Act has filed this petition for seeking anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, based on information the respondent police





went to the occurrence place on 11.04.2024 at about 7.40 a.m, and found that the petitioner and 2 others have illegally transported gravel sand in unregistered Tractor at Govt.Puramboke land at Alagankulam to Attrangarai road without getting any permission from the concerned authorities. On seeing the police, they dumped the sand on the road and the vehicle has 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. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. If the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that there are totally 3 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. Others are still absconding. Further he has contended that the petitioner was formal arrest by the respondent police in this case. Further the learned public prosecutor contended that totally 17 previous cases are pending out of which 5 cases are same type of offence and other kind of offence in various courts. In this circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

TNRM000002412024



5. After taking into consideration of the both side learned counsels arugments and on perusal of records, it is found that, the petitioner is facing the more cases in various police station. In this circumstancs, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:25:07 +0530  
Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Devipattinam 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 District Judge,  
Ramanathapuram

**Thursday, the 30th day of May 2024**

CrI.M.P.No.210/2024

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000230-2024)

Mohamed Jahangir, (aged 38/2024)

S/o.Mohamed Meerasa

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,

Kenikkarai P.S., in Cr.No.210/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated : 21.05.2024 prays to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.Raja Sahul Hameed,B.Sc.,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, who were granted anticipatory bail vide order of this court in CrI.M.P.No.1731/2024 dated 25.04.2024 with a condition to report before the Respondent Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on him

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has

TNRM000002302024



been complying the condition before the Respondent Police Station from 13.5.2024 to till date. The petitioner is the only bread winner of his family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner has complied with the condition before the Respondent Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m., from 13.05.2024 to 30.05.2024 for the past 18 days.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made on both sides, and the nature of offences, this Court is inclined to relax the anticipatory bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

In the result, the petition is allowed and the condition imposed on the petitioner is totally relaxed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 30th day of May 2024.

S  
KUMARAGURU  
Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:26:01 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through E-Mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**CrI.M.P.No.153/2024**  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000169-2024)

Nagarajan, (aged 58/2024),  
S/o.Muniyandi.

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**Chathirakudi P.S.,**  
**Cr.No.27/2024.**

...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.Murugaboopathy, B.Com., L.L.B., 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.27/2024 of Chathirakudi P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, has filed this petition



seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, the defacto complainant is running Tamilar Velanmai Kuttupannai Limited Liability Partnership and he purchased lands for developing the agricultural in rural areas. A1 introduced himself the defacto complainant as he was doing real estate business along with one Ramesh. A1 approached the defacto complainant and informed him to purchase the land. The defacto complainant has accepted A1. A1 and A2 were brought some other persons and approached the defacto complainant. The defacto complainant was cheated by all the petitioners by executing sale deed by impersonation of the real owners of the property and also cheated by using forged document in respect of the properties which was sold to the defacto complainant vide various sale deed. On 01.07.2023 the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent police and the same was enquired. During the enquiry A1 appeared on 11.07.2023 agreed to return the sum of Rs.51,71,040/- within two months. But he did not return the amount to the defacto complainant. Then on 09.10.2023 the defacto complainant sent a complaint before the Superintendent of Police, Ramanathapuram. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contention is that the petitioner is arrayed as A3. He was only attested witness. Further he has contended that the petitioner is not involved any such kind of offences to intention to cheating the



defacto complainant he was attested as a witness in document. The learned counsel for the petitioner further would submit that the petitioner has no knowledge about to the money transaction between the defacto complainant and other accused. Further he has contented that the petitioner does not receive any amount as a mediator. The petitioner is in no way connected to the offence. Further he has contented that earlier 3 anticipatory bail applications were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court. A1 and A2 have already moved the anticipatory bail application before the Hon'ble High court. The Hon'ble High Court has given the interim anticipatory bail to the co-accused. Under these circumstances, if the petitioner is arrested by the respondent police they have to harass him. If the petition is not allowed, the petitioner is put to irreparable loss. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Counsel for the Public prosecutor has objected to release the petitioner by stating that the petitioner was also acting as a mediator and given a false promise he was accommodated with other accused and forged the document. Not only forged the document and also impersonation of the real owner of the property and executed the sale deed. Most of the amount is in the custody of the petitioner. The summon served to the petitioner but he is not appeared before the respondent police for enquiry. Further he has contented that investigation is yet to be completed. Earlier 3 anticipatory bail applications were dismissed by the Principal Sessions



Court. Under these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and perusal of the contention of the learned counsel for the objector, it is admitted fact that one of the accused moved for anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble High Court, the Hon'ble High Court has granted interim order on anticipatory bail. The learned counsel for the petitioner contention is that co-accused has already got interim order on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is entitled to get the anticipatory bail. The learned counsel for the accused contention is not sustainable one. In the present case, the petitioner was an attested witness, he was also involved in the occurrence directly as per Prosecution case. Further this court opinion is that the investigation is yet to be completed. The involvement of the amount was very huge. Earlier 3 anticipatory bail applications were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court. No change of circumstances in investigation from the previous dismissal order. The amount involved in huge, the attitude of the petitioner and other accused, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses being the mediator of the properties, to sell the properties by way of impersonation of the real owner of the property. There is no change of circumstances from the earlier dismissal order. Nature of offence and circumstances are considered by this Court and



TNRM000002952024



come to the conclusion, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Hence this petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:26:20 +0530  
Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.  
The Inspector of Police, Chathirakudi 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**Crl.M.P.No.179/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-0000189-2024)**

Namburajan, (aged 43 )  
S/o.Chellasamy.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Forest Ranger,  
Mandapam Forest Range,  
in WLOR No.10/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 21.05.2024 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.Arun Kannan, 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 is the accused in WLOR.No.10/2024 of Mandapam Forest Range. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 9, 39(1)(a, b, d), 39(3)(a, b, c), 40(2), 50, 51(1), 52 and 57 of Wild Life Protection Act 1972, has filed this petition seeking to release him on



anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, at the time of patrolling on 18.04.2024 at about 8.00 a.m they have found that the petitioner has illegally possessed 130 kgs of boiled and processed sea cucumber for the worth of Rs.10,50,000/- which was hoarded by the petitioner. Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. 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. Earlier 3 anticipatory bail applications were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court. 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 anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has illegally possessed 130 kgs of boiled and processed sea cucumber for the worth of Rs.10,50,000/- which was hoarded by the petitioner. Earlier 3 anticipatory bail applications were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court. Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. Investigation is pending. There is no change of circumstances from the earlier dismissal orders. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be

TNRM000002692024



dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of both side learned counsels arguments and on perusal of the case records, it found that totally the petitioner has illegally possessed 130 kgs of boiled and processed sea cucumber for the worth of Rs.10,50,000/- which was hoarded by the petitioner. Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. Since investigation is pending and it is in initial stage and also huge value of the properties involved in this case. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances, gravity of the offence and huge amount of property are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

S  
KUMARAGURU

Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:26:40 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.

The Inspector of Forest Ranger, Mandapam Forest Range.

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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**Crl.M.P.No.215/2024**

1.Chidambaram, (aged 55 )  
S/o.Ramaiah.

2.Arunkumar, (aged 32)  
S/o. Chidambaram

...Petitioners/Accused No.1,2

/vs/

State, through the Forest Ranger,  
Mandapam Forest Range,  
in WLOR No.12/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 21.05.2024 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.Arun Kannan, 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 petitioner is the accused in WLOR.No.12/2024 of Mandapam Forest Range. The petitioner who apprehend arrest at the hands of the



respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 9, 39(1)(a, b, d), 39(3)(a, b, c), 40(2), 50, 51(1), 52 and 57 of Wild Life Protection Act 1972, have filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. Accordingly, the prosecution case is that at the time of patrolling on 17.05.2024 at about 6.00 a.m., when the defacto complainant they have found that the petitioners have illegally possessed the boiled sea cucumber 75 kg for the worth of Rs.7,80,000/- and sea horse for the worth of Rs.10,000/-. Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. Hence the charge.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case and he is in no way connected in this case. The petitioner are arrayed as A1 and A2. A3 was already released on bail in CrI.M.P.No.2854/2024 on 29.05.2024 by the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram. Further the learned counsel for the petitioner further would submitted that the 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 anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence petition is to be allowed.



4. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioners have illegally possessed boiled sea cucumber , for the worth of Rs.7,80,000/- and sea horse for the worth of Rs.10,000/- Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. Only 3 witnesses was examined by the respondent police. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of the both side learned counsels arguments and on perusal of the case records, now this court opinion is that the date of occurrence was happened on 17.05.2024. The petitioners have illegally possed 75 kgs of boiled sea cucumber, for the worth of Rs.7,80,000/- and sea horse for worth of Rs.10,000/. Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. Nature and circumstances are considered by this court and come to the conclusion since the investigation is pending and it is initial stage and also sea cucumber for worth of Rs.7,80,000/- and sea horse for worth of Rs.10,000/. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Therefore the petitioners are not entitled to get

TNRM000002352024



anticipatory bail at this stage. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

S  
KUMARAGURU

Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:26:57 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Forest Ranger, Mandapam Forest Range,  
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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**Crl.M.P.No.216/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000236-2024)**

Vigneswaran @ Vikki, (aged 24 )  
S/o.Vilvamoorthy.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Forest Ranger,  
Mandapam Forest Range,  
in WLOR No.13/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 21.05.2024 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., 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 is the accused in WLOR.No.13/2024 of Mandapam Forest Range. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 9, 39(1)(a, b, d), 39(3)(a, b, c), 40(2), 50, 51(1), 52 and 57 of Wild Life Protection Act 1972, has filed this petition seeking to release him on



anticipatory bail..

2. Accordingly, the prosecution case is that at the time of patrolling on 18.05.2024 at about 8.00 a.m and they have found that the petitioner has illegally possessed the boiled and processed sea cucumber 48 kgs for a worth of Rs.4,80,000/- Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. 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. 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 anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has illegally possessed boiled 48 kgs sea cucumber for a worth of Rs.4,80,000/-Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. Only 4 witnesses was examined by the respondent police. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.



5. After taking into consideration of the both side learned counsels arguments and on perusal of the case records, now this court opinion is that the date of occurrence was happened on 18.05.2024. The petitioners have illegally possessed 48 kgs of boiled sea cucumber, for the worth of Rs.Rs.4,80,000/- Further the properties involved in this case were secured by the respondent police. Nature and circumstances are considered by this court and come to the conclusion since the investigation is pending and it is initial stage and also sea cucumber for worth of Rs.Rs.4,80,000/-.If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Therefore the petitioners are not entitled to get anticipatory bail at this stage. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:27:15 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Forest Ranger, Mandapam Forest Range,  
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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**CrI.M.P.No.228/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000248-2024)**

Marilingam, (aged 28),  
S/o.Karuppasamy.

....Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 21.05.2024 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.Radhakrishnan, 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.26/2024 of Kovilangulam 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, the defacto complainant is a Revenue



Inspector. Based on the information, on 30.04.2024 at about 8.30 p.m. the respondent police was conducted vehicle inspection in the occurrence place, the petitioner and another person illegally transported 4 ½ unit of river sand without getting any permission from the competent authorities in a Tipper Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN.65 BX 7443 F 9427 at primary Health Centre, Kovilangulam. The 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. Properties involved in this case have already been secured by the police. Most of the investigation has already been completed. Earlier bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.54/2024 dated 09.05.2024. 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, there are totally 2 accused involved in this case., The petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 has already released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.M.P.No.7560/2024 on 22.05.2024. On the date of occurrence the petitioner another person illegally transported 4 ½ unit of river sand without getting any permission from the competent authorities in a Tipper Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN.65 BX 7443 F 9427 at primary Health Centre, Kovilangulam. The Properties have been secured by the respondent police.



Material part of the witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. Further he has contended that 3 previous cases are pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will be 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 another person illegally transported 4 ½ unit of river sand without getting any permission from the competent authorities in a Tipper Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN.65 BX 7443 at primary Health Centre, Kovilangulam. The Properties have been secured by the respondent police. Material part of the witnesses examined by the respondent police. Further more 3 previous cases are pending against the petitioner. Nature and circumstances, release of Co-accused 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 **District Munsif-cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi** 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.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty 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 learned District Munsif cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi 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

TNRM000002732024



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 absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A IPC.**

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:27:30 +0530  
Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

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





**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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**Crl.M.P.No.243/2024**  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000273-2024)

Malairaj @ Malairaju, (aged 60),  
S/o.Kathiravan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**Chathirakudi P.S.,**  
**Cr.No.131/2015.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 28.05.2024 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.P.Muthulakshmi, B.A., L.L.B., 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.131/2015 of Chathirakudi P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.9, 16, 17, 18 of Bonded Labour Abolition Act 1976 and



Section 26 of Juvenile Justice Act, has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, based on the information received through Child line official phone, the defacto complainant went to the occurrence place and found that the petitioner was running bricks chamber and he was using juveniles and others for his work on meager wages under his control. 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 occurrence took place on 04.08.2015. The petitioner was not knowing about the FIR registered against him. The case was taken on file in PRC. No.38/2022. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 22.04.2024. The petitioner surrendered before the Judicial Magistrate, Paramkudi on 20.05.2024 and NBW was recalled. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has stated that there is no necessity to grant anticipatory bail since accused was released on station bail on 04.05.2024 before the Investigation Officer. Hence this petition is to be dismissed as infructuous.

5. Considered the submission made by the learned Public Prosecutor that the petitioner was released on station bail. Hence this petition is dismissed as infructuous.

TNRM000002732024



In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

S  
KUMARAGURU Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU Date: 2024.05.30  
19:27:43 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.  
The Inspector of Police, Chathirakudi 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**CrI.M.P.No.268/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000298-2024)**

1. Sivaramakrishnan @ Siva, (aged 22),  
S/o.Narayanan.

2. Kabilan, (aged 21)  
S/o. Ramakrishnan.

....Petitioner/Accused No.7, 8

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**Uchippuli P.S.,  
Cr.No.210/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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.Shanmuganathan, M.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of 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.210/2024 of the respondent police. The petitioners who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the



offences punishable U/s.399 IPC r/w Section 25(1A) Arms Act, have filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, at the time of police patrolling on 16.05.2024 they found that the petitioners and others have illegally possessed deadly weapons, threads, monkey cap, chilly pockets for commit dacoity in the occurrence place. 4 persons were red handed and other accused escaped from the occurrence place. The properties ( including 4 two wheelers) involved in this case have been seized by the respondent police. 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 offence.. Further he has contended that the properties involved in this case has already been secured by the respondent police. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. If the petitioners are enlarged on anticipatory bail, they will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, there are totally 8 accused involved in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A7 and A8. A2 to A5 are judicial custody. Others are still absconding. On 16.05.2024 the petitioners and others have illegally possessed deadly weapons in the occurrence place to commit dacoity. Properties involved in this case has already been secured by the respondent



police. 5 witnesses have already been examined. Other accused yet to be arrested. 3 previous cases are pending against the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner and 2 previous cases are pending against the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to commit same type of offence again.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, it is found that the petitioners and 6 others have involved in this case. On the date of occurrence all the accused assembled for committing dacoity in the public with deadly weapon and other things. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. 3 previous cases are pending against the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner and 2 previous cases are pending against the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner. Nature and circumstances and bad antecedents are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioners are entitled not 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 **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram 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 petitioner/accused is not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail order stands cancelled automatically;**

**ii) that the petitioners shall produce undertaking affidavit that they shall not involve in similar type of offence in future at the time of furnishing sureties;**

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 petitioners shall report and sign 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;

v) that the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

vi) that the petitioners 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 petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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;**

TNRM000002352024



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

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

S  
KUMARAGURU

Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:22:21 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05..2024

Copy sent through e-mail

To  
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram,  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Uchippuli P.S.,  
The petitioners through their 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**CrI.M.P.No.267/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000299-2024)**

Sivaramakrishnan @ Siva (aged 22),  
S/o.Narayanan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**Kenikkarai P.S.,  
Cr.No.231/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 28.05.2024 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.Shanmuganathan, M.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.231/2024 of Kenikkarai P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC, has filed this petition



seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, there is a previous motive between both parties. On 01.05.2024 at about 7.30 p.m., when the defacto complainant was going with his friend to get the salary, nearby OVS theater the petitioners and others waylaid the defacto complainant and abused him in filthy language and A2 assaulted him by way of sickle on his back and A1 assaulted him with sickle on his head and others assaulted him by way of hands and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences. 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. Earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.141/2024 dated 16.05.2024. The injured was discharged from 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 3 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A2. Earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.141/2024 dated 16.05.2024. A1 was released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.(MD) No.6985/2024 dated 24.05.2024. Earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this Court in



CrI.M.P.No.79/2024 dated 16.05.2024 against A3. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with sickle on his head and caused injuries. The injured was discharged from the hospital. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. 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, the petitioner is arrayed as A2. Earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this Court against the petitioner and A3. A1 was released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.(MD) No.6985/2024 dated 24.05.2024. On the date of occurrence the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with sickle on his head and caused injuries. The injured was discharged from the hospital. Material part of the witnesses has already been examined. No 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 of offence and circumstances and release of co-accused 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 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 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 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;

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**

TNRM000002992024



**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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU  
KUMARAGURU Date: 2024.05.30  
19:27:57 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram.  
The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**CrI.M.P.No.247/2024**  
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000274-2024)

1. Munispandi@ Munispandian (aged 28)  
S/o.Murugaboobathy.
2. Thenispandi @ TheniPandian,(aged 28)  
S/o.Murugaboobathy.
- 3.Murugavalli, (aged 47),  
W/o.Murugaboobathy.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated.28.05.2024 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.B.Kaleeswaran, MCA., 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.80/2024 of the respondent P.S. The petitioners who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 294(b), 323, 325, 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, the petitioners, tractor was pledged with defacto complainant for the amount of rs.1,00,000/- On 13.05.2024 at about 6.00 p.m., when the defacto complainant was at home, the petitioners came there and quarrel with defacto complainant and abused him in filthy language and A1 assaulted him with stone on his head and A2 assaulted with iron rod on his mouth and right cheek and broken two teeth and caused injuries and also A3 assaulted defacto complainant's wife and pulled hair 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 offence. Injured was discharged from hospital. Major part of the investigation has already been completed. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they will not tamper the witnesses and abscond. Hence the petition is to be allowed.



4. On the other hand, the Learned Public Prosecutor has contended that on the date of occurrence, the petitioners came there and quarrel with defacto complainant and abused him in filthy language and A1 assaulted him with stone on his head and A2 assaulted with iron rod on his mouth and right cheek and broken two teeth and caused injuries and also A3 assaulted defacto complainant's wife and pulled hair and caused injuries. The injured was discharged from hospital 26.05.2024. 6 witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. No previous case is pending against the petitioners.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides the learned counsels and on perusal of records, it is found that, on the date of occurrence t the petitioners came there and quarrel with defacto complainant and abused him in filthy language and A1 assaulted him with stone on his head and A2 assaulted with iron rod on his mouth and right cheek and broken two teeth and caused injuries and also A3 assaulted defacto complainant's wife and pulled hair and caused injuries 6 witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. 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. 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 **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram within 15 days** from the date of this order and on such arrest or surrender the petitioners 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 pass book to ensure their identity;

iii) that the petitioners 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 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU Date: 2024.05.30  
19:28:11 +0530  
Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Keelakkarai P.S.,  
The Petitioners through their 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**CrI.M.P.No.258/2024**

**(CNR No. TNRM-00-000290-2024)**

Dhanapal @ Dhanabalan,(aged 23)  
S/o.Murugesan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**R.S.Mangalam P.S.,  
Cr.No.126/2024.**

**...Respondent/Complainant**

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of 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.126/2024 of R.S.Mangalam P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.147, 148, 294(b), 307, 427, 506(ii) IPC and section 21(1) of Arms Act, has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.



2. According to the prosecution, there is some previous motive between the defacto complainant's street peoples and the petitioner's village peoples. Following which, on 24.05.2024 at about 4.30 p.m, when the defacto complainant and her Daughter-in-law were at house, the petitioner and others came there with dangerous weapons and knocked the door and asked about her son and abused in filthy language and damaged the water buckets. Further the petitioner (A11) tried to assault her and also threatened them with dire consequences. 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.. Further he has contended that this is a case and case in counter in Cr.No.127/2024. Further he has contended that no one was injured in this case. Co-accused A3 was released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.(MD) No.7988/2024n on 29.05.2024. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. If the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, there are totally 18 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A4. The occurrence was happened due to previous motive between two village groups. Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.127/2024. Further he has contended that the investigation is in



preliminary stage. Further he would submit that if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to police picketing. Investigation is yet to be completed. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. 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 there are totally 18 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A4. The occurrence was happened due to previous motive between two village groups. Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.127/2024. Investigation is in preliminary stage. The investigation is not yet completed and the petitioner is still is still absconding. The petitioner has filed this petition in earlier stage. All the accused have involved in this occurrence as per FIR. The learned Public Prosecutor has strongly objected to released the petitioner that, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to police picketing and also to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances, period of incarceration and stage of the investigation are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is not entitled not to get anticipatory bail at this stage, hence the petition is dismissed.

TNRM000002902024



In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05..2024

Copy sent through e-mail

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



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 petitioners are 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 Inspector of Police, Devakottai Taluk Police Station 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;

iv) that the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness 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 abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A  
**IPC.**

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

S  
KUMARAGURU Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:22:45 +0530

**Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024**

Copy sent through e-mail:



TNRM000002902024



To  
The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, R.S.Mangalam P.S.,  
The Petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM000002892024



**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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**  
**CrI.M.P.No.260/2024**  
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000289-2024)

1. Prabhu, (aged 40)  
S/o.Mathavaraj.
2. Nagavalli (aged 62)  
W/o.Mathavaraj.
- 3.Balakrishnan, (aged 68),  
S/o.Chellam.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1-3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,  
Nainarkovil P.S.,  
**Cr.No.81/2024**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated.28.05.2024 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.P.A.Sugumar, 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.81/2024 of the respondent P.S. The



petitioners who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 427, 506(ii) IPC, have filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, the defacto complainant is residing at Chennai and he is doing real estate business on 05.05.2024 at about 8.30 p.m., the defacto complainant went to Erulappa Samy Temple at Keelakavanoor by his car bearing registration No.TN 20 BK-4777 along with his driver and his assistant he informed about the temple visit to Paramasivam and one Tamilarasu they have come to the temple before reach him. Subsequently the petitioner and their unknown person waylaid the defacto complainant. The 1st petitioner tried to assaulted him with iron rod and the petitioners pushed him and the 1st petitioner abused in filthy language by way of stick. Further the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner threatened the car diver to get the key and also damaged the left front portion of the car using wooden log and snatched the key from the driver and their phone of the defacto complainant. Thereafter the 1st petitioner threatened the defacto complainant to put his signature in the cheque and the same was refused by him, then he slapped him by way of hand . The defacto complainant filled the cheque for Rs.5,00,000/- of the SBI KK Nagar, Branch Cheque. After getting the cheque all the accused assaulted him and fell down. The defacto complainant filled the cheque for Rs.5,00,000/- of the SBI KK Nagar,



Branch Cheque. After getting the cheque all the accused assaulted him and fell down. Due to such act of the petitioners he is sustained fracture on his left shoulder and caused injuries on left side head. The defacto complainant went to the Government Hospital on 6.5.2024 at about 3.38 a.m., Aasik Private Hospital. 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 no way connected with the case. The injured was discharged from 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 on the date of occurrence all the petitioners have assaulted the defacto complainant with stick on his head and sustained fracture on his left shoulder and caused injuries. The injured is taking treatment as in-patient at Asik Hospital, Ramanathapuram.

5. In view of the submission of the learned Public Prosecutor, the injured person is taking treatment as in-patient and he is not yet discharged from the private hospital. Considering the same, the petitioners are not entitled to get any relief at this stage. Hence this petition is dismissed.

TNRM000002892024



In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:28:26 +0530  
Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through e-mail:

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Nainarkovil P.S.,  
The Petitioners through their 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024**

**CrI.M.P.No.173/2024**  
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000191-2024)

Saravanan, (aged 26),  
S/o.Murugan.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**Uchippuli P.S.,**  
**Cr.No.210/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 21.05.2024 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.Muthuduraisamy, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru. B. Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., 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.210/2024 of the respondent police. The petitioner who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences



punishable U/s.399 IPC r/w Section 25(1A) Arms Act, has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, at the time of police patrolling on 16.05.2024 they found that the petitioners and others have illegally possessed deadly weapons for commit dacoity in the occurrence place. 4 persons were red handed and other accused escaped from the occurrence place. The properties involved in this case have been seized by the respondent police. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence.. Further he has contended that the properties involved in this case has already been secured by the respondent police. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. Further he would submit that there was a civil dispute between the petitioner and his brothers, due to which his brother threatened him to register a case against him. Further he has contended that the petitioner has lodged a complaint before the IG, DIG, DSP, Ramanathapuram to delete his name in this case. No specific overt-act against the petitioner. If the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, there are totally 8



accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 – A5 are in judicial custody. Others are still absconding. On 16.05.2024 the petitioner and others have illegally possessed deadly weapons in the occurrence place to commit dacoity. Properties involved in this case has already been secured by the respondent police. 5 witnesses have already been examined. Other accused yet to be arrested. One previous case is pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to commit same type of offence again.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, it is found that the petitioner and 7 others have involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. On the date of occurrence all the accused assembled for committing dacoity in the public with deadly weapons. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. One previous case is pending against the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner. Nature and circumstances are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled not to get anticipatory 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 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 petitioner shall produce undertaking affidavit that he shall not **involve in similar type of offence in future at the time of furnishing sureties;**

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 petitioners shall report and sign 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;

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

TNRM000002952024



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;**

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

IPC.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:22:58 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05..2024

Copy sent through e-mail

To  
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram,  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Uchippuli 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 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024  
Crl.M.P.No.245/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000272-2024)**

Chandru,(aged 22)  
S/o.Govindaraj.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
R.S.Mangalam P.S.,  
Cr.No.126/2024.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of 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.126/2024 of R.S.Mangalam P.S. The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.147, 148, 294(b), 307, 427, 506(ii) IPC and section 21(1) of Arms Act, has filed this petition seeking to release him on anticipatory bail.



2. According to the prosecution, there is some previous motive between the defacto complainant's street peoples and the petitioner's village peoples. Following which, on 24.05.2024 at about 4.30 p.m, when the defacto complainant and her Daughter-in-law were at house, the petitioner and others came there with dangerous weapons and knocked the door and asked about her son and abused in filthy language and damaged the water buckets. Further the petitioner (A11) tried to assault her and also threatened them with dire consequences. 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. . Further he has contended that this is a case and case in counter in Cr.No.127/2024. Further he has contended that no one was injured in this case. Co-accused A3 was released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.7988/2024 on 29.05.2024.. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. If the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that, there are totally 18 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A4. The occurrence was happened due to previous motive between two village groups. Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.127/2024. Further he has contended that the investigation is in



preliminary stage. Further he would submit that if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to police picketing. Investigation is yet to be completed. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. 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 there are totally 18 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A4. The occurrence was happened due to previous motive between two village groups. Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.127/2024. Investigation is in preliminary stage. The investigation is not yet completed and the petitioner is still is still absconding. The petitioner has filed this petition in earlier stage. All the accused have involved in this occurrence as per FIR. The learned Public Prosecutor has strongly objected to released the petitioner that, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to police picketing and also to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances, period of incarceration and stage of the investigation are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is not entitled not to get anticipatory bail at this stage, hence the petition is dismissed.

TNRM000002722024



In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.**

S  
KUMARAGURU

Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
19:23:13 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05..2024

Copy sent through e-mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, R.S.Mangalam 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 30th day of May 2024**

CrI.M.P.No.236/2024

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000267-2024)

1.Ajay Surya (aged 19/2024)  
S/o.Saravanan

2.Alex, (aged 19/2024)  
S/o.Iyyachamy

...Petitioner/Accused No.1,2

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,  
Kenikkarai P.S., in Cr.No.89/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated : 28.05.2024 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioners.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.R.Rameshkannan,B.Com.,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, who were granted bail vide order of this court in CrI.M.P.No.1210/2024 dated 19.03.2024 with a condition to report before the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., until further orders. The petitioners have filed this petition seeking to relax the bail condition

TNRM000002672024



imposed on them.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been complying the condition before the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., from 24.03.2024 to till date. The petitioners are only bread winner of their family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the bail condition imposed on them.

The Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners have complied with the condition before the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., from 24.03.2024 to 28.05.2024 for the past 70 days.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made on both sides, and the nature of offences, this Court is inclined to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioners.

In the result, the petition is allowed and the condition imposed on the petitioners is totally relaxed.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024.

S  
KUMARAGURU Digitally signed by  
S KUMARAGURU Date: 2024.05.30  
19:23:38 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024



TNRM000002672024



Copy sent through E-Mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai P.S.,  
The petitioners through their counsel.