



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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.N0.120/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000106-2025)

Meenatchi, (aged 42),
W/o. Vikram.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Paramakudi Town P.S.,
in Cr.No.84/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13..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. Ramalingam, 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 and remanded to judicial custody on 28.03.2025 in Cr.No.84/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.303(ii) BNS, seeks bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, on 08.01.2025 at about 5.15 p.m, the defacto complainant was travelling in a bus to go to T.Pudukottai , while the bus was nearing Atruppalam stop, her 3 ½ sovereign of gold chain was stolen and on complaint, the case was registered

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted 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 was arrested on 28.03.2025 and she is in judicial custody for the past 42 days and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.20/2025 on 08.05.2025 and that the petitioner is released on bail, she is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and she 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 formally arrested on 26.03.2025 and remanded to judicial custody on 28.03.2025 and that five witnesses have been examined and the investigation is not yet completed. He further submitted that earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.20/2025 on 08.05.2025 and that similar nature of 6 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, she would indulge in similar offence again.



5. Considering that grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and also that the investigation is not yet completed and that there are several cases 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. Therefore the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:13:58 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

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

TNRM000001062025





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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.118/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000108-2025)

Meenachi, (aged 42),
W/o. Vikram.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Paramakudi Town P.S.,
in Cr.No.370/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.A. Ramalingam, 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 and remanded to judicial custody on 28.03.2025 in Cr.No. 370/2024 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.303(ii) NH BNS, seeks bail.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:14:17
+0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 29.11.2024 at about 2.30 p.m., when the defacto complainant was travelling in a bus No.26 from Parmakudi to Abiramam, her 6 sovereign of gold chain was stolen and and complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted 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 was arrested on 28.03.2025 and she is in judicial custody for the past 42 days and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 18/2025 on 08.05.2025 and that the petitioner is released on bail, she is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and she 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 formally arrested on 26.03.2025 and remanded to judicial custody on 28.03.2025 and that the investigation has been completed and charge sheet was filed on 17.04.2025. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No. 18/2025 on 08.05.2025 and that similar nature of 6 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, she would indulge in similar offence again.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:14:25 +0530



5. Considering that grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that even though charge sheet has been filed, she is having several previous cases and there is no change of circumstances since the earlier dismissal order, 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:14:21 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Paramakudi Town P.S.,
The petitioners through her 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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.19/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000008-2025)

Kalai, (aged 53),
S/o. Karuppaiah.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Keelathooval 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 Thiru.R.Silambaraj, B.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/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 22.04.2025 in Cr.No.57/2025 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

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
20:06:00
+0530
KAVITHA



complainant along with police party on 22.04.2025 at about 09.15 a.m and found that the petitioner illegally possessed and was selling 110 liters of palm toddy contained in plastic pots 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 the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.1183/2025 on 30.04.2025 and that 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 (110 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 totally similar nature of 11 previous cases were pending against the petitioner, out of which under 8 cases are disposed and convicted and remaining 3 cases are pending and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.



5. Considering that nature of offence and period of incarceration and also that there is change of circumstances since the earlier dismissal order and the substantial part of the investigation is completed, 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.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 of the petitioner, he **shall report before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar, Virudhunagar District 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;

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 abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.269 BNS, 2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
20:06:09 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur,
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar, Virudhunagar District,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Keelathooval 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, Mahalir Neethimandram
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram
Thursday, the 15th day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No.29/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000069-2025)**

1.Mariyammal, Age 51
W/o.Pandaram

2.Kesavan, Age 26
S/o.Pandaram

3.Selvi @ Malaiselvi Age 40
W/o.Thambidurai

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Devipattinam P.S.,
in Cr.No.113/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

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

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S.J.Sheik Ibrahim, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, M.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/A1 to A3 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 118(1) of BNS in Cr.No.113/2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, the defacto complainant's relative namely Jamuna was committed suicide due to some family dispute and died on 29.04.2025. A1 is mother, and A2 is brother and A3 is sister aunt of the deceased. On 01.05.2025 the defacto complainant and the deceased's husband went to the deceased house for post ritual, at the time, all the accused abused them in filthy language and A2 assaulted the defacto complainant with knife on his head and also bite the defacto complainant's relative on his right hand and assaulted with hands and A3 catch the private part of the defacto complainant and caused injuries and on complaint, the case was 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 the injured were discharged from hospital and that the investigation is almost complete and that the injured was discharged from the hospital and that counter case has been registered in Cr.No.114/2025 and that no



previous case is pending against the petitioners. 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.114/2025 and that the injured was discharged from hospital on 09.05.2025 and that four witnesses have been examined and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the fact that the injured were discharged from the hospital and also that the substantial part of the investigation is over and that there is no antecedents against the petitioner, 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 No.I, Ramanathapuram**, 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 stands 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 twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.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

TNRM000000692025



BNS, 2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:16:17 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Devipattinam 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, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 15th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.41/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000054-2025)

and

Intervene Petition Crl.M.P.No.81/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000086-2025)

Muthulakshmi, (aged 38),
W/o. Pursothaman.

....Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
DCB, Ramanathapuram,
Cr.No.07/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Mohammed Shareef Sate, (aged 46),
S/o.Abdul Kadhar.

... Intervener/Defacto
Complainant.

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

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

This petition 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.J.Udhuman, B.Sc., B.L., the learned Counsel for the intervener 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/A2 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 08.04.2025 in Cr.No.07/2025 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.465, 420, 294(b), 506(i) IPC, seeks bail.

2. According to the case of the prosecution the petitioner and her husband/A1 were cheated the defacto complainant for a sum of Rs.26,00,000/- by indulging fraud as they were executing sale agreement in favour of the defacto complainant in respect of their property and thereafter they have failed to execute sale deed to the defacto complainant and the property was sold to others 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 was arrested on 08.04.2025 and she is in judicial custody and she is having a daughter aged about 15 years. The occurrence was happened in the year 2021 to 2023 and after long duration of the agreement, the defacto complainant has not come to execute the sale



deed, then the land was sold to others. He further submitted that the investigation is almost over and that the earlier application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram in CIS CrI.M.P.No.606/2025 on 22.04.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is no possibility to tamper the witnesses and abscond. He further submitted that the petitioner and A1 are ready to jointly to deposit a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- and hence, he prayed to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Counsel for the intervener opposed to granting bail to the petitioner stating that the petitioner and her husband cheated a sum of Rs.26,00,000/- which was given to them for purchasing a land belongs to them and they have failed and thereafter the land was sold to others for a sum of Rs.70,00,000/-. He further submitted that the amount is not yet recovered and she is having similar nature of some previous cases and the investigation is pending and also if the petitioner is released on bail, she shall deposit the said amount and may be consider the bail application.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed to release the petitioner stating that the amount involved in this case is Rs.26,00,000/- and the same is not yet recovered . Totally 2 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is A2. A1 is the husband of this petitioner. He further submitted that



the petitioner was arrested on 08.04.2025 and she is in judicial custody and that the investigation is not yet completed and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1185/2025 on 29.04.2025. He further submitted that similar nature of two previous cases are pending against the petitioner in various district, hence he objected to release the petitioner on bail.

6. The amount involved in this case is Rs.26,00,000/- and the amount is not yet recovered and the property involved in this case is subsequently sold to others for a sum of Rs.70,00,000/- and the petitioner and her husband received more than lakh rupees and they have alleged to have cheated the defacto complainant as well as, other previous cases are pending against the petitioner and her husband. The Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed for granting bail to this petitioner stating that there are some cases against the petitioner/accused.

7. Therefore, considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and also the amount is not yet recovered and that there are similar nature of previous cases are pending against the petitioner in various districts and the fact that the investigation is not yet completed and there is no change of circumstances since the earlier dismissal order, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner .

KAVITHA

Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:16:33
+0530

TNRM000000542025



In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

In respect of the intervene petition is closed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:16:36 +0530
KAVITHA
Vacation Vacation Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, DCB, Ramanathapuram,
The petitioner through her Counsel.
The intervener 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 15th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.42/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000053-2025)
and
Intervene Petition Crl.M.P.No.80/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000085-2025)

Purusothaman, (aged 41),
S/o.Balakrishnan.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
DCB, Ramanathapuram,
Cr.No.07/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Mohammed Shareef Sate, (aged 46),
S/o.Abdul Kadhar.

... Intervener/Defacto
Complainant.

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

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

This petition 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.J.Udhuman, B.Sc., B.L., the learned Counsel for the intervener and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Panidiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the



learned 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 08.04.2025 in Cr.No.07/2025 of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.465, 420, 294(b), 506(i) IPC, seeks bail.

2. According to the case of the prosecution the petitioner and his wife/A2 were cheated the defacto complainant for a sum of Rs.26,00,000/- by indulging fraud as they were executing sale agreement in favour of the defacto complainant in respect of their property and thereafter they have failed to execute sale deed to the defacto complainant and the property was sold to others 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 he is in no way connected with the offence. He further contended that the petitioner was arrested on 08.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and he is having a daughter aged about 15 years. The occurrence was happened in the year 2021 to 2023 and after long duration



of the agreement, the defacto complainant has not come to execute the sale deed, then the land was sold to others. He further submitted that the investigation is almost over and that earlier application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram in CIS CrI.M.P.No.744/2025 on 02.05.2025 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is no possibility to tamper the witnesses and abscond. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to deposit a sum of Rs.10,00,000/-to the credit of Cr.No.of the concerned Court and hence, he prayed to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Counsel for the intervener opposed to granting bail to the petitioner stating that the petitioner and his husband were cheated a sum of Rs.26,00,000/- which was given to them for purchasing a land belongs to them and they have failed and thereafter the land was sold to others for a sum of Rs.70,00,000/-. He further submitted that the amount is not yet recovered and he is having similar nature of some previous cases and the investigation is pending and also if the petitioner is released on bail, he shall deposit the said amount and may be consider the bail application.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed to release the petitioner stating that the amount involved in this case is Rs.26,00,000/- and the



same is not yet recovered . Totally 2 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is A1. A2 is the wife of this petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 08.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the investigation is not yet completed and that similar nature of four previous cases are pending against the petitioner in various districts, hence he strongly objected to release the petitioner on bail.

6. The amount involved in this case is Rs.26,00,000/- and the amount is not yet recovered and the property involved in this case is subsequently sold to others for a sum of Rs.70,00,000/- and the petitioner and his wife received more than lakh rupees and they have alleged to have cheated the defacto complainant as well as, other previous cases are pending against the petitioner and his wife. The Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed for granting bail to this petitioner stating that there are some cases against the petitioner/accused.

7. Therefore, considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and also the amount is not yet recovered and that there are similar nature of previous cases are pending against the petitioner in various districts and the fact that the investigation is not yet completed, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner .

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.



In respect of the intervene petition is closed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:16:50 +0530
KAVITHA
Vacation Vacation Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

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.



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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.46/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000019-2025)

Nandu @ Mareeswaran, (aged 24),
S/o.Marichamy.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Uchipuli P.S.,
in Cr.No.91/2025

...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.S. Thenmozhi, B.Sc., L.L.B., 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 submissions, this
Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner /sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial
custody on 01.05.2025 in Cr.No.91/2025 of the respondent P.S for the offences
punishable U/s. 25(1)(A) Arms Act, seeks bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling conducted by the defacto complainant along with police party on 01.05.2025 at about 10.00 a.m and found that the petitioner has illegally possessed a sword and he was threatening the public and also involved in rowdyism and he was apprehended by the police and property 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 01.05.2025 and that the petitioner was already 7 months in judicial custody in another case and after releasing the petitioner, he was arrested by the respondent police in the present case and it is a put up case and that in this regard the petitioner's mother has given a complaint before the Superintendent of Police, Ramanathapuram. He further submitted that most of the investigation has been completed 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 01.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the property



involved in this case has been secured . He further submitted that five witnesses have been examined and that 11 previous cases are pending against the petitioner under 326, 309(4), 427, 397, 307, 506(ii) IPC including PPDL Act and his name is in History Sheet and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge similar offence again and he objected to release the petitioner on bail.

5. . Considering the nature of offence and that the period of incarceration and the fact that the property has been recovered and that even though the substantial part of the investigation is over, the petitioner is having several cases and considering the bad antecedents of the petitioner, 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:17:13 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025.

Copy sent through e-mail:

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

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

Thursday, the 15th day of May 2025
Crl.M.P.No.86/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000097-2025)

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: .13.05.2025 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 he defacto complainant and the petitioner. On 14.04.2025 at about 7.30 p.m when the defacto complainant was talking along with 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 this Court in CrI.M.P.No.34/2025 on 08.05.2025 and that co-accused A2 was released on bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.56/2025 on 08.05.2025 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 was released on bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.56/2025 on 08.05.2025. 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 and there is specific overt-act against the petitioner and that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court on 08.05.2025 and that A2 was released on bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.56/2025 on 08.05.2025 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 nature of offence and period of incarceration and the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and there is some change of circumstances since the earlier dismissal order, 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 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, Ramanathapuram 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;

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 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:17:34 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Thriuppullani P.S.,

The petitioner through his Counsel.

The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.

TNRM000000952025



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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.87/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000095-2025)

Navaneethakrishnan, (aged 31),
S/o. Kamalavalli. (mother)

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Keelakarai P.S.,
Cr.No.02/2022
in PRC.No.50/2022.
S.C.No.63/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of
Thiru.S. Shanmuganathan, M.A., , 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
passed the following:



ORDER

The petitioner/A3 who was arrested on NBW and remanded to judicial custody on 03.02.2025 in SC No.63/2025 on the file of this Court in Cr.No.02/2022 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable U/s. 294(b), 326, 307 IPC, seeks bail.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that, the case was taken on file as SC No.63/2025 and is pending before this Court. Further he submitted that at the stage of PRC in No.50/2022, the petitioner could not appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram on 18.09.2024, hence NBW was issued against the petitioner and the same was executed on 03.02.2025 and he is in judicial custody. Further he contended that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1245/2025 on 30.04.2025 and that 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.

3. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 3 accused are involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A3. Others are appeared regularly before this Court. He further submitted that at the stage of PRC, the petitioner did not appear before the committal court hence , NBW issued against the petitioner on 18.09.2024.



He further submitted that after committal proceedings the case was sent to this court and was taken on file as SC No.63/2025 before this Court and that subsequently the NBW was executed on 03.02.2025 and he is in judicial custody. Further he has contended that 12 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and his name is under History Sheet and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in Crl.M.P.No.1245/2025 on 30.04.2025 and that the case is pending for appearance stage and that if he is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would abscond again and also would affect the trial and so he objected to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The petitioner/accused is in judicial custody for 102 days and the case is posted for appearance of the accused and the trial is yet to be commenced. The learned Public Prosecutor submits that several cases are pending against him in various districts and there is every possibility that he would abscond if released on bail. Considering that he had jumped bail an earlier occasion and he had not voluntarily surrender before the court to apprehend by the police, there is every possibility that he would again abscond, if released on bail, and there are several cases pending against the petitioner and there is no change of circumstances since the earlier dismissal order, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

TNRM000000952025



In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:17:50 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Keelakkarai 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 15th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.108/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000117-2025)

Manthiramoorthy, (aged 24),
S/o.Ponnuchamy.

...Petitioner/Accused (A7)

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S.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/A7 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 12.05.2025 in Cr.No.62/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.189(2), 140, 296(b), 115(2), 351(3) of BNS seeks bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, on 03.05.2025 at about 8.00 p.m, while the defacto complainant and his relative were going to Iyyangar bakery, the petitioner and six others were standing there and questioned about them and kidnapped by them in two wheelers. Further all the accused abused them in filthy language and assaulted with bottles and wooden log and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences at the time of kidnapping the defacato complainant and his relative were escaped and 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 he is no way connected with the offence and the petitioner was arrested on 12.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody. He further contended that the injured persons were discharged from the hospital and most of the investigation is over and there is no specific overt act. He further submitted that co-accused A1 was released on anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.M.P.No.8677/2025 on 14.05.2025 and some of the accused moved before the High Court 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 totally 8 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A7. A1 was released on anticipatory bail



by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.M.P.No.8677/2025 on 14.05.2025 and A4 and A7 moved anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble High Court and the same is pending and others are still absconding., He further submitted that the occurrence took place on 03.05.2025 and the petitioner was arrested on 12.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the kidnapped persons were secured and they were sustained injury and were discharged from the hospital . He further submitted that the investigation is in initial stage and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and he objected to release the petitioner on bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and short period of incarceration and though the injured were discharged from the hospital, the investigation is in initial stage, 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
20:05:33 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

TNRM000001172025



Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Parthibanur 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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.112/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000099-2025)

Sambath, (aged 32),
S/o.Kuppusamy.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Devipattinam P.S.,
Cr.No.117/2025.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.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/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 07.05.2025 in Cr.No.117/2025 on the file of the respondent police station for the offences punishable U/s.303(2), 132 BNS and Section 21(1) MMDR Act, seeks bail.

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



defacto complainant along with police party on 07.05.2025 at about 5.00 a.m and found that the petitioner and others have illegally transported one unit of Savadu sand in an un-numbered Tractor along with trailer with help of Bolero vehicle bearing Reg.No.TN 65 AT 7365 without getting any permit or licence . At the time of occurrence, the petitioner and another tried to took away the vehicle and they deterred the public servant discharging their duties, Further the petitioner and one another were apprehended by the police and the properties have been secured and in consequence, the case was 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 07.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police and most of the investigation is over. . He further submitted 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 3 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 and A3 moved anticipatory bail before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.(MD) No, 8663/2025 and the same is pending. Further he contended that the petitioner was arrested on 07.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (one unit of Savadu sand and 2 vehicles) involved in this



case have been recovered and that four witnesses have been examined by the Investigation Officer and that 5 previous cases are pending against the petitioner, out of which 3 cases are similar nature 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 the properties have been secured and that the investigation is not yet completed and considering the similar nature of previous cases, 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:14:35 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025.

Copy sent through e-mail:
To

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

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

Thursday, the 15th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.113/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000107-2025)

Meenatchi, (aged 42),
W/o. Vikram.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13.05.2025 U/s. 483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.A. Ramalingam, 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 and remanded to judicial custody on 21.03.2025 in Cr.No. 57/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.303(ii) BNS, seeks bail.

KAVITHA

Digitally
signed by
KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:14:49
+0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 16.03.2025 at about 1.00 p.m, when the defacto complainant was travelling from Parmakudi to Siragikottai in TMT bus and at the bus stop of the Manjalpattinam, the defacto complainant's money purse was stolen, which was contained 9 ½ sovereign of gold chains, ring and amount of Rs.6,000/- of her and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted 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 was arrested on 28.03.2025 and she is in judicial custody for the past 42 days and that the investigation is almost over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.17/2025 on 08.05.2025 and that the petitioner is released on bail, she is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and she 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 and remanded to judicial custody on 21.03.2025 and that the investigation has been completed and charge sheet was filed on 05.04.2025. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.17/2025 on 08.05.2025 similar nature of 6 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, she would indulge in similar offence again.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:14:55
+0530



5. Considering that grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that even though charge sheet has been filed, she is having several previous cases 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:14:52 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Emaneswaram P.S.,
The petitioners through her 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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.127/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-0000136-2025)

1.Murugesan, 45/2025

S/o.shanmugam.

2.Nishanthini, 31/2025

D/o.Murugasen

...Petitioners/Accused No.2, 4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,

Bazaar P.S.,

in Cr.No.120/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.M.Rajasahul Hameed 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), 324(2), 351(3) BNS in



Cr.No.120/2025 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 regarding conducting sports on the occasion of Dr. Ambathkar birthday. On 11.5.2025 at about 6.00 p.m., when the defacto complainant and his brother were standing in front of his house, at that time on the instigation of A2, A1 attacked the defacto complainant with knife on his left eye and caused injuries and A3 and A4 were pulled the defacto complainant hair and and also the petitioners damaged the tiles of the house belongs to his brothers and worth about 1000/-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 most of the investigation is completed and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner. 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 there are totally 4 accused



involved in this case. The petitioner is arrayed as A2 and A4. Others are still absconding . He further contended that the injured was discharged from hospital on 14.05.2025 and that five witnesses have been examined and no previous case is pending against the 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 there is no antecedents against the petitioner, 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 Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram** 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 twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:15:16 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

TNRM000001362025



Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Bazaar 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 15th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.132/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000142-2025)

1.Naganathan, 34/2025

S/o.Jeyapandi

2.Sathish, 40/2025

S/o.Tavasimuniyandi

...Petitioners/Accused No.1, 2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,

Devipattinam P.S.,

in Cr.No.114/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.Ilavarasan, B.A., 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 and section 4 of TNPHWH Act, he filed this petition seeking to release them on



anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, one Naganathan/1st Petitioner got married one Jamuna who is the Sister of defacto complainant. There was a misunderstanding between them, the said Jamuna committed suicide by hanging. On 01.05.2025 at 9.50 a.m, when the said Naganathan was taking his children and that was objected by the defacto complainant and his mother. Therefore the 2nd petitioner abused the defacto complainant and others, A1 attacked the defacto complaint with his wooden log on his head and caused injuries and on complaint, the case was 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 the injured were discharged from hospital and that the investigation is almost complete and that the injured was discharged from the hospital and that counter case has been registered in Cr.No.113/2025 and that no previous case is pending against the petitioners. 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 there are totally 4 accused



involved in this case . The petitioners are arrayed as A1 and A2. Others are still absconding. He further contended that the counter case has been registered in Cr.No.113/2025 and that the injured was discharged from hospital on 09.05.2025 and that four witnesses have been examined and that no previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the fact that the injured were discharged from the hospital and also that the substantial part of the investigation is over and that there is no antecedents against the petitioner, 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 No.I, Ramanathapuram** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees Ten Thousand only) 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 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA

Vacation Sessions Judge

Ramanathapuram.

15.05.2025

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:15:35 +0530



Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Devipattinam P.S.,
The petitioners through their Counsel.

TNRM000001582025



**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 15th day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No. 144/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000158-2025)

Rajendran, aged 62,
S/o. Kalimuthu

..... Petitioner / Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Peraiyur P.S.,
in Cr.No. 37/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.K. Gunasekaran, M.A.,B.L., 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), 118/(1), 351(3) of BNS Act in Cr.No.



37/2025 on the file of the respondent police, has filed this petition seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, there was a misunderstanding between both parties, on 7.5.2025 at 5.30 p.m., when the defacto complainant went with cycle near the occurrence place, the accused was noticing him and abused the filthy language with attack the iron rod on his back and caused injuries and also with dire consequences and a complaint was given by the defacto complainant, hence 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 the injured was discharged from hospital and and that counter case has been registered and that the investigation is almost over. No previous case is pending against the petitioner and that Co- accused was released on bail before the Judicial Magistrate, Parmakudi in CrI.M.P.No. 23/2025 dated 08.05.2025 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 both parties are close relatives and that the injured was discharged from hospital, He further contended that counter case has also registered and that five 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 considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and stage of investigation and the fact that release of co-accused and in counter case and 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 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 The District Munsif - cum - Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi** 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

TNRM000001582025



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 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;**

TNRM000001582025



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 15th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:16:01 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The District Munsif - cum - Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi.
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Peraiyur, 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, Magalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram.

Thursday, the 15th day of May 2025

Crl.M.P.No.52/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000017-2025)

Sharma, (aged 29),
S/o. Chandran.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Mudukulathur P.S.,
Cr.No.119/2025

...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 Panidiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the Public Prosecutor 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 30.04.2025 in Cr.No.119/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.4(1)(A) 14(A)TNP (Amendment) Act, 2024, seeks bail

O

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:19:12
+0530



2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling conducted by the police along with police party on 30.04.2025 at about 21.30 hours and found that petitioner has illegally possessed 47 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 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. The petitioner was arrested on 30.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody for the past 16 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 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 30.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that the properties (47 bottles of liquor) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that four witnesses have been examined by the investigation officer and no 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 the fact that the properties have been secured and considering that the petitioner is in judicial custody for more than 15 days and also the substantial part of the investigation is over and that there is no antecedents, 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 Mudhukulathur;**

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five 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) that the **petitioner shall report before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur 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 15th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:19:20 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Mudhukulathur

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Mudhukulathur P.S.,

The petitioner through his Counsel.

The Superintendent , District Prison, Ramanathapuram

The District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram.

TNRM000000172025





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 15th day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No.106/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000113-2025)

Ameen Sarthar @ Kalla Ameen (Age 34)
S/o.Syed Sultha

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Keelakarai Police Station,
in Cr.No.55/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.G.Kesavan, 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/Accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.04.2025 in Cr.No.55/2025 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable U/s. 25(1A) Arms Act, seeks bail.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:17:59
+0530



2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner 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 bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed by
KAVITHA

Date: 2025.05.15
19:18:01 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025



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 15th day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No.109/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000125-2025)

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: 13.05.2025 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 the petitioner name was not mentioned in the FIR and even in the charge sheet, the petitioner's name found mistake and his voluntary surrender was not accepted by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur. Hence, he could not appear before the court on hearing and that earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.58/2025 on 08.05.2025 and 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 earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.58/2025 on 08.05.2025 and 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. However, having considering the submission made by the petitioner side and considering the facts and circumstances of the case and period of incarceration and that no previous case against this petitioner, 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) 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 Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m until committal proceedings of the case** 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

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
20:05:50
+0530

KAVITHA

TNRM000000082025



Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
20:05:53 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Mudhukulathur 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, Mahalir Neethimandram,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Ramanathapuram,

Thursday, the 15th day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No.115/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000098-2025)

Manikandan, (Age 25)
S/o.Muniyandi

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Uchipuli Police Station,
in Cr.No.94/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13.05.2025 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 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 04.05.2025 in Cr.No.94/2025 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable U/s. 25(1A) Arms Act, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that, at the time of patrolling conducted by the defacto complainant along with police party on 03.05.2025 at about 08.00 p.m and found that the petitioner has illegally possessed a sword and he was threatening the public and involved in rowdyism and he was apprehended by the police and property has 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 04.05.2025 and that the property was recovered and that most of the investigation has been completed. He further submitted that the petitioner has already released on bail by this Court in another case and he was arrested by the respondent police in the present case and it is a put up case 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 04.05.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that five witnesses have been examined. He further submitted that property involved in this case has been secured



and that 6 previous cases are pending against the petitioner under 109, 351(3) BNS and 363, 120(B) IPC including PPDL Act and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again and objected to release the petitioner on bail.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and that though the substantial part of the investigation is completed, the petitioner is having several previous cases, 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:18:14 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM

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

Thursday, the 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.123/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000104-2025)

Ameen Sarthar @ Kalla Ameen (Age 34)
S/o.Syed Sulthan

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Keelakarai Police Station,
in Cr.No.55/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 13.05.2025 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Tmt.S.Thenmozhi, 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 and remanded to judicial custody on 15.04.2025 in Cr.No.55/2025 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable U/s. 25(1A) Arms Act, seeks bail.



2. The prosecution case is that, at the time of patrolling conducted by the respondent police on 15.04.2025 and found that the petitioner has illegally possessed sword and was threatening the public and he was apprehended by the police and property was 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 15.04.2025 at about 17.30 hours and that the property was recovered and that most of the investigation has been completed. He further submitted that it is put up case 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 15.04.2025 and he is in judicial custody and that five witnesses have been examined. He further submitted that property involved in this case has been secured and that 6 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and his name is under History Sheet and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.

TNRM000001042025



5. Considering the grave nature of offence and period of incarceration and also the fact that the property was recovered and that even though the substantial part of investigation is over, the petitioner is having several cases and considering the bad antecedents of the petitioner, 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 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:18:29 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Keelakarai 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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.131/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000145-2025)

Aakash, (aged 24),
S/o. Mathiyalagan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Parthibanur P.S.,
in Cr.No.52/2025

...Respondent / Complainant

Petition dated 13.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S. Chellamani, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.KR.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 in Cr.No.52/2025 for the offences punishable U/s.4(1) (A) TNP Act 2024 , seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of police patrolling on 10.04.2025 and found that the petitioner has illegally possessed 28 bottles of liquor (each 180 ml) contained in a two wheeler without getting any permit or licence for the purpose of selling at high prices in public and on seeing the police the petitioner flee away from the scene of occurrence and red-handed by the police and he is having sales amount of Rs.600/- and the properties involved in this case have been secured and in consequence, 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 properties involved in this case have been secured and that the investigation is almost over and that earlier bail applications were dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.1118/2025 dated 29.04.2025 and this Court CrI.M.P.No.11/2025 dated 08.05.2025 and that the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory 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 anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the properties involved in this case have been secured and that the investigation is not yet completed and that two 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 tamper the evidence.

5. Considering the nature of offence and that the investigation is not yet completed and there are bad antecedents against the petitioner, and there is no change of circumstances from the earlier bail applications were dismissed, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:18:43 +0530

**Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025**

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Parthibanur 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 15th day of May 2025

**Crl.M.P.No.148/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000155-2025)**

Kottaisamy, (aged 32),
S/o. Chairmen

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.K.Chandru,B.A.,L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, M.Com., B.L., 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 in Cr.No.66/2025 U/s.123, 62 BNS and section 24(1) COTPA Act 2003 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The prosecution case is that, the respondent police was contacting inspection



near iron roof belongs to the Kottaisamy. On seeing the set Kottaisamy runaway the place after that the inspected the iron roof the noticed the Vimal Pan masala bundle packet and 150 pockets of V-I tobacco pockets (each 10.5 grms) and the same were possessed by him for his self gain which where harmfull in the society.

hence 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 properties involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police and that investigation is almost over. In these circumstances, 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 has contended that the huge quantity of properties involved in this case and the same were secured by the respondent police and that the investigation is not yet completed and that the earlier two bail applications was dismissed by this Court and that two previous case is pending against the petitioner. If the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, there is possibility that he would threaten or tamper the witnesses.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and also that the properties have



been recovered and considering the fact that the investigation is not yet completed and that there are antecedents against the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
KAVITHA Date:
2025.05.15
19:18:57
+0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail
To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Sayalkudi 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 15th day of May 2025

CrI.M.P.No.94/2025

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000130-2025)

1. Muniyasamy, (aged 25),
S/o. Thachinamoorthy.

2. Balaguru, (aged 21),
S/o. Chellasamy.

3. Udayakumar, (aged 21),
S/o. Annadurai.

4. Balamurugan, (aged 20),
S/o. Muniyandi.

5. Linga Pandi (aged 24),
S/o. Chithiraivelu.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 5

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.05.2025 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.M.Mayakannan, M.Com., B.L. the learned Counsel for the petitioners and Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:19:47 +0530



passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners / accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.140, 296(b), 115(2), 351(3) BNS in Cr.No.62/2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

The learned Counsel for the petitioners have made an endorsement that They are is not pressing this petition. Recording the same this petition is dismissed as not pressed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed as not pressed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:19:50 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail:

To

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Parthibanoor 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 15th day of May 2025
Crl.M.P.No.98/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000103-2025)

Sriram, (aged 19)
S/o.Naganathan.,

...Petitioner/Accused No.6

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thiruppulani P.S.,
in Cr.No.32/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.5.2025 prays to extension of time to produce the sureties
in Crl.M.P.No.1130/2025 dated 22.4.2025.

This petition is coming up on this day before me for hearing in the presence
of Tmt.S.Thenmozhi, B.Sc., 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

This petition has been filed by the petitioner for extension of time to produce
the sureties as per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.1130/2025 dated 22.4.2025.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:20:01 +0530



2. Heard the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.1130/2025 dated 22.4.2025 with a condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram within a period of 15 days from the date of above said order. He could not produce the sureties in time before the concerned Court due to non-payment of deposit amount and seeks to extend the time to comply the conditional order in CrI.M.P.No.1130/2025 dated 22.4.2025

4. The learned Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioner was enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.1130/2025 dated 22.05.2025 and hence he has no serious objection for extension of time to produce the sureties.

5. Having considered the fact and reasons stated in this petition and prayer of the petitioner seeking time can be accepted in the interest of justice on condition that the petitioner is directed to pay a sum of **Rs.1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only)** to **the District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram** and to produce the sureties as ordered in CrI.M.P.No.1130/2025 dated 22.05.2025 is hereby extended for further 15 days from today and other conditions passed in the said order remains unchanged.

TNRM000001032025



In the result, the petition is allowed on condition that the petitioner pays **Rs.1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only)** on or before 20.5.2025 to the District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram and on such payment time is extended till 30.05.2025.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:20:07 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Thiruppulani 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 15th day of May 2025
Crl.M.P.No.99/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000123-2025)

1. Kamal Musthafa, (aged 68),
S/o. Jamaludeen.

2. Thameem Ansari, (aged 33),
S/o. Kamal Musthafa

3. Asarudeen, (age 33),
S/o. Kamal Musthafa

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

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Keelathooval P.S.,
in Cr.No.42/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.5.2025 prays to extension of time to produce the sureties
in Crl.M.P.No.979/2025 dated 29.4.2025.

This petition is coming up on this day before me for hearing in the presence
of Thiru.K.Gunasekaran, M.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:

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:20:14 +0530



ORDER

The petition has been filed by the petitioners for extension of time to produce the sureties as per the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.979/2025 dated 29.4.2025.

2. Heard, the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners were granted on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.979/2025 dated 29.4.2025 with a condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur within a period of 15 days from the date of above said order. The 2nd and 3rd petitioners were taking care of the 1st petitioner. They could not produce the sureties in time before the concerned Court and seeks to extend the time to comply the conditional order imposed in CrI.M.P.No.979/2025 dated 29.4.2025.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.979/2025 dated 29.4.2025 and hence he has no serious objection for extension of time to produce the sureties.

5. Having considered the fact and reasons stated in this petition and prayer

TNRM000001232025



of the petitioners seeking extension of time can be accepted in the interest of justice on condition that the petitioners pays **Rs.1000/- each (Rupees Thousand only)** to **the District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram** and to produce the sureties as ordered in CrI.M.P.No.979/2025 dated 29.4.2025 is hereby extended for 15 days from today is granted. The other conditions passed in the said order remains unchanged. No further extension time will be granted.

In the result, the petition is allowed on condition that the petitioners pays **Rs.1000/- each** (Rupees Thousand only) on or before 20.5.2025 to the District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram on such payment of time is extended till 30.5.2025 No further extension time will be granted.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date: 2025.05.15
19:20:20 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Keelathooval 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 15th day of May 2025
CrI.M.P.No.100/2025
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000115-2025)

Sathiyaraj, (aged 40),
S/o. Konadiyan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Kenikarai P.S.,
in Cr.No.106/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 13.5.2025 prays to extension of time to produce the sureties
in CrI.M.P.No.1181/2025 dated 29.4.2025.

This petition is coming up on this day before me for hearing in the presence
of Thiru.K.Gunasekaran, M.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**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner for extension of time to produce
the sureties as per the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.1181/2025 dated 29.04.2025.

2. Heard the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well
as the learned Public Prosecutor.

KAVITHA

Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:19:30 +0530



3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.1181/2025 dated 29.04.2025 with a condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram within a period of 15 days from the date of above said order. He could not produce the sureties in time before the concerned Court due to non-payment of deposit amount and seeks to extend the time to comply the conditional order in CrI.M.P.No.1181/2025 dated 29.04.2025

4. The learned Public Prosecutor would submit that the petitioner was enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.1181/2025 dated 29.04.2025 and hence he has no serious objection for extension of time to produce the sureties.

5. Having considered the fact and reasons stated in this petition and prayer of the petitioner seeking time can be accepted in the interest of justice on condition that the petitioner is directed to pay a sum of **Rs.1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only)** to **the District Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram** and to produce the sureties as ordered in CrI.M.P.No.1181/2025 dated 29.04.2025 is hereby extended for further 15 days from today and other conditions passed in the said order remains unchanged.

In the result, the petition is allowed on condition that the petitioner pays **Rs.1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only)** on or before 21.5.2025 to the District

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:19:36 +0530

TNRM000001152025



Mediation Centre, Ramanathapuram and on such payment time is extended till 30.05.2025.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 15th day of May 2025.

KAVITHA
Digitally signed
by KAVITHA
Date:
2025.05.15
19:19:32 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
15.05.2025

Copy sent through e-mail

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