



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

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

Thursday, the 08 day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No. 66/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000010-2025)

Ramanathan @ Rajivgandhi, (aged 34),
S/o. Gopal.

..... Petitioner /Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Thiruvadanai P.S.
Cr.No. 66/2025

..... Respondent / Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru. M. Kesavan, B.A., L.L.B., PG.D, the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of and of Thiru.K.R.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 were granted bail vide order of this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 1033/2025 dated 09.04.2025 with a condition to report and sign before



the Inspector of Police, respondent police station daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. The petitioner has now filed this petition seeking to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. from 24.04.2025 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 bail condition imposed on him.

The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has not complied the earlier condition for a period of one month.

This court has already imposed the condition that the petitioner shall comply the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. But the petitioner has complied the condition for 14 days only.

Considering the fact that the petitioners have already granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 1033/2025 dated 09.04.2025 that the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month and the petitioners are complying the condition for only 14 days. Now the

TNRM000000102025



petitioners prays to modify the condition, this court is inclined to modify the condition that the petitioners are directed to appear and sign before the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station weekly once on Monday at 10.30 a.m.

In the result, the condition is modified that the petitioner is directed to appear and sign before the Investigation Officer respondent police station weekly once on Monday at 10.30 a.m.

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

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:13:33 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Thiruvadanai 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,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 08 day of May 2025
Crl.M.P.No. 70/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000031-2025)

Pragadeeshwaran @ Pradeeshwaran, (aged 22)
S/o. Veerabathiran.

..... Petitioner /Accused No. 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Ramanathapuram Bazaar P.S.
Cr.No. 92/2025

..... Respondent / Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru. M. Murugesan, B.Sc.,B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of and of Thiru. K.R.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 were granted bail vide order of this Court in Crl.M.P.No. 1161/2025 dated 23.04.2025 with a condition to report and sign before



the Investigation Officer respondent Police station daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. The petitioner has now filed this petition seeking to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. from 24.04.2025 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 bail condition imposed on him.

The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has not complied the earlier condition for a period of one month.

This court has already imposed the condition that the petitioner shall comply the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. But the petitioner has complied the condition for 14 days only.

Considering the fact that the petitioners have already granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 1161/2025 dated 23.04.2025 that the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month and

TNRM000000312025



the petitioners are complying the condition for only 14 days. Now the petitioners prays to modify the condition, this court is inclined to modify the condition that the petitioners are directed to appear and sign before the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the learned Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m for further 4 weeks.

In the result, the condition is modified that the petitioner is directed to appear and sign before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No - I, Ramanathapuram** weekly twice on **Monday and Friday at 10.30 a.m. for further four weeks.**

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

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:13:58 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Bazaar P.S., 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,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 08 day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No. 64/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000046-2025)

Mohamed Bagath, (aged 28)
S/o. Sulthan Ibrahim

..... Petitioner /Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kenikarai P.S.
Cr.No. 164/2025

..... Respondent / Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

This petition 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 and of Thiru.B. Karthikeyan, B.A., 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 were granted bail vide order of this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 939/2025 dated 15.04.2025 with a condition to report and sign before



the learned Judicial Magistrate No - II, Ramanathapuram daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. The petitioner has now filed this petition seeking to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before the learned Judicial Magistrate No - II, Ramanathapuram daily once at 10.30 a.m. from 21.04.2025 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 bail condition imposed on him.

The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has not complied the earlier condition for a period of one month.

This court has already imposed the condition that the petitioner shall comply the condition before the Judicial Magistrate No - II, Ramanathapuram daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. But the petitioner has complied the condition for 17 days only. Hence, this court is not inclined to relax the condition in the earlier order.

Considering the fact that the petitioners have already granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 939/2025 dated 15.04.2025 that the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the learned Judicial Magistrate No - II, Ramanathapuram daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month and the petitioners are complying the condition for only 17 days. Now the petitioner prays

TNRM000000462025



to modify the condition, this court is inclined to modify the condition that the petitioners are directed to appear and sign before the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the learned Judicial Magistrate No - II, Ramanathapuram weekly twice on Monday and Friday at 10.30 a.m for further remaining period.

In the result, the condition is modified that the petitioner is directed to appear and sign before the learned Judicial Magistrate No - II, Ramanathapuram weekly twice on Monday and Friday at 10.30 a.m for period of four weeks.

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

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
19:15:48 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through E-Mail

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Kenikarai 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,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Principal District and Sessions Judge, (I/c)
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 08 day of May 2025
Crl.M.P.No. 68/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000045-2025)

Alhaj @ Mohammed Alhah, (aged 20),
S/o. Mohamed Hakim

..... Petitioner /Accused No. 4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Bazaar P.S. Ramanathapuram
Cr.No. 92/2025

..... Respondent / Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru. M. Raja Sahul Hameedu, B.Sc.,B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of and of Thiru. K.R.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 who was granted bail vide order of this Court in Crl.M.P.No. 1094/2025 dated 21.04.2025 with a condition to report and sign before



the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. The petitioner has now filed this petition seeking to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. from 25.04.2025 to till date. The petitioner is the ill health condition to taken the medical treatment in Hospital only bread winner of his family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has not complied the earlier condition for a period of one month.

This court has already imposed the condition that the petitioner shall comply the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. But the petitioner has complied the condition for 13 days only.

Considering the fact that the petitioners have already granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 1094/2025 dated 21.04.2025 that the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month and the petitioners are complying the condition for only 13 days. Now the petitioners

TNRM000000452025



prays to modify the condition, this court is inclined to modify the condition that the petitioners are directed to appear and sign before the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the Investigation Officer respondent police station weekly once on Monday at 10.30 a.m.

In the result, the condition is modified that the petitioner is directed to appear and sign before the Investigation Officer respondent police station weekly once on Monday at 10.30 a.m

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

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
19:16:12 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through E-Mail

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Ramanathapuram Bazaar 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,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 08 day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No. 65/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000039-2025)

Saravanan, (aged 39),
S/o. Palanichamy,

..... Petitioner /Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Ilanchempur P.S.
Cr.No. 22/2025

..... Respondent / Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru. T. Muneeswaran, B.A.,B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of and of Thiru.K.R.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 was granted bail vide order of this court in CrI.M.P.No. 903/2025 dated 09.01.2025 with a condition to report before the



Inspector of Police, Sivagangai Taluk P.S. daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. Now the petitioner has filed this petition seeking to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

The learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before the Inspector of Police, Sivagangai Taluk P.S. daily once at 10.30 a.m. from 16.04.2025 to till date. The petitioner is only bread winner of his family, it is very difficult to comply the condition and prays to relax the bail condition imposed on him.

The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has not complied the earlier condition for a period of one month.

This court has already imposed the condition that the petitioner shall comply the condition before the Inspector of Police, Sivagangai Taluk P.S. daily once at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one month. But the petitioner has complied the condition for 22 days only. Hence, this court is not inclined to relax the condition in the earlier order.

In the result, the petition is dismissed and the petitioner is direct to comply the remaining period of the conditions.

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

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:16:33 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000392025



Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Sivagangai Taluk P.S., Sivagangai District,

The Inspector of Police, Ilanchempur P.S.,

The Petitioner through his Counsel.

The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

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

Thursday, the 08 day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No. 73/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000055-2025)

Maruthupandian, (aged 34),
S/o. Sankaranarayanan

.... Petitioner /Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Keelathoval P.S.
Cr.No. 45/2025

..... Respondent / Complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 prays to relax the bail condition imposed on the petitioner.

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

ORDER

The petitioner who was granted bail vide order of this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 1095/2025 dated 17.04.2025 with a condition to report and sign before



the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur 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 bail condition imposed on him.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been complying the condition before this court daily twice at 10.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. from 25.04.2025 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 bail condition imposed on him.

The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the petitioner has not complied the earlier condition for a period of one month.

This court has already imposed the condition that the petitioner shall comply the condition before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur daily twice at 10.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m., until further orders. But the petitioner has complied the condition for 13 days only.

Considering the fact that the petitioners have already granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 1095/2025 dated 17.04.2025 that the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the learned Judicial Magistrate,



Mudukulathur daily twice at 10.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m., until further orders and the petitioners are complying the condition for only 13 days. Now the petitioners prays to modify the condition, this court is inclined to modify the condition that the petitioners are directed to appear and sign before the petitioner / accused has been complying the condition before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur daily once at 10.30 a.m for further remaining period.

In the result, the condition is modified that the petitioner is directed to appear and sign before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur daily once at 10.30 a.m for further remaining period.

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

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
19:17:01 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through E-Mail

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Keelathoval 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, Mahalir Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram
Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025**

**CrI.M.P.No.4/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000002-2025)**

Manikandan, age 31,
S/o.Thangaraj

..petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
R.S.Mangalam P.S.,
Cr.No.135/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 6.5.2025 U/s.482 BNSS Act to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S.Srikanth, B.A., B.L., 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 submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.135/2025 of the respondent P.S. The petitioner who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences U/s. 296 (b), 115(2), 324(2), 351(2) BNSS and section 4 of TNPHWH Act,



he filed this petition seeking to release them on anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that the petitioner is the brother of defacto complainant and there was a family dispute between petitioner and the defacto complainant. On 28.04.2025 at about 10.00 a.m., The petitioner insisted the defacto complainant to give 10 sovereign jewels which was given to her marriage and abused her in filthy language and assaulted the defacto Complainant's Mother in law by his hand and damaged the two wheeler by stone and assaulted her and strangled the neck and snatched her 10 sovereign Mangalyam and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and hence the defacto complainant was given a complaint and was registered

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has contended that, the petitioner have been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. Further he has contended that, the injured was discharged from hospital and that the most of the investigation is completed and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner and that the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, they will not tamper the witnesses. Hence this petition is to be allowed.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there was a family dispute between them. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from the hospital on 29.04.2024 and that Six witnesses have been examined by the



investigation officer and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and the fact that the substantial part of the investigation is over and that there are no antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of his order, before the learned **learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stand cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the petitioner and 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) that the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, , respondent Police Station daily at 10.30 a.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 abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.229 A IPC.

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

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:17:30 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS 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

Crl.M.P.6/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-0000062-2025)

1.Roopan, 34/2025

S/o.Nagendran

2.Suviskar, 32/2025

S/o.Sasu Abaranam

...Petitioners/Accused No.1, 2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,

Rameswaram Jetty P.S.,

in Cr.No.40/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

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

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.N.Premnath, B.Sc., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners 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 submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS in Cr.No.40/2025

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:25:18
+0530



on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that there was a previous enmity between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Due to which on 23.04.2025 at about 8.15 p.m, the defacto complainant was standing in front of his house, at that time the petitioners abused him in filthy language and A2 assaulted with hand on his cheek and A1 assaulted with Tiles Stone on his left head and caused injuries and A1 damaged the Two wheeler by Tiles Stone and also threatened them with dire consequences and hence the defacto complainant was given a complaint and was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that, the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected with the offence. He further submit that the injured was discharged from the hospital and that counter case has been registered in Cr.No.41/2025. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and they would not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the counter case has been registered in Cr.No.41/2025 and that the injured was discharged from hospital on 23.04.2025 and that five witnesses have been examined and one previous case is



pending against the 1st petitioner and that no previous case against the 2nd petitioner .

5. Considering the nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from hospital and the fact that the substantial part of the investigation is completed and hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with stringent conditions;

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram** on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only)** each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioners/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stand cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the petitioners and 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) that the **petitioners shall report before the Inspector of Police, , respondent Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month and**



on further condition that they shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

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

vii) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.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
19:25:32 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The District Munsif – cum - Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Rameswaram Jetty P.S.,
The petitioners through their Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS 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.9/2025
(CNR No.TNRM-00-000059-2025)

Vijay, Age 35
S/o.Kanagaraj

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Uchipuli P.S.,
in Cr.No.89/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated : 8.5.2025 U/s..482 BNSS to grant anticipatory 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 Thiru.K.R.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was apprehends at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.89/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that there was a previous motive between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Following which on 28.04.2025 at 5.15 p.m., the petitioner and others assaulted with the defacto complainant sword and abused him in filthy language and A1 assaulted them with sword and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and hence the defacto complainant was given a complaint and 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 by the defacto complainant. He further contended that the injured was discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is almost over and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he will not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there are totally two accused involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 was released on anticipatory bail before the Judicial Magistrate No.II Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.743/2025 dated 05.05.2025 and that the injured was discharged from hospital on 30.04.2025 and that four witnesses have already been examined by the Investigation Officer and that four previous case is pending against the petitioner.



5. Considering the nature of offence and the fact that injured was discharged from hospital and also considering the stage of investigation and that released of co-accused and that there are antecedents against the petitioner this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, No.II, Ramanathapuram** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the petitioner and 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) that the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of police, respondent police daily once at 10.30 a.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
19:28:44 +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 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, Mahalir Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram**

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

**CrI.M.P.No.21/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000075-2025)**

Muthusamy, Age 44
S/o.Karuppiah

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 6.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.A.David, B.Sc., 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 submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(2), 115(2), 125, 351(3) of BNS



and Section 4 of TNPHW Act in Cr.No.23/2025 on the file of the respondent police, has filed this petition seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there was a land dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Following which on 26.04.2025 at 07.00 p.m., when the defacto complainant was standing in his house at that time the petitioner abused them in filthy language and A1 assaulted with sickle on his back side and assaulted the defacto complainant's aunt with his hand on his cheek and A2 assaulted with iron rod on his left head and A1 assaulted the defacto complainants wife with hand on his cheek and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and hence the defacto complainant was given a complaint and 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 injured was discharged from the hospital and that the investigation is almost over and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he will not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

KAVITHA
Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:17:47
+0530



4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there are totally 2 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 released on station bail. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from hospital on 29.04.2025 and that five witnesses have been examined by the investigation officer and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the fact that the injured was discharged from hospital and also considering the fact that most of the investigation is over and that there is no antecedents against the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the petitioner and 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) that the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of 15 days** 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 8th day of May 2025

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
KAVITHA Date:
2025.05.08
19:17:56 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000752025



Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Uthirakosamangai P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.

KAVITHA Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:18:05
+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.23/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000077-2025)

Selvaraj, (aged 50),
S/o. Issac.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Ilanchempur P.S.,
in Cr.No.34/2025

...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.J. Bill Klinton, B.Sc., L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.K.R.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 296(b), 115(1),351(2) of BNS r/w Section 4 of



TNPHW Act in Cr.No.34/2025 on the file of the respondent police, has filed this petition seeks anticipatory bail.

2. . The case of the prosecution is that, on 01.05.2025 at about 11.00 a.m, the defacto complainant's house construction work was going on by using Tractor, due to which the petitioners abused her in filthy language and pulled her hair and assaulted with hands and also threatened her 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 by the defacto complainant. He further contended that no one was injured and that the investigation is almost over. No previous case is pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he will not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that injured was not treated as in patient and that material part of the witnesses have already been examined by the Investigation Officer and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the fact that injured was snot



treated as in patient and also considering the stage of investigation and that there is no antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Mudhukulathur** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only)** with **two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the petitioner and 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) that the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of police, respondent police daily once at 10.30 a.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.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:18:58 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Mudhukulathur,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Ilanchembur P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



**IN THE COURT OF VACATION CRIMINAL JUDGE,
RAMANATHAPURAM.**

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

Thursday, the 8th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.26/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000073-2025)
and
Crl.M.P.No.83/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-00093-2025)

Abdul Rahuman, (aged 30),
S/o. Kabeer.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi P.S.,
in Cr.No.85/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Abudl Kasim,(aged 63/2025)
Thaivu Rawthar.

...Intervenor/defacto complainant

Petition dated 06.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.
Intervene Petition dated 08.05.2025 u/s.338 BNSS

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of
and Thiru.T.M. Arunkannan, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner
and Thiru S.Mohamed Natheem, B.Sc., B.L., the learned counsel for the
Intervene 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



submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.85/2025 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, on 25.04.2025 at about 12.30 p.m the defacto complainant was using mobile phones and hearing some movie songs, at that time the petitioner and all the accused questioned about the defacto complainant and others and abused them in filthy language and assaulted them with rod and wood and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences and hence the defacto complainant was given a complaint and 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. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from the hospital on 30.04.2025. 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 there is no possibility to would tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:21:49
+0530



4. The learned counsel for the intervener petitioner objected to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail and the investigation is not completed. The injured was taking treatment in private hospital. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, there is possibility that they would threaten the witnesses and abscond and he prays to dismiss this petition.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 4 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 to A4 were still absconding. He further contended that the injured was discharged from the hospital on 30.04.2025 and that five witnesses have been examined by the investigation officer and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of offence and stage of investigation and also considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and that there is no antecedents against the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with the following conditions:

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi** on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only)** each **with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial



Magistrate concerned and if the petitioners/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stand cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the petitioners and 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) that the **petitioners shall report before the Inspector of Police, Thallakulam Police Station, Madurai District daily at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that they shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

vi) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on 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;**

TNRM000000732025



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

In respect of the intervene petition is closed.

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

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:22:04 +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, Sayalkudi P.S.,
The Inspector of Police, Thallakulam P.S., Madurai District
The petitioner through his Counsel.
The intervene 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

Crl.M.P.No.28/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000072-2025)

1. Ramamoorthy, (aged 44),
S/o. Ramachandran.

2. Ganesamoorthy, (aged 30),
S/o. Gajendran.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1,2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Mudhukulathur P.S.,
in Cr.No.121/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

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

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S. Pranavanathan, B.Com, B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and Thiru.K.R.M.Karunaivel pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners /A1, A2 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 324(4) (5), 351(2)



BNS in Cr.No.121/2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that there was a wordy quarrel arose between the petitioner and son-in-law of the defacto complainant in respect of riding vehicles. Following which on 02.05.2025 at about 5.00 p.m., the petitioner tres -passed into the defacto complainants' son- in- law house and abused in filthy language and assaulted with iron rod and caused injuries and damaged the two wheeler and Tractor worth of Rs.5000/- and also threatened him with dire consequence and on complaint, the case has been registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have not committed any such offence and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further contended that no one was injured and that the investigation is almost completed. In these circumstances, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and they would not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 3 accused are involved in this case. The petitioners are arrayed as A1, A2. A3 is still absconding. He further submitted that no one was injured and that material part of the investigation is over and that one previous case is pending against the 2nd

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:22:28 +0530



petitioner and no previous case is pending against the 1st petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of offence and stage of the investigation and also considering the fact that no one was injured and that there are antecedents against the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate Mudhukulathur**, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only)** each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioners/accused did not surrendered within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioners shall deposit a sum of Rs.2,000/- each (Rupees Two Thousand only) to the Credit of Crime No.121/2025 before the learned Judicial Magistrate Mudhukulathur without prejudice to their defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.**

iii) that the petitioners and 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;

iv) that the **petitioners shall report before the Inspector of Police, respondent police station daily at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that they shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

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

viii) 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
19:22:45 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
08.05.2025

TNRM000000722025



Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Mudhukulathur,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Mudhukulathur P.S.,
The petitioners through their Counsel.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:22:53 +0530



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS 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.30/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000071-2025)

1.Asman, Age 33

S/o.Mohamed Abuthahir

2.Tharik, Age 24

S/o.Mohamed Abuthahir

3.Rinosekhan @ Mohamed Rinosekhan, Age 23,

S/o.Ubayadullah

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,

Keelakarai P.S.,

in Cr.No.39/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 6.5.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

Intervene Petition dated: 24.04.2025 U/s.339(2) BNSS.

This petition 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.K.R.M.Karunaivel pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this



Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.137(2), 127(2), 115(2), 118(1) of BNS in Cr.No.39/2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioners has made an endorsement that he is not pressing this petition. Recording the same this petition is dismissed as not pressed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

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

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.08
19:23:20 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
8.05.2025



**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.31/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000068-2025)**

and

**Intervene Petition CrI.M.P.No.78/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000083-2025)**

Jesintha Mery @ Jesintha Mary, (aged 43),
D/o. Arokya Babu @ Babu

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
DCB, Ramanathapuram,
in Cr.No.31/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Raguvaran, (aged 63),
S/o.Sathasivam.

... Intervener/Defacto
Complainant.

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

Intervene Petition dated 08.05.2025 u/s. U/s.339(2) BNSS.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of
Thiru.G. Dineshraj, M.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru
M.Sivasankar, MCA., B.L., the learned Counsel for the intervener and
Thiru.K.R.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com, B.L., representing on behalf of the

KAVITHA

Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:24:00
+0530



learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.420, 120(b) IPC in Cr.No.31/2025 on the file of the respondent police, has filed this petition seeking anticipatory bail.

2. According to the case of the prosecution the petitioner is relative of the defacto complainant. The petitioner informed the defacto complainant to get Govt.job for his son and believing her words the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.5,50,000/- through bank account of A1's sisters A4 and A5 account and further directly given a sum of Rs.10.00,000/- to the A1 along with A2 as per direction of this petitioner/ A3 at Chennai and after they have failed to get the Govt.job and a sum of Rs.80,000/- only returned to the defacto complainant and the remaining amount of Rs, 14,70,000/- is not yet returned and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and she is in no way connected with the offence. He further contended that the petitioner has not involved in the offence and the money transaction was done only through A1 and that the investigation is almost over and no previous case is pending against the petitioner and that



earlier bail application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1112/2025 dated 29.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, there is no possibility to threaten the witnesses and tramper the evidence and abscond. Hence, he prayed to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Counsel for the intervener submitted that the petitioner is instructed to get the Govt job to the defacto complainant's son. The petitioner along with other accused have jointly cheated the amount of the defacto complainant for getting Govt.job for his son. He further submitted that the petitioner was accompanied the A2 to deliver the money to A1 at Chennai. The remaining amount of Rs.14,70,000/- involved in this case is not yet recovered and the investigation is yet to be completed and hence he objected to release the petitioner on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the occurrence took place from the year 2021 to 2023 and FIR was registered on 10.04.2025. There are totally 5 accused are involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A3 and she is wife of A2. Others are still absconding. All the accused involved in this case and the amount involved in this case is not yet recovered. He further submitted that witnesses six witnesses have been examined and that the petitioner is main accused in this case and she is yet to be arrest and that if she is



released on anticipatory bail there is no possibility to recover the amount and he objected to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

6. A perusal of the FIR, entire money transaction was done through A1 under instruction of this petitioner and the investigation is in initial stage. A2 alone is arrested whereas others are absconding. Considering the specific overt-act attributed against this petitioner and also the investigation is in initial stage and there is no change of circumstances from the earlier application was dismissed, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

In respect of the intervene petition is closed.

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

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.08
19:24:13 +0530

Vacation Criminal 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.
The Intervener through his Counsel.