



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.39/2026
(CNR No.TNRM-00-000049-2026)

1. Sriram Mari, (aged 24),
S/o.Mari.

2. Ameer Khan, (aged 57),
S/o.Abubakkar.

...Petitioners/Accused No.2,3,

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Kenikkarai P.S.,
in Cr.No.207/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.V.Sunil Malhotra, B.Com., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com.,B.L., representing on behalf of the the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners/A2, A3 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.207/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seek anticipatory bail.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:18:30 +0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is running a mechanic workshop. On 21.04.2026 at about 6.30 p.m., the 1st petitioner/A2 came to the workshop for puncture repair work of a 407 vehicle and enquired about the charges, to which the defacto complainant informed him that the service charge was Rs.1,500/-. After completion of the work, the 1st petitioner/A2 refused to pay the charges to the defacto complainant. In the meantime, the 1st petitioner/A2 called the owner of the vehicle, namely the A1. Both the petitioners objected to the charges, and a wordy altercation arose between them. Following the same, both accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and A1 slapped him on his cheek, and the 1st petitioner/A2 assaulted him with a vehicle key on his cheek, thereby causing injuries. They also threatened him with dire consequences. On the basis of the complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned counsel for petitioners filed a memo stating that to withdraw the petition in respect of the 2nd petitioner. He further contended that the 1st petitioner has not committed any such offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the 1st petitioner and that if the 1st petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and he would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and



he prays to release the 1st petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 2 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and that A1 was released on bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.435/2026 dated 29.04.2026. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from hospital on 26.04.2026 and that five witnesses have been examined and that there are no previous cases pending against the 1st petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the injured has been discharged from hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and that there are no criminal antecedents pending against the 1st petitioner and also that the co-accused (A1) was released on bail by concerned court, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner with the following conditions; In respect of the 2nd petitioner, the petition is dismissed as with drawn.

6. Accordingly, the 1st petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kenikkarai**; on condition that the 1st petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees**



Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the 1st 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 1st petitioner shall report before the **Inspector of Police, Respondent P.S., daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

iv) that the 1st petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses either during investigation or trial;

vi) that the 1st petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 1st petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 1st 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.



As far as, in respect of the 2nd petitioner this petition is dismissed as with drawn.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T

Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T

Date: 2026.05.13
17:18:51 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,*

“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram, (through e-mail)

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai P.S.,

The petitioners through their Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: **Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026
CrI.M.P.No.33/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000048-2026)

Kavi @ Kaviyarasu, (aged 23),
S/o.Karnan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Emaneswaram P.S.,
in Cr.No.80/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.S.Sobanapriya, B.A., L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of 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 arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.80/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(1), 109 of BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there is some misunderstanding between the both parties. Due to which on 13.04.2026 at about 1.00 a.m, the petitioner abused



the defacto complainant in filthy language and to commit murder assaulted with knife on his back side of the head and right wrist and caused injuries 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 is in no way connected with the offence and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.730/2026 on 30.04.2026 and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions may be imposed if any by this Court 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 the injured was discharged from hospital and and that five witnesses have been examined and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and that he strongly objected to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail and that there are nine previous cases pending against the petitioner for the offences punishable U/s.394, 34, 392, 323, 506(ii) IPC and 115(2), 118(1), 296(b), 351(3), 103(1) BNS including TNPHW Act, NDPS Act and TNPPDL Act.

5. On perusal of the records, it is found that the earlier Anticipatory bail application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram, only on



30.04.2026. According to the prosecution, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for further investigation. Considering the grave nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that, even though the injured has been discharged from the hospital, there is no change in the circumstances of the investigation, 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 13th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:19:22 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

- ***This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”***
- **** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.***

Copy sent to
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Emaneswaram P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: **Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.08/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000008-2026)

1. Ramayee, (aged 48),
W/o.Poovalingam,

2. Karthick @ Karthikumar, (aged 31),
S/o.Poovalingam.

3. Naganathan, (aged 28),
S/o.Poovalingam.

...Petitioners/Accused No.2,3,4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Keelathooval P.S.,
in Cr.No.55/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 04.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.S..Chellamani, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of 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 passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners/A2 to A4 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.55/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that there was a prior motive between both parties. Due to this, on 28.04.2026 at night, the defacto complainant was sitting near a water tank when his father came there. At that time, the A1 abused the defacto complainant's father and pulled him down. When this was questioned by the defacto complainant, all the accused assaulted him with a knife, sword, and stick, causing injuries to his left ankle. They also attacked his cousin with a sword on the lower left side of his abdomen, causing injuries. Based on the complaint, a case was registered.

3. The learned counsel for petitioners filed memo seeking to withdraw petition against 3rd accused. . He further contended that the 2nd and that 4th accused have not committed any such offence and they have been falsely implicated in this case and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners and that if the 1st and 3rd petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and they would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and he prays to release the 1st and 3rd petitioners on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 4 accused are involved in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A2 to A4 and that A1 was arrested and released by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur in CrI.M.P.No.105/2026 on 12.05.2026 and that A3 was arrested and released on own bond. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from hospital on 10.05.2026 and that five



witnesses have been examined and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners.

5. Considering the nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the injured has been discharged from hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and that there are no criminal antecedents pending against the petitioners and also that release of co-accused on bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st and 3rd petitioners with the following conditions;

6. Accordingly, the 1st and 3rd 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, Mudukulathur**; 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 1st and 3rd 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 1st and 3rd 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 1st and 3rd petitioners shall report before the **Inspector of Police, Respondent P.S., daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further



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

iv) that the 1st and 3rd petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses either during investigation or trial;

vi) that the 1st and 3rd petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 1st and 3rd petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 1st and 3rd petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji-vs- State of Kerala(2005) AIR SCW 5560;**

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

As far as, in respect of the 2nd petitioner/ 3rd accused, this petition is dismissed as not pressed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:27:13 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026



- *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*
- ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur, (through e-mail)

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: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.18/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000018-2026)

Nivetha, (aged 25),
D/o.Chandrasekaran.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Bazaar P.S., Ramanathapuram.
in Cr.No.180/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 04.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.R.Silambaraj, 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 learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.180/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the petitioner are husband and wife and there is some family dispute between them and a



divorce case is pending before the Court. Due to which, the petitioner is living separately along with her female child. Subsequently, on 27.04.2026 at about 6.00 p.m, the defacto complainant went to the petitioner's house to see her daughter, at that time the petitioner abused him in filthy language and poured hot water on his face and caused injuries on his neck, both shoulders and backside neck and also threatened him with dire consequence 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 there is a family dispute between them and that the injured was discharged from the hospital and that most of the investigation is completed and that there is no previous case against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, she is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and she would not tamper or threaten the witnesses and hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the injured was discharged from hospital on 12.05.2026 and that four witnesses have been examined and that there is no previous case against the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the injured has been discharged from hospital and that substantial part of the investigation is complete and also that there is no criminal antecedent 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 **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram**; on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

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

iii) that the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that she shall make available herself 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;

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

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in



accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the

Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji-vs- State of Kerala(2005) AIR SCW 5560;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:19:52 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

- ***This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”***
- **** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.***

Copy to:

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram, (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Bazaar P.S., Ramanathapuram
The petitioner through her Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.19/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000019-2026)

Sekar, (aged 45),
S/o.Raman.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Theriruvveli P.S.,
in Cr.No.16/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 04.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, 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 learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.16/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seek anticipatory bail.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:20:04 +0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant's husband and the petitioner are brothers and there was a civil dispute between them. Due to which on 01.05.2026 at about 7.30 hours, the petitioner abused the defacto complainant and her mother in filthy language, and assaulted with iron rod on their legs and head 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 and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and they would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the injured was discharged from hospital on 08.05.2026 and that five witnesses have been examined and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the injured has been discharged from hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and also that there is no criminal



antecedent, 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 **Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur**; on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

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

iii) that the petitioner shall report before the **Inspector of Police, Respondent P.S., daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:20:11 +0530



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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:20:16 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,*

“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The Judicial Magistrate, Mudukulathur (through e-mail)

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Theriruvveli P.S.,

The petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: **Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No. 25/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000026-2026)

Samayasankar, (aged 37),
S/o.Neelakandan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thirupalaikudi P.S.,
in Cr.No.102/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated : 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.S.Srikanth, 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 learned Public Prosecutor learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/ sole accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.102/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.332(c), 331(4), 305(A) BNS r/w 62 BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, on 28.04.2026 at about 23.39 hours, while the defacto complainant was at home, she heard a noise from the terrace. Thereupon, the defacto complainant and her relatives went to the terrace to check. At that time, the

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:15:38 +0530



petitioner, who was hiding on the terrace, attempted to rob the chain of the defacto complainant, which was prevented by the defacto complainant's relative. Further, when the petitioner was enquired, he stated that he was suffering from ill health. Thereafter, he was sent to the hospital by ambulance, and on the basis of the 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 no one was injured and also no property was stolen and that most of the investigation is complete. He further submitted that there is an illegal contact between the defacto complainant and the petitioner and it is a false case and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not tamper or threaten the witnesses and hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that no one was injured and that the attempted to snatch a chain belongs to the defacto complainant and that five witnesses have been examined and that no previous case pending against the petitioner. He further submitted that there is an illegal contact between them as per investigation.

5. Considering the nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:15:44 +0530



and the fact that no one was injured and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and also that there is no antecedents against the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with the following conditions;

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

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



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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of may 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T

Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:15:53 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,*

“<https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai, (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Thirupalaikudi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: **Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.28/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000042-2026)

Rahul, (aged 26),
S/o.Kathirvel.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thondi P.S.,
in Cr.No.94/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.M.Vijay, 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 learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.94/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 02.05.2026 at about 11.30 p.m., while



the defacto complainant was sleeping outside his house, the petitioner and two others came there on a two-wheeler, abused him in filthy language, and A1 assaulted him with an iron rod. A1 also assaulted his daughter, while the others assaulted the defacto complainant's wife with their hands and an iron rod on her face and chest, thereby causing injuries. The occurrence is stated to have taken place due to the defacto complainant and his wife allegedly spreading allegations regarding the character of A1 to the family members of A1's fiancée. On the basis of the 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 and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and they would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there is one named accused and two unnamed accused involved in this case. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from hospital on 05.05.2026 and that four witnesses have been examined and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioner.



5. Considering the nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the injured has been discharged from hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and also that there is no criminal antecedent pending 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 **Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai**; on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail 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 P.S., daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the

TNRM000000422026



investigation Officer;

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

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

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the

Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji-vs- State of Kerala(2005) AIR SCW 5560;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:20:41 +0530
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to
The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

TNRM000000422026



The Inspector of Police, Thondi P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: **Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.N.30/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000032-2026)

1. Karthigai Murugan, (aged 41),
S/o.Sakthivel.

2. Mariyappan, (aged 58),
S/o.Thangapandi,

3. Ramalakshmi, (aged 66),
W/o.Sakthivel.

4. Sakthivel. (aged 71),
S/o.Panchalam,

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Sayalgudi P.S.,
in Cr.No.185/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.A.Soundharapandiyan, M.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of 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 passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners/A1 to A4 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent



police in Cr.No.185/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.126(2), 296(b),324(2), 351(3) BNS, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, as per the order of the Court, the defacto complainant was in possession and enjoyment of his property/garden, which was enclosed with fencing works. The petitioners allegedly interfered with and restrained the workers engaged by the defacto complainant and also damaged the lock of the garden. When the same was questioned by the defacto complainant on 18.04.2026 at about 7.00 p.m., all the petitioners abused him in filthy language and threatened him with dire consequences. On the basis of the complaint, the present 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 and that no one was injured and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioners and that if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and they would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and he prays to release the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that no one was injured and that five witnesses have been examined and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners. He further submitted that they have damaged a lock of the garden only.



5. Considering the civil dispute pending both parties and nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that no one was injured and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and also that there are no criminal antecedents pending against the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with the following conditions;

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **District Munsif–cum–Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi**; on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioners/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail 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 P.S., daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that they shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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



investigation or trial;

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:22:30 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,*

"<https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>" (or) use "scan QR code"

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app "eCourts Services" from Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi, (through e-mail)

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Sayalgudi P.S.,

The petitioners through their Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.31/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000040-2026)

Keesavan, (aged 28),
S/o.Gurusamy. .

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Cyber Crime P.S., Rmanathapuram,
in Cr.No.06/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 08.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court in the presence of Thiru.K.Muthuduraisamy, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru. K.RM. Karunaivel Pandiyan, representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both side submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 05.04.2026 in Cr.No.6/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 317(2), 318(2), 318(4), 112(2), 61(2), 3(5) BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, based on complaints, the Cyber Crime Wing inspected the bank accounts and found that the petitioner A2 used the bank account of A3 and another and had withdrawn huge sums of money from the



bank accounts of members of the public belonging to various States during the period from 23.04.2025 to 12.09.2025. The said amounts were converted into cryptocurrency and transferred to the same to foreign bank accounts. Consequently, 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 submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 05.04.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 39 days and that most of the investigation is over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.684/2026 on 29.04.2026 and that there is no previous case against the petitioner. He further stated that the petitioner is ready to deposit some amount before the concerned court and that the if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 3 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and that A2 is in judicial custody and that A3 was released on station bail. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 05.04.2026 and that cheating amount amount involved in this case is very huge and that the earlier bail application was dismissed on 29.04.2026 and that the investigation is



not yet completed and has to investigate about involvement of other persons and the network and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would abscond and threaten the witnesses and strongly objected to release the petitioner on bail at this stage.

5. On perusal of the records, it is found that the earlier application was dismissed only on 30.04.2026 and that there is no change of circumstances in the investigation. Considering the grave nature of the offence, the cheated amount not having been recovered from the accused, the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, and the fact that the investigation is still incomplete. Further, having regard to the huge amount involved in the case and the necessity for the police to investigate the involvement of other persons and the network, there exists every possibility of the petitioner absconding or tampering with the digital records if released on bail. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:22:58 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
13.05..2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“<https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*

TNRM000000402026



Copy to:

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.35/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000041-2026)

1. Alaguvel, (aged 50)
S/o. Ramasami,

2. Mathinathan, (aged 42)
S/o.Lakshmanan.

.....Petitioners/Accused No. 1, 2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Peraiyur P.S.,
in Cr.No. 65/2026

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.S.Chellamani, B.A.,B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of Thiru. KR.M. Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com.,B.L., on 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 and A2 who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 06.05.2026 in Cr.No.65/2026 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable



U/s.303(2) BNS @ u/s.21(1) MMDR Act, seek bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of patrolling duty involved by the respondent police on 06.05.2026 at about 10.00 a.m and intercepted a tractor bearing Reg.No.TN 49 BV 8984, they found that the petitioners have illegally transported One unit of red sand in the vehicle without getting any permit or license. Further, the petitioners were apprehended by the police and the sand was recovered along with the vehicle and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and that they were arrested on 06.05.2026 and they are in judicial custody for the past 8 days . He further submitted that the properties have been recovered by the police and that most of the investigation has been completed and that if the petitioners are released on bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and they would not abscond and hence, he prays to release the petitioners on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the petitioners were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 06.05.2026 and that one unit of red sand and vehicle involved in this case have been recovered and that three witnesses have been examined and one previous case is pending against the 2nd petitioner for the offence u/s. 302 IPC and that if they are released on bail, they would indulge in similar



offence again.

5. The sand involved in this case is red sand, and there are no similar previous cases pending against both petitioners. Considering the nature of the offence, the period of incarceration, and the fact that the properties have been secured and a substantial part of the investigation is complete, this Court is of the view that the accused may be released on bail, subject to the following stringent conditions:

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

ii) **Before execution of bond, the petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) each to the Credit of in Crime No.65/2026 before the learned District Munsif – cum- Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi on the file of the respondent police station, without prejudice to their defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.**

iii) 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;

iv) that the petitioners shall produce undertaking affidavit that they shall



not involve in similar type of offence in future at the time of furnishing sureties;

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

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

vii) that the petitioners 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 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;**

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 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:23:35 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
13.05.2026.

TNRM000000412026



➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The District Munsif – cum - Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi (through e-mail)

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Peraiyur P.S.

The Petitioner through their Counsel.

The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.(through e-mail)



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.36/2026

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000046-2026)

Sakthi Mugesh, (aged 24),
S/o.Niraikulathan.

....Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Rameswaram Town P.S.,
in Cr.No.122/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 08.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.T.M.Arunkannan, 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 learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 07.05.2026 in Cr.No.122/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offence punishable U/s.4(1)(A) and 14(A) of TNP (Amendment) Act, 2024, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that, at the time of vehicle inspection conducted by the respondent police on 07.05.2026 at 16.00 hours and intercepted a



two wheeler bearing Reg.No. TN 65 AL 1307, they found that the petitioner was in illegal transportation of 144 liquors bottles (each 180 ml) kept in a sack without any valid permit or licence for the purpose of selling at high prices in public. Further, the petitioner was apprehended by the police and the properties were seized, and in consequence thereof, the present case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and that he was arrested on 07.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 7 days and that the properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that most of the investigation has been completed. He further submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses and 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 07.05.2026 and that the property (144 bottles of liquor) involved in this case have been recovered along with vehicle. He further submitted that two witnesses have been and the investigation is in initial stage and that one previous case is pending against the petitioner for the offence u/s. Arms Act and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and also he would indulge in similar offence again and has objected to release the petitioner on bail at this stage.



5. There is antecedent against the petitioner and he is in judicial custody for only 7 days. Considering the nature of the offence, the short period of incarceration, the fact that even though the properties have already been secured, the investigation is in nascent stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

In the result, this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:23:59 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to:

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.37/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000036-2026)

Duraikumar, (aged 38),
S/o.Palanichamy,

....Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Rameswaram Town P.S.,
in Cr.No.111/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 08.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.I.Muthumurugan, B.Sc., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru. K.RM. Karunaivel Pandiyan. B.Com.,B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 26.04.2026 in Cr.No.111/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offence punishable U/s.4(1)(A) and 14(A) of TNP (Amendment) Act, 2024, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that, while the respondent police were on



patrolling duty on 26.04.2026 at about 06.00 hours, they found that the petitioner was in illegal transportation of 473 liquor bottles (each 180 ml) in a TATA Indigo car without any valid permit or licence and for the purpose of selling at high prices in public. Further, the petitioner was apprehended by the police the properties were seized, and in consequence thereof, the present case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and that he was arrested on 26.04.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 18 days and that the properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that most of the investigation has been completed. He further submitted that one previous case is pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses and 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 26.04.2026 and that the property (473 bottles of liquor) involved in this case have been recovered along with vehicle. He further submitted that two witnesses have been examined and that similar nature of two previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and also that he would indulge in similar offence again.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:24:17 +0530



5. Considering the nature of the offence, and the period of incarceration, the fact that huge quantity of liquor bottles secured along with vehicle, and that the investigation is not yet completed and also that there is similar nature of antecedents against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

In the result, this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:24:22 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to:

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.38/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000035-2026)

Asaraf Ali, (aged 32),
S/o.Sithik.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Parthibanur P.S.,
in Cr.No.22/2026
in C.C.No.26/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 08.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

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

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.02.2026 in Cr.No.22/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 331(4), 305(a) BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 30.01.2026, at about 10.00 p.m., the defacto complainant's wife and other family members were sleeping without



locking the door, as the defacto complainant's mother is an aged woman who frequently goes to the bathroom. On the next day, i.e., on 31.01.2026 at about 6.30 p.m., the defacto complainant's wife found that the bureau had been opened and that 14 sovereigns of gold jewels were missing. When they enquired about the same with the neighbours, they stated that an unidentified person had come near the house of one Veerapandiyan and, on being alarmed, he escaped from there. Thereafter, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint, and a case was registered against an unidentified person.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 02.02.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 101 days. He further submitted that the investigation has been completed and that charge sheet has been filed and the case was taken on file as C.C.No.26/2026 and that the earlier application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi in CIS.Crl.M.P.No.195/2026 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 02.02.2026 and that he was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on



02.02.2026 and that the properties involved in this case have been recovered and that the investigation has been complete and charge sheet has been filed and also the case was taken on file as C.C.No.26/2026. He further submitted that similar nature of 22 previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that the case is posted for trial on 25.05.2026 and that if he is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. Considering the grave nature of the offence and the fact that the calendar case is pending for the examination of further prosecution witnesses, this Court is of the view that, if bail is granted at this stage, there is a likelihood of tampering with the witnesses and also a possibility of the petitioner involving himself in similar offences in future, since he is allegedly involved in 22 previous cases of a similar nature. Further the alleged criminal activities of the accused are such as to create fear and insecurity among the general public. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail at this stage.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T

Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:24:47 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
13.05.2026

- *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“<https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*
- ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*

TNRM000000352026



Copy 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: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.40/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000027-2026)

1. Udhaya, (aged 24),
S/o.Murugesan.

2. Marudhupandi, (aged 23),
S/o.Marimuthu.

3. Johnpaul, (aged 40),
S/o.Sebasthiyan.

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

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Thiruvadanai P.S.,
in Cr.No.92/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 08.05.2026 U/s..482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.S.Kamaraj, B.Com(CA)., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of 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 petitioners/A1 to A3 who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.92/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.303(2), 296(b), 132, 351(3) of BNS and section 21(1) MMDR Act,



seek anticipatory bail.

2. According to the prosecution, the defacto complainant is the VAO. Based on the secret information, the defacto complainant, along with two others conducted a patrolling duty on 04.05.2026 and intercepted a vehicle bearing Reg.No.TN 65 BF 1292 and they found that the petitioners were illegally transported $\frac{1}{2}$ unit of river sand in a Mahendra Pickup vehicle bearing Reg.No.TN 65 BF 1292 at Virisozhi river bed without getting any permit or license. On seeing the police the accused fled away from the scene of occurrence by leaving the vehicle and the properties have been secured and the petitioners abused the officers in filthy language and also threatened with dire consequences and the properties were recovered and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and that they are in no way connected with the offence. He further submitted that the properties involved in this case have already been secured by the respondent police and most of the investigation is over and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners and that if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they would not tamper or threaten the witnesses and hence he prays to release the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended the properties involved in this case ($\frac{1}{2}$ unit of river sand and Mahendra Pickup vehicle bearing Reg.No.TN 65 BF



1292) have been secured by the police and that the investigation is not yet completed. He further submitted that if they are released on anticipatory bail, they would threaten the witnesses and they would indulge in similar offence again.

5. The sand involved in this case is river sand. Considering the nature of the offence and the fact that the investigation is still ongoing, and despite the securing of the properties, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in an offence of a similar nature, as it would adversely affect the environmental resources of this country.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:25:21 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
13.05.2026.

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to:

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Thiruvadanai P.S.,
The Petitioners through their Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.42/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000052-2026)

1) Ulaganathan, (aged 27),
S/o. Murugan.

2) Mani @ Sanjay Prasath, (aged 25),
S/o. Vigneshwaran.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1, 5

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Uchipuli P.S.,
in Cr.No.128/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.S. Shanmuganathan, M.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of Thiru. KR.M. Karunaivel Pandiyan, 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, A5 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.128/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.189(2), 296(b), 118(1), 351(3), 324(4) BNS, seek anticipatory bail.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:25:36 +0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 02.05.2026 at about 8.00 p.m., the petitioners and others entered the defacto complainant's village on two-wheelers and threatened the villagers, which was questioned by the victim, namely Sabari. Aggrieved by the same, they assaulted the victim with a sickle, thereby causing injuries, and also damaged the village water tank and other articles. They further threatened the villagers with dire consequences. On the basis of the 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 and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and that co-accused (A1) was released on bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.456/2026 dated 07.05.2026 and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and they would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 8 accused are involved in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A1 and A5 and that A2 was released on bail by the concerned Court on 07.05.2026 and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that five witnesses have been examined and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners. He further submitted that the damage cost of



Rs.3,000/-

5. Considering the nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the injured has been discharged from hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is complete and also that there is no criminal antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram**; on condition that the 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 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) Before execution of bond, **the petitioners shall deposit a sum of Rs.1,500/- (Rupees One Thousand Five Hundred only) each to the Credit of in Crime No.128/2026 before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram on the file of the respondent police station, without prejudice**



to their defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.

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

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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:25:48 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*



Copy to

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram (through e-mail)

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Uchipuli P.S.,

The petitioner through their Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.44/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000045-2026)

Muthupandi @ Killar, (aged 26),
S/o.Selvam.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kenikkarai P.S.,
in Cr.No.39/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 08.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

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

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 01.03.2026 in Cr.No.39/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.331(3), 305(a) BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 18.01.2026 at about 10.00 a.m., the defacto complainant and her family members had gone to her mother's house, and when they returned to their house at about 4.00 p.m., they found that the back



door of the house had been broken open and the bureau had also been broken. It was further found that 18½ sovereigns of gold jewels, cash of Rs.25,000/ and other documents belonging to the defacto complainant, were missing. Based on the complaint, a case was registered against unknown accused under Sections 331(3) and 305(a) of the BNS.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 01.03.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 72 days. He further submitted that earlier application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram in CIS CrI.M.P.No.298/2026 on 24.03.2026 and that the properties have been secured and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 4 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and that A2 and A3 are in judicial custody and that A4 was released on bail by the Principal Sessions Court on 30.04.2026. He further submitted that all the accused are belongs to other districts and that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 01.03.2026 and that out of 18 ½ sovereign of gold jewels, 15



sovereign of gold jewels were recovered and that the remaining jewels are has to be recovered. He further submitted that there is specific overt act against the petitioner along with other accused and that 9 witnesses have been examined and the vehicle used for the commission of the offence and the remaining jewels are yet to be recovered and that similar nature of 14 previous cases are pending against the petitioner . He also further stated that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would indulge in similar offence again and has objected to release the petitioner on bail at this stage.

6. Considering that the remaining jewels are yet to be recovered, that the petitioner is involved in 14 similar previous cases, and that there is a specific overt act against him, this Court is of the view that, if released on bail at this stage, he would involve similar nature of crime. Further the alleged criminal activities of the the accused are such as to create fear and insecurity among the general public, this Court is of the view that if the accused is released on bail at this stage, there is a likelihood of the accused absconding and also tampering with prosecution witness. Hence, this court not inclined to grant bail to this accused at this stage.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:26:06 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
13.05.2026



- *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*
- ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to:

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



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.23/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000022-2026)

Nagasamy, (aged 52),
S/o.Ramu.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Kenikkarai P.S.,
in Cr.No.208/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 04.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.Mohamed Faizul Rahuman, B.B.A.,L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru. K.RM. Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com.,B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.208/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 324(4), 351(3) BNS r/w section 4 of TNPHW Act, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are husband and wife. On 23.04.2026 the defacto complainant was at



home, the petitioner asked money for consuming liquor, which was refused by her. Due to which, the petitioner assaulted her with hands and legs and damaged household articles and electronic items and also he removed water pump which was restrained by her. Further, the petitioner pulled her hair and trampled on her chest and damage cost of Rs.2,00,000/- 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 there is a family dispute between them and that no one was hospitalized and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not tamper or threaten the witnesses and hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that no one was hospitalized and that five witnesses have been examined and that no previous case pending against the petitioner and that the damage value of Rs.2,00,000/-. Further submitted that both were living in same roof.

5. Considering the nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that no one was hospitalized and that the substantial part of the investigation is over and both were living in same roof and also that there is no



antecedents against the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with the following conditions;

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

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

iii) that the **petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of 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;

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

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned



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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of may 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:16:14 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,*

“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram, (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Kenikkarai P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.26/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000031-2026)

Balamurugan, (aged 30),
S/o.Malaiyandi.

...Petitioner/Accused No.6

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Bazaar P.S., Ramanathapuram.
in Cr.No.110/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.K.Gunasekaran, 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 learned Public Prosecutor, the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A6 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.110/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 318(4) BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:26:42 +0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the Manager of a ready-made garments shop. On 06.03.2026, at about 4:45 p.m., the defacto complainant and another person were in the staff room when the petitioner and others arrived in a car bearing Registration No. TN 12 D 6681. They introduced themselves as Income Tax officers and asked the defacto complainant to accompany them to the shop for inspection. The defacto complainant asked their ID cards, they refused to give the same. Believing their representation, the defacto complainant went along with the petitioner and seven others. Once there, they collected the mobile phones of the staff, dishonestly took a sum of Rs.6,10,000/- from the cash box, assaulted the staff with their hands, and threatened them with dire consequences. Based on the complaint, a 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 name is not found in the FIR and that there is no direct involvement against this petitioner and that most of the investigation is over and that some of the amount has been recovered from A1 and that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.528/2026 dated 20.04.2026 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 and hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 9 accused are involved in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A6 and that A1 to A4 are in judicial custody and others are still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioner is belongs to Sivagangai District and that the amount cheated in this case is Rs.6,10,000/- out of which Rs.1,59,300/- was recovered from A1. Based on confession of A1 other accused included in this case and that at the time of occurrence the petitioner is there along with other accused and there is direct involvement against this petitioner and that the earlier application was dismissed on 20.04.2026 and that the investigation is not yet complete and other accused are yet to be arrested and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. In these circumstances, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and has objected to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

5. It is an offence of cheating by impersonating Income Tax officers. There is specific overt-act against the petitioner as per prosecution. The cheated amount of Rs.6,10,000/- out of which Rs.1,59,300/- was recovered from A1 and the remaining amount and also mobiles phones are yet to be recovered.



6. Earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.528/2026 on 20.04.2026 and there is no change of circumstances. Considering the grave nature of offence and that the amount involved in this case is very huge and the fact that the investigation is in nascent stage and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as per prosecution and also other accused yet to be arrested and the remaining amount yet to be recovered, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:26:51 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

- *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“<https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*
- ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Bazaar P.S., Ramanathapuram,
The petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.27/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-0000242026)

Alagar, (aged 19),
S/o.Karuthasamy.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Uchipuli P.S.,
in Cr.No.119/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 08.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Tmt.STR.Thenmozhi, B.Sc., L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of 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 arguments, this Court passes the following...

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 26.04.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.119/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 324(4), 351(3) BNS r/w section 25(1A) Arms Act, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that on 25.04.2026 the defacto complainant was at Attrangarai ground, at that time his sister informed the petitioner and others have damaged a car using sword, which was parked in front of the defcto complainant's house. Further, the defcto complaint found the accused persons on CCTV footage and questioned about them. Due to which, the petitioner/A1 abused him in filthy language and assaulted with sword on his back side and assaulted with hands on his stomach and other attacked him with hands and caused injuries and also threatened him with dire consequences and the damage cost of Rs.10,000/- and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that, the petitioner is in no way connected with the offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 26.04.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 17 days and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete . He further submitted that co-accused (A2) was released on anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court on 30.04.2026 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions and he would not threaten the witnesses and he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has contended that totally 3 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and A2 was released on



anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No727/2026 dated 30.04.2026 and A3 is still absconding. He further submitted that FIR was registered based on CCTV footage and that the petitioner was arrested on 26.04.2026 and that the injured was discharged from hospital on 26.04.2026 and that five witnesses have been examined and that damage cost of Rs.10,000/- and tht six previous cases are pending against the petitioner for the offence u/s. 308(4), 309(4), 351(3) BNS including Arms act and NDPS Act and also his name is under History Sheet and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. There are criminal antecedents against the petitioner. However, considering the nature of the offence, the period of incarceration, and the fact that the injured person has been discharged from the hospital, and that a substantial part of the investigation is over, as well as the fact that the co-accused was released on anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

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

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:26:22 +0530



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 deposit a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) to the Credit of Crime No.119/2026 before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram, without prejudice to his defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.**

iv) Considering the facts of the previous case, **the petitioner shall report before the Inspector of Police, Kamuthi P.S, 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;

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

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

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



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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T

Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:26:30 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
13.05.2026.

- *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*
- ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to:

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram, (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Kamuthi P.S.
The Inspector of Police, Uchippuli P.S.,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.
The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: **Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,**
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026
CrI.M.P.No.29/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000030-2026)

1. Dharmaraj, (aged 48),
S/o.Panchavarnam.

2. Abbas, (aged 51)
S/o.Sellam.

3. Gopinath @ Gopi, (aged 28),
S/o.Perumal.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
T.U.Mangai P.S.,
in Cr.No.46/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.K.Anbuezhayan, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of 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 passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners/A1 to A3 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.46/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 118(1), 115(2), BNS, seeks anticipatory bail.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:16:24 +0530



2.The case of the prosecution is that, the 1st petitioner is son of the defacto complainant. On 26.04.2026 at about 24.00 hours, while the defacto complainant was sleeping at her house, all the accused came there, assaulted her with their hands, trampled and rolled over her, and caused injuries to her tongue, teeth, left knee, and right wrist. On the basis of the complaint, the case 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 submitted that there is a land dispute between both the parties and that the injured were discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners and that 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 and hence they prays to release the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the injured was discharged from hospital on 29.04.2026 and that four witnesses have been examined. He further submitted that the petitioners have involved in another case in Cr.No.42/2026 and they were released on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.11/2026 dated 06.05.2026.

5. Considering the civil dispute and nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the injured was discharged from hospital and that the substantial part of the investigation is over, this court is inclined to grant

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:16:31 +0530



anticipatory bail to the petitioners with the following conditions;

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **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 once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that they shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in



accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners are released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the

Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji-vs- State of Kerala(2005) AIR SCW 5560;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:17:04 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram, (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, T.U.Mangai P.S.,
The petitioners through their Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.41/2026
(CNR No.TNRM-00-000051-2026)

Yuva @ Yuva Pradhap, (aged 19),
S/o.Muniyasamy.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Uchipuli P.S.,
in Cr.No.30/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.M.Sridharan, B.B.A., L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of 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 passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/Accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.30/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.189(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3), 303(2)(NH) BNS, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 05.02.2026 at about 10.30 p.m., while the defacto complainant had parked his two-wheeler in front of Big-Boss Hotel at



Salaivalasai, the petitioner and another person came there on a two-wheeler and fell down. The defacto complainant advised them regarding the same. Aggrieved by it, the petitioner and the other person abused the defacto complainant and his friends in filthy language, attacked them with sticks, snatched the mobile phones and silver chain belonging to his friends, and also threatened them with dire consequences. On the basis of the 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 and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and they would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there are totally 6 accused involved in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A5 and that A1, A3, A4 were released on anticipatory bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.546/2026, 354/2026, 399/2026 dated 26.03.2026, 24.02.2026, 02.03.2026 respectively and that A2 was released on bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.162/2026 on 13.02.2026. He further submitted that the injured was discharged from hospital on 07.02.2026 and that six witnesses have been examined and that there is no previous case pending



against the petitioner.

5. Considering the nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the injured has been discharged from hospital and that the major part of the investigation is over and that there is no criminal antecedent pending against the petitioner and also that co-accused were released on bail and anticipatory bail by the concerned Court and Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram respectively, 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 Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram; on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioner/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stands cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

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

iii) that the petitioner shall report before the **Inspector of Police, Respondent P.S., daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition



that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:18:19 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

➤ *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“ <https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*

➤ ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to
The District Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Uchipuli P.S.,

TNRM000000512026



The petitioner through his Counsel.



IN THE COURT OF VACATION SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.,

PRESENT: Thiru. T.Balamurugan, B.A., B.L.,
Vacation Sessions Judge,
Additional District Judge, Paramakudi.

Wednesday, the 13th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.43/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000053-2026)

Rjavishnu, (aged 25),
S/o.Vijayakumar.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Peraiyur P.S.,
in Cr.No.64/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 08.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.K.Gunasekaran, 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 learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.64/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 351(3) BNS r/w section 4 of TNPHW Act, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant's family visited the petitioner for the purpose of arranging the marriage of her daughter with him. Thereafter, the defacto complainant's family decided that they were not willing to

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.13
17:17:43 +0530



proceed with the marriage alliance with the petitioner and subsequently arranged a marriage alliance with another person. Aggrieved by the same, on 01.05.2026 at about 12.15 p.m., when the defacto complainant went to a temple to see her mother, the petitioner came there, abused her in filthy language, assaulted her with a wooden log on her thigh, thereby causing a contusion injury, and also threatened her with a knife. On the basis of the 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 no one was injured and that most of the investigation is complete 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 and hence he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that no one was injured and that five witnesses have been examined and that two previous cases pending against the petitioner for the offences u/s.296(b), 329(3), 351(3) BNS including Arms Act.

5. There are previous cases pending against the petitioner. However, considering the nature of offence and facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that no one was injured and that the substantial part of the investigation is over, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with the following

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:17:48 +0530



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 **District Munsif-cun-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 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 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;

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

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in



accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji-vs- State of Kerala(2005) AIR SCW 5560;**

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.13
17:17:56 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.05.2026

- *This order is available in E-Courts Official Web Site,
“<https://districts.ecourts.gov.in/case status/case number>” (or) use “scan QR code”*
- ** Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi, (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Peraiyur P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel.