



**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.252/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000283-2024)

Albert Reegan, (aged 21/2024)  
S/o.Vedhamuthu,

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,  
Paramakudi Taluk P.S., in Cr.No.106/2024

...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.13/2024 dated 09.05.2024 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.



2. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 a.m. from 17.05.2024 to till date. The petitioner is only bread winner of their family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

3.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 17.05.2024 to 30.05.2024 for the past 14 days and also the petitioner filed this petition in an very earlier stage.

4. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made on both sides, the petitioner has filed this petition in an very earlier stage. Nature of offence is considered by this court and come to the conclusion the petitioner is not entitled to get any relief. Hence this petition is dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

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

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
18:58:26 +0530  
Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

TNRM000002832024



Copy sent through E-Mail

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

TNRM000002942024



**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.263/2024

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000294-2024)

1.Laksham, (aged 58)

S/o.Sethukarai

2.Veeramakali, (aged 46)

S/o.Kalimuthu

3.Puduraja, (aged 48)

S/o.Balakrishnan

4.Kamalanathan, (aged 40)

S/o.Sethukarai

5.Sathiyendran, (aged 53)

S/o.Sethukarai

6.Raja (aged 55)

S/o.Setti

7.Ponvayuru (aged 44)

S/o.Shanmugam

8.Raja, (aged 51)

S/o.Balkarasu

9.Poduraja, (aged 49)

S/o.Ayyadurai

10.Samayachandran (aged 40)

TNRM000002942024



S/o.Katturaja

11.Samayaselvam, (aged 53)

S/o.Samayamuthu

12.Chinnatharumaiya, (aged 41)

S/o.Kani

13.Raja, (aged 51)

S/o.Piranmalai

14.Seeniselvam (aged 53)

S/o.Pattani

...Petitioner/Accused No.1 - 14

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,

Ramanathapruam Forest Range,

WLOR No.8/2024

...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.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, who were granted bail vide order of this court in CrI.M.P.No.89/2024 dated 16.05.2024 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



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 20.05.2024 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 Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., from 20.05.2024 to 30.05.2024 for the past 11 days.

Considering the fact that the petitioner has been complying the condition for the past 11 days and also considering the nature of the offence, this Court is not inclined to relax the condition and inclined to modify the condition imposed on the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.89/2024 dated 16.05.2024 to the effect that the petitioners shall report and sign before the “ Thondi Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., until further orders.

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  
18:58:46 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

TNRM000002942024



Copy sent through E-Mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Forest Ranger, Ramanathapuram Forest Range.,  
The Inspector of Police, Thondi 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 District and Sessions Judge,  
**Ramanathapuram.**

**Thursday, the 30th day of May 2024**  
Crl.M.P.No.206/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000226-2024)

1.Ramachandran, (aged 34)  
S/o.Samydurai,

2.Jeyakumar, (aged 28)  
S/o.Samydurai,

3.Balasubramaniyan, (aged 36)  
S/o.Samydurai @ Samynathan

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,  
Abiramam P.S.,  
in Cr.No.62/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

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

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 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 Petitioner, who were granted anticipatory bail vide order of this court in CrI.M.P.No.1615/2024, dated 25.04.2024 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 petitioners have filed this petition seeking to relax the anticipatory bail condition 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 9.05.2024 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 anticipatory 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 10.05.2024 to 21.05.2024 for the past 20 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 petitioners.

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

TNRM000002262024



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

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
18:58:59 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

Copy sent through E-Mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Abiramam 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.35/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000036-2024)**

Kannan, (aged 28),  
S/o.Sundaram.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
Thiruvadanai P.S.,  
Cr.No.45/2024.

...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.T.M.Arunkannan, B.A., 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 who was arrested on 21.03.2024 in Cr.No.45/2024 on the file to file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC @ U/s.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 302 IPC, has filed this petition



for seeking bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, the defacto complainant is a wife of the deceased. The deceased was doing sculptor work. The petitioner is doing tiles work. Due to some previous motive on their works, on 19.03.2024 at about 3.00 p.m when the deceased was going near Pannavayal wine shop road, the petitioner way laid him and abused in obscene words and assaulted with hands and pushed him and assaulted with reaper log on his head and all over of his body and caused greivous injuries. Thereafter he was admitted in Thiruvadanai Govt Hospital and he was admitted for further treatment at Sivagangai Govt.Hospital, there he died. 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 the petitioner was arrested on 21.03.2024 and he is in judicial custody for the past 71 days. Investigation has already been completed. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he will not abscond. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has narrated the prosecution version. Further he has contended that the petitioner was arrested on 20.03.2024 and he is in judicial custody for the past 72 days. The investigation was completed. Charge sheet is yet



to be filed. Further he would submit that 3 previous cases are pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on bail, no prejudice will cause to the prosecution.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides learned Counsels arguments and on perusal of records, it is found that the occurrence took place on 19.03.2024. Initially FIR was registered against the petitioner U/s. 341, 294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC and the offences were altered U/s.302 IPC. On the date of occurrence the petitioner assaulted by way of hands and reaper log and caused death. The petitioner is more than 72 days incarceration in judicial custody. The investigation was completed. Awaiting to file Charge sheet. 3 previous cases are pending against the petitioner. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, no prejudice will cause to the prosecution. Considering the nature and circumstances and period of custody are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to get bail with the following conditions:

i) that the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing of bond for Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Thriuvadanai;**

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 and sign before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram 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 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.**

S  
KUMARAGURU

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
18:57:31 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024.

TNRM000000362024



Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai,  
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram,  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Thiruvadanai P.S.,  
The petitioner through his Counsel,  
The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram,



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

**PRESENT: THIRU.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.101/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000116-2024)**

Muthukrishnan, (aged 40),  
S/o.Bakkiyam.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**Mandalamanikkam P.S.,  
Cr.No.22/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 14.05.2024 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.S.Anandhakumar, 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 who was arrested on 05.04.2024 in Cr..No.22/2024 on the file to file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.294(b), 506(ii), 302 IPC , has filed this petition for seeking bail.





2. The prosecution case is that, the defacto complainant is a grand-son of the deceased. The petitioner is maternal uncle of the defacto complainant. The defacto complainant went to the petitioner's village for his relatives condolence and after he was staying in his uncle /petitioner house on 05.04.2024 at night. The petitioner came there to his house, at the time the defacto complainant was talking with the petitioner's daughter. Due to which some wordy quarrel arose between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Thereafter the defacto complainant went to his grandfather's house, the petitioner came there, the deceased questioned the petitioner about the quarrel at that time the petitioner abused him in filthy language and assaulted with sickle on his all over the body and caused death. 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 the petitioner was arrested on 05.04.2024 and he is under judicial custody for the past 56 days. Further he would submit that the petitioner is son-in-law of the deceased and aged about 80 years old. At the time of quarrel between the petitioner and defacto complainant, the deceased slipped from his bed and sustained a traumatic injury and the was admitted to the Kamuthi Govt. Hospital by the petitioner. Due to his advanced age and already unwell health, he died in hospital. The defacto complainant is the maternal uncle of the petitioner. There



was a family dispute between the petitioner and his wife. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has narrated the prosecution version. Further he has contended that the petitioner is son-in-law of the deceased. The occurrence was happened due to some family dispute. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 05.04.2024.. The investigation is is yet to be completed. In If the petitioner is released on 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 on the date of occurrence , the petitioner assaulted the deceased with sickle on his over all body and caused death. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 05.04.2024 Investigation is yet to be completed. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances, gravity of offence and period of incarceration are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is not entitled to get bail at this stage. Hence the petition is dismissed.

TNRM000001162024



In the result, the 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  
18:56:05 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024.

Copy sent through e-mail

To  
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,  
The Inspector of Police, Mandalamanickam 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.184/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000204-2024)**

Muniasamy @ Peeskutty,  
S/o.Duraisamy.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**Kenikkarai P.S.,  
Cr.No.257/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 21.05.2024 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.M. Mohan Babu, 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 who was arrested 16.05.2024 in Cr.No.257/2024 of the respondent P.S., for the punishable offences U/s. 341, 294(b), 397 IPC and Section 25(1A) Arms Act, has filed this petition for seeking bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, on 14.05.2024 at about 4.30 p.m, when the defacto complainant was proceeding in a two wheeler, the petitioner waylaid him and abused in filthy language and snatched Rs,3700/- from his pocket by using dangerous weapon. 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. The petitioner was arrested on 16.05.2024 and he is in judicial custody for the past 15 days. Property has been recovered by the respondent police. Further he would submit that the petitioner refused to put his signature in 110 Cr.P.C bond sent by Tahsildar and he was admitted to appear on summon. Due to which the respondent police has registered a false case against him. It is a put up case for statistical purpose. Major part of the investigation has already been completed. If the petitioner is released on bail, he 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 petitioner has illegally using dangerous weapon and snatched Rs.3,700/- from the defacto complainant's pocket and threatened the public. Further he has contended that the weapon has been secured by the respondent



police. The petitioner was arrested on 16.05.2024 and he is in judicial custody. Weapon have been secured by the respondent police. 7 witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. Further he has contended that 16 previous cases are pending against the petitioner in various police stations. The petitioner has not complied the court conditions in CrI.M.P.No. 558/2024 dated 08.02.2024. In this regard the respondent police has filed a petition before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.,II, Ramanathapuram and sent a notice to the petitioner for explanation. Further he would submit that the petitioner has violated the U/s.110 Cr.P.C bond in MC No.73/2023 dated 05.07/2023. Detention order was passed by the District Collector on 28.05.2024. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to commit similar offence again. Hence this petition is to be dismissed.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides the learned counsels and on perusal of records, it is found that the petitioner was snatched money from the defacto complainant by using sword and he was arrested on 16.05.2024 and he is in judicial custody. 7 witnesses have already been examined by the respondent police. 16 previous cases are pending against the petitioner in various police stations. The petitioner has not complied the court conditions in CrI.M.P.No. 558/2024 dated 08.02.2024. In this regard the respondent police has filed a petition before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.,II, Ramanathapuram and sent a notice to the petitioner.

TNRM000002042024



Further more the petitioner has violated the U/s.110 Cr.P.C bond in MC No.73/2023 dated 05.07/2023. Detention order was passed by the District Collector on 28.05.2024. Nature and circumstances, period of custody and bad antecedents are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioner is not entitled to get bail at this stage. Hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the 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  
18:56:19 +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,

TNRM000002612024



**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.230/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000261-2024)**

Rajavel, (aged 48),  
S/o.Pandi.

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
Kenikkarai P.S.,  
Cr.No.279/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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.S.Pranavanathan, 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/accused who was arrested on 23.05.2024 in Cr.No.279//2024 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.328, 294(b), 353, 506(ii) IPC and section 24(1) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act has filed this petition for seeking bail.





2. According to the prosecution, based on an information the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 22.05.2024 at about 6.00 p.m., and found that the petitioner and others have illegally possessed 49 bags Ganesh Pockets and 11 bags of Coolip bags in their vehicles at Kanshab Street near Alam School complex without getting any licence, for selling at higher price in the public and the same have been recovered. Totally 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products. Further more they abused them in filthy language and to disturb and discharging public servant duties. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, he has not committed any such offence and he has falsely been implicated in this case. He would further contend that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 23.05.2024. The petitioner is running a petty shop and due to business motive a false information was given to the respondent police and the respondent polices has registered the case for statistics purpose. Further he would submit that the properties involved in this case have already been seized by the police. Most of the investigation has been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will not possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the Learned Public Prosecutor has contended that totally 6 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A3. A6 is still



absconding. Others are in judicial custody. The petitioner and others have illegally possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products in their vehicles without getting any licence, for selling at higher price near School complex and the same have been recovered. Based on confession the tobacco products was purchased from A6 who is residing at Bangalore. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2024. He would further submit that properties (tobacco products, 3 vehicle, mobile phone) involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2 and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. The investigation is in preliminary stage. One same type of offence case is pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on bail, he will commit same kind of offence again.

5. After taking into consideration of both sides the learned counsels and on perusal of records, it is found that the petitioner is arrayed as A3. The petitioner and others have illegally possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products in their vehicles nearby school without getting any licence, for selling at higher price and the same have been recovered. The petitioner was arrested on 23.05.2024. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2 and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. Same kind of one previous case is pending against the petitioner. Investigation is in preliminary stage. The petitioner has filed this

TNRM000002612024



petition in earlier stage. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible 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 petitioner is not entitled to get bail at this stage. Hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the 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  
18:56:28 +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.232/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-0000263-2024)**

1. Syed Mohammed Buhari, (aged 19/2024),  
S/o.Asan Ibrahim.

2. Hasan @ Asan Ibrahim, (aged 40/2024),  
S/o.Arockiyasamy.

....Petitioners/Accused No.3, 7

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**R.S.Mangalam P.S.,  
Cr.No.127/2024.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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.M.Raja Sahul Hameed, B.Sc., B.L. the learned Counsel for the petitioners 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 petitioners who were arrested on 25.05.2024 in Cr.No.127/2024 on the



file of the respondent P.S., for the offences punishable U/s.147, 148, 294(b), 286, 427, 307, 506(ii) IPC and 3(a) of Explosive Substances Act and section 25(1)(a) of Arms Act, have filed this petition for seeking bail.

2. According to the prosecution, there is a previous motive between two village groups. Following which on 24.05.2024 at about 4.30 p.m the defacto complainant's brother and his relative were going R.S.Mangalam in a two wheeler , at that time the petitioners and others abused in filthy language and threw petrol bomb against them and having deadly weapons and 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 offence. Further he has contended that the petitioners were arrested on 25.05.2024. Further he has contended that this is a case and case in counter . Due to some previous motive between both the groups. No one was injured. Material part of the witnesses have already been examined. If the petitioner is enlarged on 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 13 accused in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A3 and A7. The occurrence was happened due to some previous motive between both villagers. Further he would



submit that Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.126/2024. The petitioners were arrested on 25.05.2024. Investigation is in preliminary stage. No one was injured. Other accused yet to be arrested. If the petitioners are released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence the 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 A3 and A7. The occurrence was happened due to some previous motive between both villagers. Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.126/2024. The petitioners were arrested on 25.05.2024. Investigation is in preliminary stage. No one was injured. Other accused yet to be arrested. If the petitioners are released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances, period of incarceration are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioners are not entitled to get bail at this stage, hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the 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  
S  
KUMARAGURU Date:  
2024.05.30  
18:56:41 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05..2024

TNRM000002632024



Copy sent through e-mail

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

TNRM000002702024



**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.239/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000270-2024)**

Shanmugarajan,  
S/o.Chellaiah.

....Petitioner/Accused No.5

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
Kenikkarai P.S.,  
Cr.No.279/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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.A.Selvaraj, M.A., 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/accused who was arrested on 23.05.2024 in Cr.No.279//2024 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.328, 294(b), 353, 506(ii) IPC and section 24(1) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, has filed this petition for seeking bail.





2. According to the prosecution, based on an information the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 22.05.2024 at about 6.00 p.m., and found that the petitioner and others have illegally possessed 49 bags Ganesh Pockets and 11 bags of Coolip bags in their vehicles at Kanshab Street near Alam School complex without getting any licence, for selling at higher price in the public and the same have been recovered. Totally 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products. Further more they abused them in filthy language and to disturb and discharging public servant duties. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, he has not committed any such offence and he has falsely been implicated in this case. He would further contend that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 23.05.2024. Further he would submit that the properties involved in this case have already been seized by the police. Due to spoil the reputation of the petitioner, the respondent police has falsely registered the case against the petitioner. Most of the investigation has been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will not possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the Learned Public Prosecutor has contended that totally 6 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A5. A6 is still absconding. Others are in judicial custody. The petitioner and others have illegally



possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products in their vehicles without getting any licence, for selling at higher price near School complex and the same have been recovered. Based on confession the tobacco products was purchased from A6 who is residing at Bangalore. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2024. He would further submit that properties (tobacco products, 3 vehicle, mobile phone) involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2 and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. The investigation is in preliminary stage. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence the petition is to be dismissed. .

5. After taking into consideration of both sides the learned counsels and on perusal of records, it is found that the petitioner is arrayed as A5. The petitioner and others have illegally possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products n their vehicles nearby school without getting any licence, for selling at higher price and the same have been recovered. The petitioner was arrested on 23.05.2024. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2 and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. Investigation is in preliminary stage. The petitioner has filed this petition in earlier stage. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is

TNRM000002702024



released on bail, it will possible 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 petitioner is not entitled to get bail at this stage. Hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the 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  
18:56:53 +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.249/92024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000280-2024)**

1. Balamurugam @ Balamurugan, (aged 42),  
S/o.Muthu.
2. Balagurunathan Pakkivil @ Pakkiri, (aged 48),  
S/o.Natarajan., .....Petitioners/Accused No.2,4
- /vs/
- State, through the Inspector of Police  
Kenikkarai P.S.,  
Cr.No.279/2024 ...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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.T.M.Arunkannan, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners 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 petitioners/accused who were arrested on 23.05.2024 in Cr.No.279//2024 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.328, 294(b), 353, 506(ii) IPC and section 24(1) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, have filed this



petition for seeking bail.

2. According to the prosecution, based on an information the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 22.05.2024 at about 6.00 p.m., and found that the petitioners and others have illegally possessed 49 bags Ganesh Pockets and 11 bags of Coolip bags in their vehicles at Kanshabib Street near Alam School complex without getting any licence, for selling at higher price in the public and the same have been recovered. Totally 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products. Further more they abused them in filthy language and to disturb and discharging public servant duties. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners has contended that, they have not committed any such offence and they have falsely implicated in this case. He would further contend that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 22.05.2024. Further he would submit that the properties involved in this case have already been seized by the police. The petitioners are running groceries shop in their village. Due to spoil the reputation of the petitioner, the respondent police has falsely registered the case against the petitioner. Most of the investigation has been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on bail, it will not possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the Learned Public Prosecutor has contended that



totally 6 accused involved in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A2 and A4. A6 is still absconding. Others are in judicial custody. The petitioners and others have illegally possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products in their vehicles without getting any licence, for selling at higher price near School complex and the same have been recovered. Based on confession the tobacco products was purchased from A6 who is residing at Bangalore. The petitioners were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2024. He would further submit that properties (tobacco products, 3 vehicle, mobile phone) involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2 and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. The investigation is in preliminary stage. Same type of one previous case is pending against the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner. No previous case is pending against the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner. If the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence the petition is to be dismissed. .

5. After taking into consideration of both sides the learned counsels and on perusal of records, it is found that the petitioners are arrayed as A2 and A4. The petitioners and others have illegally possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products n their vehicles nearby school without getting any licence, for selling at higher price and the same have been recovered. The petitioner was arrested on 23.05.2024. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2

TNRM000002802024



and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. Investigation is in preliminary stage. The petitioners have filed this petition in earlier stage. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on bail, it will possible 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 petitioners are not entitled to get bail at this stage. Hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the 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  
S  
KUMARAGURU Date:  
2024.05.30  
18:57:06  
+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 petitioners through their Counsel.

TNRM000002932024



**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.262/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000293-2024)**

Sudhakar, (aged 42),  
S/o.Ramamoorthy.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
Kenikkarai P.S.,  
Cr.No.279/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 28.05.2024 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.A.Ramalingam, B.A., 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/accused who was arrested on 23.05.2024 in Cr.No.279//2024 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.328, 294(b), 353, 506(ii) IPC and section 24(1) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, has filed this petition for seeking bail.





2. According to the prosecution, based on an information the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 22.05.2024 at about 6.00 p.m., and found that the petitioner and others have illegally possessed 49 bags Ganesh Pockets and 11 bags of Coolip bags in their vehicles at Kanshab Street near Alam School complex without getting any licence, for selling at higher price in the public and the same have been recovered. Totally 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products. Further more they abused them in filthy language and to disturb and discharging public servant duties. Hence the charge.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, he has not committed any such offence and he has falsely been implicated in this case. He would further contend that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 23.05.2024. Further he would submit that the properties involved in this case have already been seized by the police. The petitioner is running a petty shop, due to spoil the reputation of the petitioner, the respondent police has falsely registered the case against the petitioner. Most of the investigation has been completed. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will not possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, the Learned Public Prosecutor has contended that totally 6 accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. A6 is still



absconding. Others are in judicial custody. The petitioner and others have illegally possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products in their vehicles without getting any licence, for selling at higher price near School complex and the same have been recovered. Based on confession the tobacco products was purchased from A6 who is residing at Bangalore. The petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2024. He would further submit that properties (tobacco products, 3 vehicle, mobile phone) involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2 and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. The investigation is in preliminary stage. No previous case is pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence the petition is to be dismissed. .

5. After taking into consideration of both sides the learned counsels and on perusal of records, it is found that the petitioner is arrayed as A1. The petitioner and others have illegally possessed 700 Kgs of Prohibited Tobacco Products n their vehicles nearby school without getting any licence, for selling at higher price and the same have been recovered. The petitioner was arrested on 23.05.2024. A1 to A3 are running petty shops and groceries shop in their villages. A2 and A5 were selling the products to A1 to A3 shops. Investigation is in preliminary stage. The petitioner

TNRM000002932024



has filed this petition in earlier stage. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, it will possible 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 petitioner is not entitled to get bail at this stage. Hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the 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  
18:57:18 +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  
Crl.M.P.No.244/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000275-2024)**

1. Asik @ Mohammed Asik(aged 23/2024)  
S/o.Nainakaja.
2. Novbal @ Mohammed Novbal,(aged 22/2024)  
S/o.Abuthakir.
3. Ahamed, (aged 19/2024),  
S/o. Anwar Sathak.
4. Santhosh, (aged 20/2024),  
S/o.Shenthilkumar.
5. Asrin @ Mohammed Asrin (aged 19/2024),  
S/o.Nagoregani.
6. Sivasankar, (aged 19/2024),  
S/o.Siva.
- 7.Nijamudeen @ Kisamudeen(aged 23/2024),  
S/o.Syed Mohamed.
- 8.Riyaz @ Mohamed Riyaz(aged 19/2024),  
S/o.Abuthakir. ...Petitioners/Accused No.1, 2, 6, 8 to 12

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police  
**R.S.Mangalam P.S.,**



**Cr.No.127/2024.**

...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.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.127/2024 of the respondent P.S. The petitioners who were apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.147, 148, 294(b), 286, 427, 307, 506(ii)IPC and section 3(a) of Explosive Substances Act and section 25(1)(a) Arms Act, have filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, there is a previous motive between two village groups. Following which on 24.05.2024 at about 4.30 p.m the defacto complainant's brother and his relative were going R.S.Mangalam in a two wheeler , at that time the petitioners and others abused in filthy language and threw petrol bomb against them and having deadly weapons and 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 offence. Further he has contended that this is a case and case in counter . Due to some previous motive between both the groups. No one was injured. 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 13 accused in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A1, A2, A6, A8 to A12. The occurrence was happened due to some previous motive between both villagers. Further he would submit that Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.126/2024. Investigation is in preliminary stage. No one was injured. The petitioners are yet to be arrested. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Hence the 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 as A1, A2, A6, A8 to A12. The occurrence was happened due to some previous motive between both villagers. Counter case has also registered in Cr.No.126/2024. Investigation is in preliminary stage. No one was injured. If the petitioners are released on bail, it will possible to tamper and hamper the witnesses. Nature and circumstances,

TNRM000002752024



gravity of offence and period of incarceration are considered by this Court and come to the conclusion that the petitioners are not entitled to get bail at this stage, hence the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the 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  
18:57:42 +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 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 District Judge,  
Ramanathapuram

**Thursday, the 30th day of May 2024**  
CrI.M.P.No.237/2024  
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000268-2024)

Satheeshkumar (aged 26/2024)  
S/o.Annadurai

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State through the Inspector of Police,  
Emaneswaram P.S., in Cr.No.69/2024

...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.K.Gunasekaran,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 was granted anticipatory bail vide order of this court in CrI.M.P.No.1733/2023 dated 25.04.2024 with a condition to report and sign before the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., until further orders. The petitioner has now 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 been complying the condition before the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., from 07.5.2024 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 has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition the Respondent Police Station daily twice at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., from 30.4.2024 to 30.05.2024.

Considering the fact that the petitioner has been complying the condition for the past 30 days and also considering the nature of the offence, this Court is not inclined to relax the condition and inclined to modify the condition imposed on the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.1733/2024 dated 25.04.2024 to the effect that the petitioner shall report and sign before the “ respondent police station weekly once i.e., on every Monday at 10.30 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., until further orders.

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

Digitally signed  
by S  
KUMARAGURU  
Date: 2024.05.30  
18:58:15 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge  
Ramanathapuram.  
30.05.2024

TNRM000002682024



Copy sent through E-Mail

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