



IN THE COURT OF VACATION CRIMINAL JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram,

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.13/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000009-2025)

Chellappa @ Martin (aged 29),
S/o. Manoharan

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
DCB Ramanathapuram,
in Cr.No. 6/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru. M. Mayakannan, M.Com.,B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B,Com, B.L., representing on behalf of Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 28.03.2025 in Cr.No. 6/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 468, 471, 408, 109 IPC, seeks bail.

2. According to the prosecution, the defacto complainant is the Special

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:27:20 +0530



Tahsildhar of Kadaladi. A1 is the temporary staff and he is deputed to distribute the pension amount to the pensioners. A2 is the father of A1, A3 is the relative of A1. A1 had cheated the pensioners commission amount of Rs.33,75,530/- and the A1 was transferred a sum of Rs. 27,22,210/- to the A2 and A3 accounts, it was found at the time of inspection by the defacto complainant and a complaint was given by him and so the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence and that the petitioner was arrested on 28.03.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 42 days. He further contended that the earlier application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram in CIS.CrI.M.P.No.541/2025 dated 07.04..2025 and that A2 was released on bail by the Principal Sessions 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this Court and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence, he prayed to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 3 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 was released on the ground of his bank account is freezed by the prosecution and granted bail by the Principal Sessions Court on 29.04.2025. A3 moved anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and the same was dismissed

TNRM000000092025



as withdrawn in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6330/2025 on 22.04.2025. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 28.03.2025 and that the amount involved in this case is very huge and it is not yet recovered. He further submitted that the petitioner is son of A2 and that six witnesses have been examined and remaining witnesses yet to be examined and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is no possibility to recover the amount.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case and period of incarceration and also considering the fact that the amount involved in this case is very huge and the same was not yet recovered and that the investigation is not yet completed, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
20:27:28 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, DCB, Ramanathapuram,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.15/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000013-2025)

Pandi, (aged 60),
S/o.Ponnuchamy.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Theriruveli P.S.,
in Cr.No.23/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.K.Anbu Chezhiyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 22.04.2025 in Cr.No.23/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.4(1)(A) of TNP Act, seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling by the defacto

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:28:11 +0530



complainant along with police party on 22.04.2025 at about 08.15 a.m and found that the petitioner has illegally possessed and was selling 120 liters of palm toddy contained in plastic pots without getting any permit or licence and he was apprehended by the police and the properties were seized by the police and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. He further contended that the petitioner was arrested on 22.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 17 days and that the properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the petitioner was arrested on 22.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (120 liters of Palm Toddy) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that two witnesses have been examined by the investigation officer and that similar nature of one previous case is pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. Considering the nature of offence and that the properties have been



secured and that even though the investigation is not yet completed, the petitioner is more than 15 days in judicial custody, hence this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

v) Considering the facts of the previous case, **the petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai Police Station, Ramanathapuram daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available themselves 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;

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:28:16
+0530



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

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

ix) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.269 BNS, 2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
KAVITHA Date:
2025.05.08
20:28:20 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Theriruvelli P.S.,
The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai P.S., Ramanathapuram,
The petitioners through his Counsel.
The Superintendent , District Prison, Ramanathapuram
The District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.16/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000015-2025)

1. Ganesamoorthy, (aged 20),
S/o. Velu.

2. Muneeswaran, (aged 20),
S/o. Karthick.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1,2.

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Abiramam P.S.,
Cr.No.62/2025

....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.M. Muhadarshini, B.A., L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Panidiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1, A2 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody



on 21.04.2025 in Cr.No.62/2025 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.8(C) r/w 20(b) (ii) (A) NDPS Act 1985 and 4(1)(A) Tamil Nadu Prohibition (Amendment) Act, seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling by the defacto complainant along with police party on 21.04.2025 and found that the petitioners and others was selling Kanja and in possession of 0.65 grams of Kanja contained in Zip lock covers in their vehicles and was secured by the police and the petitioner was arrested and they are having sales amount of Rs. 3,500 was secured. The properties and sales amount were seized by the police and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned representing Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected with the offence. The petitioner was arrested on 21.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 8 days. He further contended that properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.1186/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that the earlier bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.1186/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioners are released on



bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and they would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioners on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 5 accused involved in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A1 and A2. A3 moved bail. A5 was released on anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and others are still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioners were arrested on 21.04.2025 and they are in judicial custody and that the properties (.65 grms of Cannabis pockets , 3 vehicles and sales amount of Rs.3,500/-) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that the investigation is in initial stage and that 2 previous cases pending against the 1st petitioner under 506(ii) IPC including Arms act and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court on 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioners are released on bail, they would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and objected to release the petitioners.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that the properties have been recovered along with vehicles and considering the fact that the investigation is in initial stage and that there are previous -antecedents against the 1st petitioner and just because co-accused was

TNRM000000152025



granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, this court is not entertained to grant bail for the similar nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:28:36 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Abiramam P.S.,
The petitioners through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.25/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000074-2025)

Meenakumar,
S/o. Valampuri.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Abiramam P.S.,
in Cr.No.62/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

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

ORDER

The petitioner/A4 who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.8(c), r/w 20(b) (ii) (A) NDPS and 4(1) (A) TNP Act in Cr.No.62/2025, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling by the defacto complainant along with police party on 21.04.2025 and found that the petitioners and others was selling Kanja and in possession of 0.65 grams of Kanja contained in Zip lock covers in their vehicles and was secured by the police and the petitioner was arrested and they are having sales amount of Rs. 3,500 was secured. The properties and sales amount were seized by the police and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned representing Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. He further contended that properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that co-accused was released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 5 accused involved in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A4. Others moved bail before this Court. A5 was released on anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court. He further submitted that the properties



(.65 grms of Cannabis pockets , 3 vehicles and sales amount of Rs.3,500/-) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that the investigation is in initial stage and that 5 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, there is possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and also to indulge in similar offence again and objected to release the petitioner..

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and that the properties have been recovered along with vehicles and considering the fact that the investigation is in initial stage and that there are previous -antecedents against the petitioner and just because co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, this court is not entertained to grant anticipatory bail for the similar nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
20:28:50 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000742025



Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Abiramam P.S.,
The petitioners through his Counsel.

Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:28:54
+0530



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.34/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000078-2025)

Karmegam (aged 27),
S/o. Ramachandran

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thiruppullani P.S.,
in Cr.No. 72/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition 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 of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Panidiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.04.2025 in Cr.No.72/2025 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 126(2), 109, 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seeks bail.



2. According to the prosecution, there is some previous motive between the defacto complainant and the petitioner. On 14.04.2025 at about 7.30 p.m when the defacto complainant was talking alongwith his relative, at that time, the petitioner and A2 came there in a two wheeler and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and both are assaulted them with sickle and tried to commit murder and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has not committed any such offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further contended that the petitioner was arrested on 16.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the injured was discharged from the hospital and most of the investigation is completed. He further submitted that the petitioner has suffered fracture in his lower limbs and he is taking treatment as in patient in Govt.Hospital, Ramanathapuram and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1226/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and he would not abscond. Hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.



4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 2 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1, A2 moved bail before this Court. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 16.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that due to ill-health of the petitioner, he is taking treatment as in-patient in the Govt.Hospital for fracture on his lower limbs. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from the hospital on 24.04.2025. there is specific overt-act against the petitioner and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court on 29.04.2025 and that five witnesses have been examined. He further submitted that eight previous cases are pending against the petitioner and he is a regular offender and his name is in History Sheet and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility that he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. On perusal of FIR, there is specific overt-act against the petitioner. Considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that even though the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is over, the petitioner is having several previous cases, hence considering the bad antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

TNRM000000782025



In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:29:17 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail
To

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.36/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000047-2025)

Kalaimohan, (aged 27),
S/o. Kalimuthan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Nainarkoil P.S.,
in Cr.No.27/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.A.Santhoshkumar, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 25.03.2025 in Cr.No.27/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.108 BNS, seeks bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, the petitioner had already married and having two children. The deceased is the daughter of the defacto complainant. There was love affairs between the defacto complainant's daughter/deceased and the petitioner. The petitioner promised to marry her, hence they have sexual intercourse with them and she was conceived as 3 months pregnancy. Thereafter the petitioner refused to marry her and instigated to her to commit suicide. Following which the deceased set on fire herself on 24.03.2025 at about 6.15 a.m and on this condition she ran away and fell down in front of the petitioner's house and she was admitted in the hospital and on the same day she was died and a compliant was given by the defacto complainant and so the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected with the offence and the petitioner was arrested on 25.03.2025 and he is in judicial custody. He further contended that the deceased and the petitioner having illegal contact and that the petitioner is already married and having children., He further submitted that the investigation is almost over and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1079/2025 on 28.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the



petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 25.03.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court on 28.04.2025 and that investigation is not yet completed and that the offence is grievous nature. He further submitted as per post-mortem report of the deceased, she was carrying 4 months child and that the DNA test report is yet to be received. He further submitted that one previous case is pending against the petitioner under 302 IPC and that the earlier application was dismissed on 28.04.2025 and there is no change of circumstances. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and he strongly objected to release the petitioner on bail.

5. The investigation is not yet complete as per prosecution and there is a previous case is under sec.302 IPC. Considering the grave nature of offence and that the petitioner is more than 45 days in judicial custody, however since, the investigation is not yet completed, there is possibility that he would abscond if he is released on bail this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and there is no change of circumstances since the earlier dismissal order. Therefore the petition is dismissed.

TNRM000000472025



In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
20:29:33 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,

Vacation Sessions Judge,

Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram

Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.37/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000076-2025)

Alaguraja, (aged 28),

S/o.Koodalingam

....Petitioner/Accused No.3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police

Emaneswaram P.S.,

Cr.No.76/2025.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S. Chellamani, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following..

ORDER

The petitioner/A3 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 01.05.2025 in Cr.No.76/2025 on the file of the respondent police station for the offences punishable U/s.303(2) BNS and Section 21(1) MMDR Act, seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, the defacto complainant is the VAO. Based on information the defacto complainant and his assistant involved in patrolling



on 24.04.2025 and found that the petitioner and A2 others have illegally transported 17 bags of of river sand in a two wheeler bearing Reg.No.TN 65 BU 4250 without getting any permit or licence from the concerned authorities at Vaigai riverbed and one of accused was apprehended by the police and others were flee away from the place of occurrence also properties involved in this case have been secured and on complaint the case has been registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Further he contended that the petitioner was arrested on 01.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody. Further he has contended that the properties involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police and most of the investigation is over and no previous case is pending against the petitioner. He further submitted that co-accused (A1) was released on bail by the Principal Sessions Court in Crl.M.P.No. 1237/2025 on 30.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he would not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 5 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A3. A1 was released on bail by the Principal Sessions Court in Crl.M.P.No. 1237/2025 on 30.04.2025 and A4 and A5 were moved anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and A2 is still absconding. Further he contended that the



petitioner was arrested on 01.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (17 bags of river sand and two wheeler) involved in this case have been recovered and that five witnesses have been examined by the Investigation Officer and that similar nature of two previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that if he is released on bail, there is possibility that he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. Considering the nature of offence and duration of incarceration and also considering the fact that that the properties have been secured and that substantial part of the investigation is over and release of co-accused, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions:

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

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



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

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

v) **Considering the facts of the previous cases of the petitioner, he shall report before the Inspector of Police, Kamuthi police station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

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



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

U/s.269 BNS, 2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:29:55 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
08.05.2025.

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi;

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Emaneswaram P.S.,

The Inspector of Police, Kamuthi P.S.,

The Petitioner through his Counsel.

The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram,

The District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.43/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000042-2025)

Kumaravel, (aged 55),
S/o. Thanikodi.

....Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Mudukulathur P.S.,
Cr.No.228/2016

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 6.5.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of
Thiru.J. Uduman, B.Sc., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of
Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the
Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this
Court passes the following

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested on NBW and remanded to
judicial custody on 26.03.2025 in CC.No.55/2021 on the file of the learned Chief
Judicial Magistrate, Ramanathapuram in Cr.No.228/2016 of the respondent police



for the punishable offence U/s.420,.465, 466, 475, 477(A) IPC @ 465, 466, 477(A) IPC, seeks bail.

2. According to the prosecution, the petitioner had been working as Typist of the District Munsif Court, Mudukulathur and he had forged the signature of the judge in the judgment of uncontested cases in the year of 2015 and on complaint given by the Head Cleark of the Court and so the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that, the petitioner had been working as typist, Mudukulathur Court and absconding charge sheet was filed and the case was taken on file as C.C.55/2021 and same is pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ramanathapuram. Further he submitted that no such summon was served to the petitioner, hence he has without knowledge about the case, therefore he could not attend the court on 12.11.2021.Hence NBW was issued against the petitioner on the same day and the same was executed on 26.03.2025 and he is in judicial custody.. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.N 582/2025 on 15.04.2025 and that he is in no way connected with the offence and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1148/2025 on 25.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail,



no prejudice would cause to the prosecution, the above said absence is neither willful nor wanton by the petitioner. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on y bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the absconding charge sheet was filed . Initially the case was taken of file by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur as C.C.No.46/2021 and the same was referred to the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate and was taken on file as C.C.No.55/2021 and the same is pending before the Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Ramanathapuram. He further submitted that and he was absconding for long time, hence summon was not able to serve to the petitioner. Due to non appearance of the petitioner before the Court on 12.11.2021 hence NBW was issued against him on the same day. Further he has contended that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1148/2025 on 25.04.2025 and that two witnesses have been examined and remaining witnesses yet to be examined and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility that he would abscond again and objected to release the petitioner.

5. The offence is grave in nature about forging signature of the Presiding Officer of the Court and the trial is going on in the Chief Judicial Magistrate Court. Two witnesses have been examined and that the case is posted for examination for



further witnesses. It is also found that the accused was arrested time and he was not available for even service of summon. The case is pending from 2021. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility that he would again abscond and the trial would be affected, since the trial is commenced and two witness have been examined, The Principal Sessions Court has already given direction to the trial court to examine the remaining witnesses on daily basis and to dispose of the case within two months. Considering the above, this Court is not inclined to grant bail at this stage.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
KAVITHA Date:
2025.05.08
20:30:12
+0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ramanathapuram.

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Mudukulathur P.S.,

The Petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.44/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000038-2025)

Abdul Jameen, (aged 32/2025)
S/o.Mushafar Kani.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Sayalgudi P.S.,
in Cr.No.38/2022

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition 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.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested on NBW and remanded to judicial custody on 25.04.2025 in Cr.No.38/2022 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 109, 294(b), 506(i) IPC and section 4 of TNPHW



Act, seeks bail.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that, the case was taken on file as C.C No.123/2022 and same is pending before learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi.. Further he submitted that due to health illness the petitioner could not appear before the trial court on 12.09.2024, hence NBW was issued against him and the same was executed on 25.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody. Further he contended that if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, no prejudice would cause to the prosecution, the above said absence is neither willful nor wanton by the petitioner. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 3 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1. Further he contended that the case was taken on file as C.C.No.123/2022 and the same is pending before learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi and that the case was posted for appearance on 05.09.2024, on that day the petitioner did not appear before the trial Court, hence NBW has been issued against him and it was executed on 25.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody. Further he contended that the case is posted for \ 313(1)(b) questioning stage and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility to jumped on bail.



5. Due to non-appearance of the petitioner before the learned District Munsif-cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi and issued NBW against the petitioner on 05.09.2024 and the NBW was executed on 25.04.2025.. Due to long period of abscondance, the case is pending for questioning stage. However, considering the stage of the case and period of incarceration this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following conditions;

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

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

iii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.2,000/- (Rupees Two Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit to the Credit of District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram;**

iv) 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., until further orders** and on further condition that he shall make available himself as



and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

vi) that the petitioner shall not abscond either during the 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 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.269 BNS, 2023

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA

Date:
2025.05.08
20:30:35 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
08.05.2025.

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.45/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000028-2025)

1. Nivash, (aged 18),
S/o. Bose,

2. Samjebadurai, (aged 19),
S/o. Peter,

3. Krishnan, (aged 22),
S/o. Babu.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3.
/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Abiramam P.S.,

Cr.No.57/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of
Tmt.K.Kavipriya the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of
Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the
Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this
Court passes the following

ORDER

The petitioners/A1 to A3 who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
20:30:43 +0530



on 15.04.2025 in Cr.No.57/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.8(c), r/w 20(b) (ii)(A) NDPS Act and 4(1)(A) TNP (Amendment) Act 2024, seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling the defacto complainant along with police party on 15.04.2025 and found that the petitioners and others was selling Cannabis pockets in front of the school and they are having 250 grms of Cannabis contained with small pockets for the purpose of selling at high prices in public and he was apprehended by the police. . The properties were seized by the police and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned representing Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected with the offence. The petitioners were arrested on 15.04.2025 and they are in judicial custody for the past 15 days. He further contended that properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1125/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioners are released on bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and they would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioners on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there are totally 5 accused



involved in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A1 to A3. A5 moved bail. A4 is still absconding. The petitioners were arrested on 14.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (.250 grms of Cannabis pockets) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that three witnesses have been examined and the investigation is not yet completed and that similar nature of one previous case pending against 2nd petitioner and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1125/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioners are released on bail, they would threatened the witnesses and to indulge in similar offence again.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that the properties have been recovered and considering the fact that the investigation is not yet completed and that there is similar nature of case pending against the 2nd petitioner, and that there is no change of circumstances, since the earlier dismissal order, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
20:30:49 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000282025



Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Abiramam P.S.,
The petitioner through their Counsel.

Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
KAVITHA Date:
2025.05.08
20:30:50
+0530



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.49/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000056-2025)

Lakshmanan, (aged 24),
S/o.Veerapathirasamy.

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Abiramam P.S.,
in Cr.No.62/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 6.5.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.P. Thirumalaikumar, B.Sc., B.L. the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Panidiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A3 accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 21.04.2025 in Cr.No.62/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.8(C) r/w 20(b)(ii)(A) NDPS Act and 4(1)(A) TNP Act, seeks bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling by the defacto complainant along with police party on 21.04.2025 and found that the petitioner and others was selling Kanja and in possession of 0.65 grams of Kanja contained in Zip lock covers in their vehicles and was secured by the police and the petitioner was arrested and they are having sales amount of Rs. 3,500 was secured. The properties and sales amount were seized by the police and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned representing Counsel for the petitioner submitted 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 21.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 8 days. He further contended that properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1228/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 5 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A3 and A5 moved anticipatory bail before



the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and others are still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 21.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (.65 grms of Cannabis pockets , 3 vehicles and sales amount of Rs.3,500/-) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1228/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that the investigation is in initial stage and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and objected to release the petitioner.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that the properties have s been recovered along with vehicles and considering the fact that the investigation is in initial stage and just because co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, this court is not entertained to grant bail for the similar nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
20:31:04 +0530
Vacation Criminal Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000562025



Copy sent through e-mail

To

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

Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:31:06
+0530

KAVITHA



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.54/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000027-2025)

Murugesan, (aged 57),
S/o. Veeramuthu.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
PEW P.S., Ramanathapuram,
in Cr.No.23/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.5.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of
Tmt.K.Kavipriya the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of
Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the
Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this
Court passes the following

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial
custody on 21.04.2025 in Cr.No.23/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the
offences punishable U/s.4(1)(B) of TNP Act, seeks bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling by the police on 21.04.2025 at about 16.30 hours and found that petitioner has illegally possessed 29 bottles of liquor (each 180 ml) without getting any permit or licence for the purpose of selling at high prices in public and he was having sales amount of Rs.260/-. The properties and sales amount were seized by the police and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned representing Counsel for the petitioner submitted 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 21.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 18 days. He further contended that properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1239/2025 on 30.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the petitioner was arrested on 21.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (.29 bottles of liquor and sales amount of Rs.260/-) involved in this case have been recovered. He further

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:31:16 +0530



submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court on 30.04.2025 and that the five witnesses have been examined and that similar nature of one previous case pending against him and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge similar offence again.

5. Considering the nature of offence and that the properties have been secured and considering the fact that the petitioner is more than 18 days in judicial custody and also that the substantial part of the investigation is over, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

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

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) as non-refundable to the Credit of District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram;**

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

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



v) Considering the facts of the previous case, the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, Ramanathapuram Town Police Station daily tonce at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

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

ixi) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.269 BNS, 2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:31:22 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000272025



Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, PEW, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of police, Ramanathapuram Town P.S.,

The petitioners through his Counsel.

The Superintendent , District Prison, Ramanathapuram

The District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.55/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000026-2025)

Chellapandi @ Kombai, (aged 24),
S/o. Murugesan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.5

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Abiramam P.S.,
in Cr.No.57/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of
Tmt.Kavipriya the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of
Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the
Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this
Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A5 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on
15.04.2025 in Cr.No.57/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences
punishable U/s.8(c), r/w 20(b) (ii) (A) NDPS Act and 4 (1) (A) TNP Amendment Act,



seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling the defacto complainant along with police party on 15.04.2025 and found that the petitioner and others was selling Cannabis pockets in front of the school and they are having 250 grms of Cannabis contained with small pockets for the purpose of selling at high prices in public and he was apprehended by the police. . The properties were seized by the police and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned representing Counsel for the petitioner submitted 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 15.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 24 days. He further contended that properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1162/2025 on 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there are totally 5 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A5 and others moved bail. The



petitioner was arrested on 15.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (.250 grms of Cannabis pockets) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that t three witnesses have been examined and the investigation is not yet completed and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in Crl.M.P.No.1162/2025 on 29.04.2025 . He further substituted that similar nature of three previous cases was pending against the petitioner out of which two cases are disposed and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge similar offence again.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that the properties have been recovered and considering the fact that the investigation is not yet completed and that there is similar nature of case pending against the petitioner, and that there is no change of circumstances, since the earlier dismissal order, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner..

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
20:31:35 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000262025



Copy sent through e-mail

To

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

KAVITHA
Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:31:37
+0530



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Mahaleer Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram .

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.56/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000033-2025)

Surya, (aged 26),
S/o. Muruganantham.

....Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Thiruppullani P.S,
Cr.No.72/2025

....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition 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.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner /A2 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.04.2025 in Cr.No.72/2025 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 126(2), 118(1), 351(3), 109 BNS, seeks bail.



2. According to the prosecution, there is some previous motive between the defacto complainant and A1. Subsequently on 14.04.2025 at about 7.30 p.m the defacto complainant was talking with his relative, at that time the petitioner and A1 came there in a two wheeler and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and both were assaulted them with sickle and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioner has not committed any such offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further contended that the petitioner was arrested on 16.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the injured was discharged from the hospital and most of the investigation is completed and there is no specific overt-act against the petitioner. He further submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and he would not abscond. Hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 2 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 moved bail before this Court. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.04.2025 and that there is specific overt-act against the petitioner and A1 as per FIR and that the injured was discharged from the hospital on



24.04.2025. He further submitted that 5 witnesses have been examined and that the petitioner is having five previous cases and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility that he would indulge in similar offence again. .

5. On perusal of FIR, it seen that though there is specific overt-act against the petitioner, A1 is the active participant in the occurrence. Hence, considering the nature of offence and period of incarceration and that considering the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that substantial part of the investigation is over, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

i) that the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on execution of a bond for a sum **Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram;**

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

iii) Considering the facts of the previous cases of the petitioner, **he petitioner shall report before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar, Virudhunagar District daily twice at 10.30 and 5.00 p.m for a**



period of one month and on further condition that they 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.269 BNS, 2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:31:54 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000332025



Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar, Virudhunagar District,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Thiruppullani P.S.,

The petitioner through his Counsel.

The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram,

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:31:57
+0530

KAVITHA



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 08th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.48/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000011-2025)

Vishwa @ Vishwanathan,
S/o.Balakrishnan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Uchippulli P.S.,
in Cr.No.90/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition 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 and Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A3 accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 30.04.2025 in Cr.No.90/2025 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable

O

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:27:37
+0530



U/s. 21(4) MMDR Act and section 303(2), 281, 132, 351(3)BNS and section 3 of TNPPDL Act , seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling duty conducted by the defacto complainant along police party on 30.04.2025 and found that the petitioner and others have illegally transported and dumping the ½ unit of savadu sand from a Tractor along with trailer in one Muneeswaran's house, without getting any permit or licence and on seeing the police, one of the accused was taken the tractor and dashed against the Electric Post and caused damage. Further the properties involved in this case have been secured and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He further contended that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 30.04.2025. He further submitted that the properties involved in this case have been recovered and that most of the investigation has been completed. He further submitted that the damage amount of the Electric Post has been paid to the concerned authority and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.



4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 4 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A3. A1 and A2 were moved anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and A4 is still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 30.04.2025 and that and that the properties (Tractor along with trailer and ½ unit of savadu sand) involved in this case have been secured and that six witnesses have been examined. He further submitted that two previous cases are pending against the petitioner, out of which one of the case is similar nature and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. The property involved in this case is savadu sand, not river sand. The damages amount was paid to the concerned authority as per submission of the learned Counsel for the petitioner. Considering the nature of offence and period of incarceration and the fact that the properties have been secured and that the substantial part of the investigation is over, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions:

i) that the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on execute a bond for a sum Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) **with two sureties** for a like sum each



to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram;**

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

iii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit to the Credit of District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram;**

iv) that the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, Kamuthi P.S daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** 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 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.269 BNS ,2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 8th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:27:49 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Uchippulli P.S.,
The Inspector of Police, Kamuthi P.S.,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.
The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.
The District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Ms. K. KAVITHA, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 08th day of May 2025
Crl.M.P.No.58/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000051-2025)

Mani @ Sabarinathan, (aged 40)
S/o. Vilvanathan

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Mudhukulathur P.S.,
Cr.No.231/2007
in PRC.No.02/2025.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 06.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant 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 petitioner and
Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the
Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court
passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested on NBW and remanded to judicial custody
on 26.04.2025 in PRC No.02/2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate,



Mudhukulathur in Cr.No.231/2007 of the respondent police for the punishable offence U/s.147, 148, 302 @ 147, 148, 323, 324, 302 r/w 34, 302 r/w 149 IPC seeks bail.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that, the case was taken on file in PRC No.02/2025 and same is pending before learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur. Further he submitted that due to non-appearance of the petitioner, NBW was issued against him and the same was executed on 26.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody. Further he contended that if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, no prejudice would cause to the prosecution, the above said absence is neither willful nor wanton by the petitioner. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that, totally 28 accused are involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A4. Further he contended that the case was split up against this petitioner and others and the case was taken on file as PRC No.2/2025 and the same is pending before learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur and that the case was posted for appearance on 26.09.2023, on that day the petitioner did not appear before the Court, hence NBW has been issued against him and it was executed on 26.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody. Further he contended that the case is posted for committal proceedings and that if the



petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility to jumped on bail.

5. Due to non-appearance of the petitioner before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur and issued NBW against the petitioner on 26.09.2023 and he was absconding for a long period and after he was arrested on 26.04.2025. Due to long period of abscondance, the case is pending for committal proceedings. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and period of abscondance, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Therefore the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 08th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
20:28:03
+0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

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