



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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.124/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000126-2026)

Rithik Kumar, (age not mentioned)
S/o.Ranjeet Prasad,

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kenikkarai P.S.,
in Cr.No.221/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru..G.Kesavan, B.A., B.L., the legal Aid Defence Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., 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 10.05.2026 in Cr.No.221/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.325, 305(a), 103(1) BNS seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the brother of the deceased. The deceased was working as Free Lancer in OICL and other



several gas companies at Ramanathapuram for the past 3-4 years. The petitioner and the deceased are belongs to Patna and they are relative. The deceased accompanied with the petitioner for assistance of her. On 2.05.2026 at about the deceased family member talking with her on video call and on the next day they did not contact her. Thereafter, the defacto complainant came to Ramanthapuram on 6th May 2026 he had received a photo of his sister dead body on whats app and he contact the local police and found that the deceased body was decomposed with neck injury and also the deceased pet puppy (a dog) also was killed 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 that there is no intention to murder the deceased. He further submitted that both are close relatives and that the petitioner was arrested on 10.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 18 days and that most of the investigation has been completed and that there is no previous case and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions and he will not threaten the witnesses and abscond. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the offence is grave in nature and that the petitioner is belongs to Patna and after trace out the petitioner by the police and he was arrested on 25.04.2026 at Bihar State and he is in judicial custody. He further submitted that after committed the occurrence the



petitioner took away the deceased gold jewels and the same was recovered from the petitioner and that the investigation is in initial stage and that if released on bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence. So, he objected to releasing the petitioner on bail.

5. Considering the nature of allegations and the materials collected so far, this Court is of the view that the investigation is in a nascent stage and the short period of incarceration, the offence alleged is serious in nature and affecting society and public. Taking into consideration the seriousness of the allegations, the stage of the investigation, this court is no inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:16:36 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

- ***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.

TNRM000001262026





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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.85/2026

(CNR No. TNRM-00-000082-2026)

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: 25.05.2026 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, based on secret information, the respondent police proceeded to the place of occurrence and intercepted a two-wheeler



(Honda Dio) bearing Registration No. TN 65 AL 1307, they found that the petitioner has illegally possessed 144 bottles of liquor (each 180 ml) kept in a sack without getting any permit or licence for the purpose of selling at high prices in public. Further, the petitioner was apprehended by the police and the properties involved in this case along with the vehicle 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 21 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 earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.36/2026 dated 13.05.2026 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 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 earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.36/2026 dated 13.05.2026 and that material parts of the witnesses have been and the 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, he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. There is antecedent against the petitioner and he is in judicial custody for more than 20 days. Considering the nature of the offence, the period of incarceration, the fact that the properties have already been secured and , the substantial part of the investigation is complete, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

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

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.12,000/-(Rupees Twelve Thousand only)to the Credit of in Crime No. 122/2026 before the learned District Munsif - cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram on the file of the respondent police station, without prejudice to his defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.**

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:29:01 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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, Rameswaram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Rameswaram Town 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.103/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000122-2026)

Matti @ Royappan, (aged 42),
S/o.Thommai Anthony.

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi P.S.,
in Cr.No.186/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.Jaber Nainar, 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/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 07.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.186/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 109(1) BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, the defacto complainant's husband and the petitioner are brothers and there was a property dispute between them. Due to which on 07.05.2025 at about 8.35 p.m. while the defacto complainant's husband was



standing near a hotel, the petitioner and another came there and abused him in filthy language and assaulted him with sickle on his back and nose and caused injuries and also threatened him with dire consequences and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence. He further contended that the petitioner was arrested on 07.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 21 days and that the injured was treated as an out patient and that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case against the petitioner. He further submitted that co-accused (A2) was released on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.51/2026 on 20.05.2026 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not tamper or threaten the witnesses and hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that there are totally 2 accused involved in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and that A2 was released on anticipatory bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.N51/2026 .dated 20.05.2026 and that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 07.05.2026 He further submitted that the injured was treated as an out-patient and that seven witnesses have been examined and that there is no previous case against the petitioner.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:16:57 +0530



5. Considering the nature of offence and the period of incarceration and the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the injured has been treated as an out-patient and that substantial part of the investigation is complete and also that there is no criminal antecedent against the petitioner and that release of co-accused on anticipatory bail, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following conditions:

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

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

iv) that the 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 trial proceedings;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:17:25 +0530
**Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026**

➤ *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:

Copy to:

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

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Sayalkudi 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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.117/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000165-2026)

1) Logesh, (aged 26/2026),
S/o. Murugan.

2) Jenithkumar, (aged 25/2026)
S/o. Murugesan.

3) Arunkumar, (aged 23/2026)
S/o. Balamurugan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1 to 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thiruppullani P.S.,
in Cr.No.118/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

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

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 to A3 who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 12.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.118/2026 for the offences punishable U/s. 25(1A) Arms Act and 296(b) BNS, seeks bail.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:17:39 +0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of patrolling duty conducted by the respondent police on 12.05.2026 at about 8.30 a.m they found that the petitioners have illegally possessed swords and were abusing and threatening the public in filthy language. Further, they were apprehended by the police along with weapon and in consequences, the present 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 12.05.2026 and they are in judicial custody for the past 16 days and that most of the investigation is completed. He further submitted that they were posted their image along with sword through Instagram of birth day party and the imaged were deleted by them. He further submitted that earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.84/2026 dated 20.05.2026 and that if the petitioners are released on bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed by this Court and that they would not abscond. 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 12.05.2026 and that the property has been secured and that earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.84/2026 dated 20.05.2026 and that the four witnesses have been examined. He further submitted that one previous case is pending against the 2nd petitioner for the offence u/s.103 (1) BNS and that if the petitioners are released on bail, there is every possibility that they would indulge in similar offence again.



5. Earlier application was dismissed on 20.05.2026. Considering the submissions made on either side and on perusal of the materials available on record, this Court is of the view that the petitioners/accused have been in judicial custody for a considerable length of time. It is also seen that the investigation is almost completed and substantial materials have already been collected by the Investigating agency. Hence this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

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

ii) 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;

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 the petitioners shall report before the Inspector of Police, Respondent police station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m for a period of one month and on further condition that they shall make available themselves for trial proceedings;

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



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

vii) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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 abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.269 BNS, 2023.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T

Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:17:55 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Thiruppullani P.S.,

The petitioner through their Counsel.

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

TNRM000001652026





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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.118/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000127-2026)

Matti Royappan, (age not mentioned),
S/o.Thommai Anthony.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi P.S.,
in Cr.No.186/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.G.Kesavan, the learned Legal Aid Defense Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.KR.M,Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., 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 was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 08.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.186/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 109(1) BNS, seeks bail.

2. he learned Counsel for the petitioner has made an endorsement that he is

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
18:41:39 +0530



not pressing this petition. In view of the endorsement made by the petitioner's Counsel, the petition is dismissed as not pressed.

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
18:41:45 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026.



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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.119/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000168-2026)

Ajithkumar, (aged 30),
S/o.Murugan,

....Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Parthibanur P.S.,
in **Cr.No.99/2026.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.A.Bharathi Raja, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.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 23.05.2026 in Cr.No.99/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offence punishable U/s.4(1)(A) TNP (Amendment) Act, 2024, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that, based on secret information the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 23.05.2026 at 6.00 a.m, they found that the petitioner was involved on liquor sales near by a temple and on seeing



the police, he fled away from there and after they inspected wine shop bar and found that the petitioner has illegally storing 45 liquor bottles without any valid permit or licence and for the purpose of selling at high prices in public. Upon searching, the petitioner was apprehended by the police the properties were seized along with Rs.450/- 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 23.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 5 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 23.05.2026 and that the property (45 bottles of liquor and Rs.450/-) involved in this case have been recovered. He further submitted that three witnesses have been examined and that the investigation is in initial stage. and that one previous case is pending against the petitioner for the offence u/s.399 IPC 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.



5. Considering the nature of the offence, and the short period of incarceration, the fact that even though the properties were secured, the investigation is in initial stage and that there is antecedents against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

In the result, this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:18:22 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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, 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.120/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000131-2026)

Kesavan, (aged 23),
S/o.Nagalingam.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Nainarkovil P.S.,
in Cr.No.84/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.P.Solai Pandiyan, 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 arguments, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A2 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.05.2026 in Cr.No.84/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.126(2), 296(b), 115(2) of BNS r/w section 3 (1)of PPDL Act, seek bail.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:18:48 +0530



2. According to the prosecution, on 14.05.2026 at about 6.30 p.m. while the defacto complainant and his friend were proceeding in a two wheeler bearing registration no.TN 65 BY 0162 in front of a Vinayagar Temple, the petitioner and 3 others came there and way laid them and damaged the front side door due to high speed driving there and abused them in filthy language and assaulted the defacto complainant with door on his head and snatched his cap, cooling glass and its worth about Rs.1,500/- and also threatened them 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 he is in no way connected with the offence and that the petitioner was arrested on 15.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 13 days. He further contended that no one was injured and that the investigation is almost over and that no previous case 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 they will not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prayed to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 4 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and others are still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on



15.05.2026 and that no one was injured and that damage cost of Rs.1500/- (Doom of the two wheeler). He further submitted that seven witnesses have been examined and that other accused yet to be arrested and that if he is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again and also threaten the defacto complainant.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and the short period of incarceration and the fact that even though the substantial part of the investigation is over, other accused yet to be arrested as per prosecution, this court not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:18:59 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
27.05.2026.

- ***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, Nainarkovil.P.S.,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM000001312026





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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.122/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000129-2026)

and

Intervene Petition Crl.M.P.No158/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000180-2026)

Ramanathan, (aged 58),
S/o.Krishnamachari.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Wing,
in Cr.No. 03/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Halik Alavudeen,
S/o.Ajmalkhan

... Intervener/Defacto
complainant

Petition dated 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

Intervene Petition dated 27.05.2026

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Ms. M.Sumitha, B.A., L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru. P.Solairaja, the learned Counsel for the Intervener and of Thiru.M. Sambath Kumar, M.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor/Deputy Legal Advisor for the State and upon hearing both side submissions, this Court passes the following:

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:19:13 +0530



ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 22.05.2026 in Cr.No.03/2026 of the respondent wing for the offence punishable U/s. 7(a) of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act 2018, seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that the petitioner/A1 is the Sub-Registrar in-charge of Velippattinam, Ramanathapuram. The defacto complainant approached the petitioner/A1 on 07.05.2026 for registration of a sale deed pertaining to the property situated at Kuyavangudi Village, pursuant to a General Power of Attorney executed by his father in favour of his mother. At that time the A1 allegedly demanded illegal gratification of Rs.50 Lakhs for registration of the document and directed the defacto complainant to make payments through A2 namely Ayub Khan, who is running a document writing office privately. Thereafter, this accused allegedly instructed the complainant to pay an initial of Rs.25 Lakhs. Upon such compulsion, the defacto complainant allegedly transferred a sum of Rs.3 Lakhs through bank account. Thereafter on 18.05.2026, the defacto complainant allegedly Rs.5 Lakhs to the ESAF bank account of A2 and handed over Rs.17 Lakhs in cash to him, thereby completing the payment of the initial installment amount of Rs.25 Lakhs. When the defacto complainant requested registration of the document on 20.05.2026, A1 reduced a sum of Rs.10 Lakhs from the balance amount and demanded a further sum of Rs. 15 Lakhs despite having already received the initial installment of Rs.25 Lakhs, thereby



making the total illegal gratification amount to Rs.40 Lakhs. The petitioner/A1 further instructed the defacto complainant to arrange the balance amount of Rs.12 Lakhs through another bank account.

During the trap proceedings on 21.05.2026 the defacto complainant and official witness approached A2 at his office as instructed by A1. Upon demand made by A1, the defacto complainant handed over tainted currency notes amounting to Rs.3 Lakhs, which received A2, counted, and kept in the office drawer. Thereafter, A2 provided bank account details for remittance of the remaining Rs.12 Lakhs as per instructions of A1. On the same day at about 15.00 hours both accused A1 and A2 were apprehended by the police and the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner been falsely implicated in this case and that he is in no way connected with the offence. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 22.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 5 days. He further contended that the defacto complainant is having some kidnapping cases of his school days and that there is no previous case against the petitioner and that most of the investigation is over and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would not threaten the witnesses or tamper the evidence and abscond. Hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Counsel for the intervener for both A1 and A2 contended that the amount involved in this case is very huge, if the petitioner is released on bail,



there is every possibility that he would hamper the investigation and tamper the evidence. Further the petitioner committed very grave offence and he objected to release him on bail at this stage.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that totally 2 accused were involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and that A2 moved for bail before this Court. He further submitted that it is a trap case and that the investigation is in initial stage and that the bribe amount is very huge and that there is specific overt-act against this petitioner and A2 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and objected to release the petitioner on bail.

6. It is the offence of trap case. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, and the short period of incarceration, this Court is of the view that the offence alleged against the petitioner is a serious economic and corruption-related offence affecting public administration and the confidence of society in Governmental institutions. Further, the investigation is in its nascent stage and release of the petitioner on bail may hamper the investigation and provide scope for influencing witnesses or tamper with evidence. Taking into consideration the seriousness of the allegations, the stage of the investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:19:28 +0530



As far in respect of the intervene petition is closed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the **27th day of May 2026.**

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:19:33 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
27.05.2026.

- *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, Vigilance and Anti-corruption Wing, Ramanathapuram,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.
The Intervener 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.123/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000168-2026)

Ayub Khan, (aged 58),
S/o.Fatharusuman.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Wing,
in Cr.No. 03/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Halik Alavudeen,
S/o.Ajmalkhan

... Intervener/Defacto
complainant

Petition dated 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

Intervene Petition dated 27.05.2026

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Ms. M.Sumitha, B.A., L.L.B the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.M. Sambath Kumar, M.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor/Deputy Legal Advisor 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



22.05.2026 in Cr.No.03/2026 of the respondent wing for the offence punishable U/s. 7(a) of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act 2018, seeks bail.

2. The prosecution case is that the petitioner/A1 is the Sub-Registrar in-charge of Velippattinam, Ramanathapuram. The defacto complainant approached A1 on 07.,05.2026 for registration of a sale deed pertaining to the property situated at Kuyavangudi Village, pursuant to a General Power of Attorney executed by his father in favour of his mother. At that time the A1 allegedly demanded illegal gratification of Rs.50 Lakhs for registration of the document and directed the defacto complainant to make payments through this petitioner/A2 who is running a private individual running a document writing office. Thereafter, this accused allegedly instructed the complainant to pay an initial of Rs.25 Lakhs. Upon such compulsion, the defacto complainant allegedly transferred a sum of Rs.3 Lakhs through bank account. Thereafter on 18.05.2026, the defacto complainant allegedly Rs.5 Lakhs to the ESAF bank account of A2 and handed over Rs.17 Lakhs in cash to him, thereby completing the payment of the initial installment amount of Rs.25 Lakhs. When the defacto complainant requested registration of the document on 20.05.2026, A1 reduced a sum of Rs.10 Lakhs from the balance amount and demanded a further sum of Rs. 15 Lakhs despite having already received the initial installment of Rs.25 Lakhs, thereby making the total illegal gratification amount to Rs.40 Lakhs. A1 further instructed the defacto complainant to arrange the balance amount of Rs.12 Lakhs through



another bank account.

During the trap proceedings on 21.05.2026 the defacto complainant and official witness approached A2 at his office as instructed by A1. Upon demand made by A1, the defacto complainant handed over tainted currency notes amounting to Rs.3 Lakhs, which received A2, counted, and kept in the office drawer. Thereafter, A2 provided bank account details for remittance of the remaining Rs.12 Lakhs as per instructions of A1. On the same day at about 15.00 hours both accused A1 and A2 were apprehended by the police and the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner been falsely implicated in this case and that he is in no way connected with the offence. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 22.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 5 days. He further contended that the defacto complainant is having some kidnapping cases of his school days and that there is no previous case against the petitioner and that most of the investigation is over and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would not threaten the witnesses or tamper the evidence and abscond. Hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that totally 2 accused were involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and that A1 moved for bail before this Court. He further submitted that it is a trap case and that the investigation is in initial stage and that the bribe amount is very huge and that there is specific



overt-act against this petitioner and A1 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and objected to release the petitioner on bail.

5. It is the offence of trap case. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, and the short period of incarceration, this Court is of the view that the offence alleged against the petitioner is a serious economic and corruption-related offence affecting public administration and the confidence of society in Governmental institutions. Further, the investigation is in its nascent stage and release of the petitioner on bail may hamper the investigation and provide scope for influencing witnesses or tamper with evidence. Taking into consideration the seriousness of the allegations, the stage of the investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the **27th day of May 2026.**

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:20:18 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
27.05.2026.

- *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:

TNRM000001302026



The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti-corruption Wing, 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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.125/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000169-2026)

Vishnu, (aged 19),
S/o.Chandrasekar.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Mandapam P.S.,
in Cr.No.71/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Tmt. I.Shalini, B.A, B.L., L.L.M., the learned counsel for the petitioner and Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both side submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A2 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 13.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.71/2026 for the offence punishable U/s. 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 324(4), 109(1) BNS r/w section 25(1)(A) Arms Act, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 12.05.2026 at about 2.30 p.m.



defacto complainant was proceeding his two wheeler bearing registration No.TN 65 BF 9528 near Mandapam camp, when the petitioners trespassed and abused him in filthy language and attacked with sword, fortunately the cut was put on the vehicle and damaged the vehicle and also threatened him with dire consequences. Further, the accused was apprehended by the police along with weapon and in consequences, 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 he was arrested on 13.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 15 days and that no one was injured and that most of the investigation has been completed and that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.87/2026 dated 20.05.2026 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 hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally two accused are involved in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and A1 moved for bail and that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 13.05.2026 and that no one was injured and the damage cost of vehicle at Rs.6,000/- . He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.87/2026 dated 20.05.2026 and that seven witnesses have been examined and that no previous case against the petitioner .



5. Considering the nature of offence and the period of incarceration and the fact that no one was injured, the major part of the instigation is completed and that there is no criminal antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

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

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) to the Credit of in Crime No.71/2026 before the learned District Munsif - cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram on the file of the respondent police station, without prejudice to his 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;

iii) that the the petitioner **shall report before the Inspector of Police, Respondent police station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for trial proceedings;

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



investigation or trial;

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:20:53 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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 , Rameswaram,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Mandapam P.S.,

The petitioner through his Counsel.

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

TNRM000001692026





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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.127/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000149-2026)

Pradeep Kishore, (aged 24),
S/o.Dhavam..

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.S.J.Sheik Ibrahim, M.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru. KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., 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/A2 accused 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.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:21:11 +0530



2. The case of the prosecution is that, based on complaints, the Cyber Crime Wing inspected the bank accounts and found that the petitioner A1 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 53 days and that most of the investigation is over. He further submitted that the earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.705/2026 dated 29.04.2026 and that and that there is no previous case against the petitioner and that A1 was released on bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.MD No.9529/2026 dated 20.05.2026 and that A3 was released on station bail 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 3 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and that A1 was released



on bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.MD No.9529/2026 dated 20.05.2026 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 earlier application was dismissed by the Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.705/2026 dated 29.04.2026 and that seven witnesses have been examined and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. Considering the nature of the offence, and the period of incarceration and the fact that major part of the investigation is over and that release of co-accused on bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CrI.O.P.MD No.9529/2026 dated 20.05.2026 and also A3 was released on station bail, hence this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

i) that the petitioner/A2 is ordered to be enlarged on bail on execution of a bond for a sum Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) **with two sureties** for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi;**

ii) 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;

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:21:20 +0530



iv) that the the petitioner **shall report before the Inspector of Police, Respondent police station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for trial proceedings;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T

Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:21:30 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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, Paramakudi,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Cyber Crime P.S, Ramanathapuram,

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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.129/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000159-2026)

Malaikannan, (aged 31),
S/o.Harikrishnan.

....Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Emaneswaram P.S.,
in **Cr.No.103/2026.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.R.Balaji, B.A., L.L.B., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.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 22.05.2026 in Cr.No.111/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offence punishable U/s.4(1)(A) TNP (Amendment) Act, 2024, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that, while the respondent police were on patrolling duty on 22.05.2026 at about 08.45 hours, they found that the petitioner was in illegal transportation of 30 bottles of liquor (each 180 ml) kept in a white



sack 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 along with Rs.520/- 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 22.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 6 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 his marriage was fixed on 29.05.2026 and its copy xerox copy of invitation has been filed 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 22.05.2026 and that the property (30 bottles of liquor and Rs.520/-) involved in this case have been recovered along with vehicle. He further submitted that three witnesses have been examined and that two previous cases are pending against the petitioner out of which one of the case is similar nature and that the petitioner's marriage is fixed and that he has no serious objection to release the petitioner on bail at this stage.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:22:20 +0530



5. There is similar nature of previous case pending against the petitioner and he is judicial custody for only 6 days. The investigation is in initial stage and on perusal of the copy of marriage invitation, the petitioner's marriage is to be held on 29.05.2026. Considering the same, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

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

ii) **Before** execution of bond, **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.2,000/-(Rupees Two Thousand only) to the Credit of in Crime No.103/2026 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi on the file of the respondent police station, without prejudice to his 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) Considering the facts of the previous cases, **the petitioner shall report before this Court daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m for a period of one month from 30-05-2026** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;



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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:22:30 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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, Paramakudi, (through E-mail)

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Emaneswaram P.S.,

The petitioner through his 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.130/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000154-2026)

1. Ajithkumar, (aged 28),
S/o.Nagaraj.

2. Sakthivel, (aged 23),
S/o.Saravanan.

...Petitioners/Accused No.1,2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Uchippuli P.S.,
in Cr.No.151/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.R.Rajasekar, B.E., 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 arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 and A2 who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 20.05.2026 in Cr.No.151/2026 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable U/s. 303 (2) BNS r/w section 21(1) of MMDR Act, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of patrolling duty involved by the respondent police on 19.05.2026 at about 1.00 a.m., and intercepted a tractor along with trial bearing registration No.TN 65 Z 5181 they found that the petitioner has illegally transported $\frac{3}{4}$ unit of mettu sand in the said tractor without getting any permit or license. Further, the petitioner was apprehended by the police and the sand was recovered along with vehicle and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and that they were arrested on 20.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 7 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 petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and 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 petitioners are arrayed as A1 and A2 and A3 is still absconding. A1 is a driver and A2 is a helper and A3 is the owner of the vehicle. He further submitted that the petitioners were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 20.05.2026 and that $\frac{3}{4}$ unit of savadu sand involved in this case have been recovered along with vehicle and that four witnesses have been examined and that 2 previous cases are pending against the 1st petitioner and one previous case is pending against



the 2nd petitioner that if they are released on bail, they would indulge in similar offence again and hence he strongly objected to release the petitioners on bail.

5. Considering the grave nature of offence and short period of incarceration and that even though the properties have been secured and substantial part of the investigation is complete, there are criminal antecedents against the petitioners, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, this petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:23:07 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge ,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

- *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, Uchipuli 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.131/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000137-2026)

Vignesh @ Goya (aged 32),
S/o.Selvaraj,

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
B1 Town P.S., Ramanathapuram
in Cr.No.89/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

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

ORDER

The petitioner/A2 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 18.05.2026 in Cr.No.89/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 296(b), 309(4), 311 of BNS seeks bail

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 17.05.2026 at about 3.30 p.m the defacto complainant was going at MSK Nagar, at that time the petitioner and another came there in a scooty and questioned about the defacto complainant and robbed a 2



sovereign of gold chain and mobile phone threatened by knife and also threatened with dire consequences 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 submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 18.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 10 days and that no one was injured and that due to previous cases, a false case was registered against the petitioner and that most of the investigation is over. He further submitted a xerox copy of scan report of the petitioner health illness and that at the time of treatment the doctor advised to him, he is under final stage 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 2 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and A1 is in judicial custody. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 18.05.2026 and that no one was injured, however the properties involved in this case are not yet recovered. He further submitted that five witnesses have been examined and that six previous cases are pending against the petitioner out of which 3 cases NDPS Act and cases are 307, 506(ii) IPC and that if the petitioner is

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:23:35 +0530



released on bail, there is every possibility that he would indulge in similar offence again Act and has no serious objection to release the petitioner on bail.

5. On perusal of the medical report, which shows that the petitioner had gone treatment for his illness on 07.05.2026. Thereafter, he was involved in the present occurrence and he was arrested on 17.05.2026.

6. There are criminal antecedents against the petitioner/A1 and the short period of incarceration and the fact that the properties involved in this case are not yet recovered and considering the criminal antecedents, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:23:41 +0530

Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
27.05. 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, B1 Town 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 27th day of May 2026

**Crl.M.P.No.132/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000140-2026)**

1. Balaji, (aged 27/2026),
S/o.Arivalakan.
2. Arunkumar, (aged 26/2026),
S/o. Muthupandi.
3. Balakrishnan, (aged 43/2026),
S/o. Alagappan.
4. Manickayaraj, (aged 46/2026),
S/o. Antony.
- 5) Pandiyan, (aged 37/2026),
S/o. Ponnusamy.

...Petitioners/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Nainarkovil P.S.,
in Cr.No.85/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.Senthikumar, B.C.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 Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both side submissions, this Court passes the following:

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:24:04 +0530

**ORDER**

The petitioners who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.05.2026 in Cr.No.85/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.309(4), 140(3) BNS @ u/s.140(3), 189(2), 324(4), 329(4) BNS, seek bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 15.05.2026 at about 8.30 hours, the defacto complainant is the daughter and her friend namely Ganga Preethika were at his home, at that time some persons were came to his house in three cars and on seeing the cars, the defacto complainant's daughter entered into the inside of the room and locked the room. Further, three women were entered into the house, the above said friend was questioning them, they broken the room door and abducted the defacto complainant's daughter in a car and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and that there is no intention to kidnap the victim. He further submitted that the petitioners were was arrested on 16.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 12 days and that most of the investigation has been completed . He further submitted that the victim was secured and that earlier application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi in CIS.Crl.M.P.N o.293/2026 dated 21.05.2026 and that he further submitted that the defacto complainant's daughter had collected huge



amounts from them and others for getting Govt.Job and that there is no previous case and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions and he will not threaten the witnesses and abscond. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 17 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed 1, A2, A8, A9, A10 and that A17 moved for bail and that others are still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.05.2026 and that six witnesses have been examined and that there is no previous case. He further submitted that as per investigation the defacto complainant's daughter/victim girl had collected huge amount from the petitioners and others and that has no serious objection to release the petitioners on bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the period of incarceration and the fact that the major part of the investigation is over and that there is no criminal antecedents against the petitioners, this court inclined to grant bail to the petitioners with the following conditions;

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

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;

iv) that the 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 trial proceedings;

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

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

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

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:24:19 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

TNRM000001402026



- *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, Paramakudi,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Nainarkovil 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 27th day of May 2026

**CrI.M.P.No.134/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000170-2026)**

Bharath, (aged 20),
S/o. Jegatheeswaran.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Mandapam P.S.,
in Cr.No.71/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Ms.I.Shalini, B.A.,B.L., L.L.M., the learned counsel for the petitioners and Thiru.KR.M,Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 13.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.71/2026 for the offence punishable U/s. 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 324(4), 109(1) BNS r/w section 25(1)(A) Arms Act, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 12.05.2026 at about 2.30 p.m. defacto complainant was proceeding his two wheeler bearing registration No.TN 65 BF 9528 near Mandapam camp, when the petitioners trespassed and abused him in



filthy language and attacked with sword, fortunately the cut was put on the vehicle and damage the two wheeler and also threatened him with dire consequences. Further, the accused was apprehended by the police along with weapon and in consequences, 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 he was arrested on 13.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 15 days and that no one was injured and that most of the investigation has been completed and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally two accused are involved in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and A2 moved for bail and that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 13.05.2026 and that no one was injured and damage cost of the vehicle at Rs.6,000/- . He further submitted that no one was injured and that seven witnesses have been examined and that no previous case against the petitioner and there is no previous case.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the period of incarceration and the fact that no one was injured, the major part of the instigation is completed and that there is no criminal antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

i) that the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on execution of a bond



for a sum Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) **with two sureties** for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **District Munsif -cum -Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram;**

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) to the Credit of in Crime No.71/2026 before the learned District Munsif - cum-Judicial Magistrate, Rameswaram on the file of the respondent police station, without prejudice to his 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 the petitioner **shall report before the Inspector of Police, Respondent police station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for trial proceedings;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:25:16 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

- *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 , Rameswaram,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Mandapam P.S.,
The petitioner through his 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.135/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000141-2026)

Sundhar, (aged 27/2026),
S/o.Vetriselvan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.17

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Nainarkovil P.S.,
in Cr.No.85/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.M.Paramasivam, B.Com., 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 Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both side submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A17 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.05.2026 in Cr.No.135/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.309(4), 140(3) BNS @ u/s.140(3), 189(2), 324(4), 329(4) BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 15.05.2026 at about 8.30 hours, the defacto complainant is the daughter and her friend namely Ganga Preethika were



at his home, at that time some persons were came to his house in three cars and on seeing the cars, the defacto complainant's daughter entered into the inside of the room and locked the room. Further, three women were entered into the house, the above said friend was questioning them, they broken the room door and abducted the defacto complainant's daughter in a car 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 that there is no intention to kidnap the victim. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 16.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 12 days and that most of the investigation has been completed . He further submitted that the victim was secured and that earlier application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi in CIS.CrI.M.P.N o.293/2026 dated 21.05.2026 and that he further submitted that the defacto complainant's daughter had collected huge amounts from them and others for getting Govt.Job and that there is no previous case and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions and he will not threaten the witnesses and abscond. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 17 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A17 and that A1, A2, A8, A9, A10 were moved for bail and that others are still absconding. He further



submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 16.05.2026 and that six witnesses have been examined and that there is no previous case. He further submitted that as per investigation the defacto complainant's daughter/victim girl had collected huge amount from the petitioners and others and that has no serious objection to release the petitioner on bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the period of incarceration and the fact that the major part of the investigation is over and that there is no criminal antecedents against the petitioner, this court inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, hence this Court is inclined to grant bail the petitioner with the following conditions;

i) that the petitioner/A17 is ordered to be enlarged on bail on execution of a bond for a sum Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) **with two sureties** for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi;**

ii) 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 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 trial proceedings;



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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:25:51 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.

27.05.2026

➤ *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, Paramakudi,
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Nainarkovil P.S.

The petitioner through his Counsel.

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

TNRM000001412026





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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.142/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000146-2026)

Asith Ali, (aged 28),
S/o.Ayubkhan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Thiruppullani P.S.,
in Cr.No.143/2025.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 25.05.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.T.M.Arun Kannan, 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 was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.143/2025 for the offences punishable U/s. 67(A) IT Act 2008, r/w section 75(1) (ii), 77, 78(1) (i), 296(b), 351(3) r/w section 4 of TNPHW Act, seek bail.

BALAMURUGAN
T



2. The case of the prosecution case is that the defacto complainant's husband is working at abroad. During the period of school days A1 and the defacto complainant are friends. A1 had demanded her for money with intention of her nude photos, hence the defacto complainant sent her photos to the petitioner /A1 and the same was sent by A1 to A2 who was residing at abroad and both are circulated the photos of the defacto complainant through private media and on complaint, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence and that at the time of occurrence, he was resided in abroad. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 23.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 5 days. He further contended that the evidence is documentary and electronic and the mobile phone and laptop have already seized by the police hence, there is no possibility for him to tamper the evidence and that most of the investigation is complete and hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 2 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1 was released on bail by the Principal Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No. 2425/2025 dated 31.10.2025. He further contended that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2026 and that only five witnesses have been examined and



that in respect of this petitioner the investigation is not yet complete. The facts as per the prosecution is that A1 forced the victim to send photos of the victim and the same was circulated on internet and social media through this petitioner/ A2. He further submitted that the mobile phone was secured from the petitioner and the same was handed over to the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and the phone was sent to Forensic Lab examination and that five witnesses have been examined and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would abscond to abroad.

5. The offence is committed using electronic gadgets . It is a case of sexual harassment and offence against woman having serious gravity. Even though, it is true that the evidence is basically electronic and the police have already seized laptop and mobile phone from A1 and were sent to the Forensic Examination. Only five witnesses have been examined.

6. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, this Court is of the view that the offence alleged against the petitioner is a serious nature and affecting the life of woman. The investigation is not yet complete and release of the petitioner on bail, may hamper the investigation and provide scope of influencing or tampering with evidence. Release of co-accused is not a ground to release this petitioner on bail. Taking into consideration the seriousness of the allegations, the stage of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is liable to be dismissed.



In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May, 2026

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:26:33 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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, Thiruppullani 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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.145/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000167-2026)

Vickneswaran, (aged 26),
S/o.Vazhamoorthy.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.Sathyaraj, 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 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 25.04.2026 in Cr.No.102/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 305(a), 331(3) BNS, seek bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 01.04.2026 at about 7.30 p.m the defacto complainant and his wife were went to a temple festival and after the



defacto complaint only returned to his house and found that the locker was broken and cash Rs.7,500/- and 1 ½ sovereign of gold ring and chain. Further he enquired about the same to the neighbours and on suspiciously the defacto complainant went to the petitioner's house and asked about the petitioners from their parents and they did not response. Further the defacto complainant lodged a complaint on 16.04.2026 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 submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 25.04.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 32 days and that most of the investigation is over. He further submitted that the petitioner is suffering Nemonia fever and he is in hospitalized 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 two accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and A2 is still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 25.04.2026 and that four witnesses have been examined. He further submitted that similar nature of 4 previous cases against the petitioner and



that the properties are not yet recovered and that if he is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would indulge in similar offence again and has objected to release the petitioner at this stage.

5. There are four previous cases of a similar nature pending against the petitioner. The petitioner has been in judicial custody for more than 31 days. Though the properties have not yet been secured, the petitioner was affected by pneumonia virus fever, and an adverse physical condition, for which he underwent treatment at Government Rajaji Hospital and was subsequently discharged.

6. Considering the nature of the offence, the period of incarceration, considering the medical grounds, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage, subject to the following stringent conditions:

i) that the petitioner/A1 is ordered to be enlarged on bail on execution of a bond for a sum Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand only) **with two sureties** for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanthapuram;**

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;



iv) that the the petitioner **shall report before the Inspector of Police, Respondent police station daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for trial proceedings;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:27:13 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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,

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,

The Inspector of Police, Uchippuli P.S.,

The petitioner through his 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.148/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000135-2026)

Vickneswaran, (aged 35),
S/o.Devarajan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Bazaar P.S., Ramanathapuram,
in Cr.No.188/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.R.Raja Gandhi, .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 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 07.05.2026 in Cr.No.188/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 316(2), 318(2) BNS, seek bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant was running a Gold Loan Redemption Service at Madurai. In connection therewith, he had



affixed notices in various districts. On seeing the said notice, the petitioner contacted the defacto complainant over phone on 02.05.2026 and stated that his gold jewels were mortgaged with IIFL Finance, Kenikkarai Branch, and that he required a sum of Rs.7,70,000/- for redeeming the same. He also sent a copy of the loan receipt to the defacto complainant. Believing his representation, the defacto complainant along with others came to Ramanathapuram, met the petitioner, and transferred the said amount to his bank account. Thereafter, the petitioner left the bank stating that he was going to bring his passbook from a car bearing Reg.No.TN 39 BF 5302, but he did not return to the bank. Further, when the defacto complainant contacted the petitioner over phone, the petitioner informed him that the jewels could not be redeemed and assured that the said amount would be repaid to the defacto complainant's account. However, the amount was not repaid and the petitioner had thereby cheated the defacto complainant of the said sum. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against the petitioner, and 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 submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 07.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 21 days and that there is a doubt against the grounds of the arrest and that it is a false complaint was given by the defacto complainant and that most of the investigation is over. He further submitted that



the earlier applications were dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram in CrI.M.P.No.471/2026 and 484/2026 dated 18.05.2026 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 and remanded to judicial custody on 07.05.2026 and that the amount involved in this case is very huge and the same was not yet recovered and that the investigation is in initial stage and that if he is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and he would indulge in similar offence again and has objected to release the petitioner at this stage.

5. Considering the nature of the offence, and the period of incarceration and also considering the fact that the amount involved in this case is not yet secured and that the investigation is in nascent stage, hence this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

BALAMURUGAN
T
Digitally signed by
BALAMURUGAN T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:27:53 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026



➤ *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 20th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.150/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000142-2026)

Ilaiyaraja, (aged 34),
S/o.Ulaganathan.

....Petitioner/Accused No.2

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Devipattinam P.S.,
in **Cr.No.91/2026.**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.N.Manickam, 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/A2 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 17.05.2026 in Cr.No.91/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offence punishable U/s.4(1)(A) of TNP Act, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that, while the respondent police were on patrolling duty on 17.05.2026 at about 09.30 a.m, they intercepted a un-numbered two-wheeler (YAMAHA-125). Upon inspection, they found that the petitioner/A2



was in illegal possession of 89 bottles of liquor (each 180 ml), without getting any permit or licence and that the petitioner/A2 confessed that the bottles belonged to A1 and were intended for sale at high prices in public. Further, the petitioner/A2 was apprehended by the police and the properties involved in this case have been secured along with sales amount of Rs.550/- and in consequence the 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 17.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 11 days and that the properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that most of the investigation is completed and that earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.82/2026 dated 20.05.2026 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 there are totally 2 accused involved in this case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and that he was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 17.05.2026 and that A1 is still absconding. He further submitted that the properties (89 bottles of liquor and Rs.550/-, two wheeler) involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.82/2026 dated 20.05.2026 and that three witnesses only have been examined and that similar nature of one previous case is 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.

5. Earlier application was dismissed on 20.05.2026 and there is no change of circumstances. Considering the nature of the offence, and the short period of incarceration, the fact that even though the properties have been secured, the investigation is not yet complete and that there is criminal antecedent against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:28:23 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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, Devipattinam 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.83/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000075-2026)
and
CrI.M.P.No.99/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000118-2026)

Kumaravel, (aged 50),
S/o.Govindhan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Vasantha,
W/o.Karnan.

.... Intervener/Defacto
Complainant.

Petition dated: 18.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

Intervene Petition dated 20.05.2026 u/s. 339(2) of BNSS

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

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:32:14 +0530



ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.04.2026 in Cr.No.22/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.126(2), 296(b), 109 BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there was previous enmity between the defacto complainant's family and the petitioner. Due to the said enmity, on 14.04.2026 at about 4.00 p.m., when the defacto complainant's husband was walking along with his friends near Kottaiyanenthal Old School, the petitioner, who was allegedly hiding there, waylaid him, abused him in filthy language, and assaulted him with a knife on his chest, right side of the neck, right side of the stomach, and right thigh, thereby causing injuries. Based on the complaint, the present 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 e arrested on 15.04.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 43 days and that the injured was discharged from hospital and that most of the investigation is over. He further submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:32:19 +0530



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 Counsel for the intervener contended that there is a civil dispute between the both parties and that the petitioner attacked the defacto complainant's husband with knife on his right stomach and right side neck and caused grievous injuries and he was taken treatment for the period on one month at Meenatchi Mission Hospital, Madurai and now he was taking treatment as an out-patient and he could not able to take food and speak and that there is a revenge would be caused if he is released on bail and he objected to release the petitioner on bail. Further if he released on bail, the condition may be imposed in other district.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.04.2026 and that seven witnesses have been examined and that the injured had sustained injury on his stomach and he was discharged from hospital on 29.04.2026 and that six witnesses have been examined and that one previous case is pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility that there is a revenge would be caused and objected to release him.

6. In view of the both side submissions there is every possibility to revenge in that area. However, considering the grave nature of offence and the long period of incarceration and the fact that the injured was discharged from hospital and



also that major part of the investigation is complete, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with the following stringent conditions;

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

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

iii) that the petitioner shall report before **the Inspector of Police, Trichy Cantonment P.S, Trichy District daily twice at 10.30 a.m and 5.00 p.m until further orders** and on further condition that he shall make available himself for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

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

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

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



5560;

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

As far as in respect of the intervene petition is closed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:32:34 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
27.05.2026

➤ *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, Trichy Cantonment P.S., Trichy District.
The Inspector of Police, Keelaselvanoor P.S.,
The Intervener through her Counsel,.
The Petitioner through his 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.128/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000152-2026)

Rajalingam, (aged 27),
S/o.Moorthy.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

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

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.K.Chanthuru, 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 passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2026 in Cr.No.110/2026 of the respondent P.S for the offences punishable U/s. 303 (2) BNS r/w section 21(1) of MMDR Act, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that based on secret information, the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 23.05.2026 at about 14.40 hours



and they found that the petitioner and his brother were downloading 1 ½ unit of river sand in front of their house in a van bearing Reg.No.TN 65 BC 7331 without getting any permit or licence and on seeing the police, A2 escaped from the place of occurrence and the petitioner was apprehend by the police along with properties and in consequence, the case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and that he was arrested on 23.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 5 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 petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 2 accused are involved in this case and both are brothers and that A2 is still absconding. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2026 and that 1 ½ unit of river sand and other things involved in this case have been recovered along with vehicle and that the investigations is in initial stage and that if he is released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again and hence he strongly objected to release the petitioner on bail.

5. The sand involved in this case is river sand and he is in judicial custody for

TNRM000001522026



only 5 days. Considering the nature of offence and short period of incarceration and that even though the properties have been secured and the stage of the investigation this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:29:30 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge ,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

- *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, 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 27th day of May 2026
CrI.M.P.No.133/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000148-2026)

1. Thangapandi, (aged 34),
S/o.Lakshmanan.

2. Arun Kumar, (aged 30),
S/o.Ladasamy.

3. Arasakumar, (aged 35),
S/o.Packiyam.

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

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Paramakudi Town P.S.,
in Cr.No.199/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.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 arguments, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioners/A1 to A3 who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 23.05.2026 in Cr.No.199/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offence punishable U/s.4(1)(A) of TNP (Amendment) Act, 2024, seek bail.



2.The case of the prosecution is that, based on information the respondent police went to the occurrence place on 23.05.2026 at about 9.15 a.m they found that the 1st petitioner/A1 has illegal possession of 20 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, based on confession of A1, all the accused were apprehended by the police and the properties were seized along with sales amount of Rs.500/-, and in consequence thereof, the present case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and that they were arrested on 23.05.2026 and they are in judicial custody for the past 5 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 petitioners are released on bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and they would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses and 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 23.05.2026 and that the property (20 bottles of liquor and Rs.500/-) involved in this case have been recovered along with vehicle. He further submitted that the investigation is in initial stage and that 3 previous cases are pending against the 1st petitioner out of which 2 cases are similar nature and that



6 previous cases are pending against the 2nd petitioner out of which 4 cases are similar nature and other offences are 351(2), 109 BNS including SC/ST Act and his name is under History Sheet and that 35 previous cases were disposed against the 3rd petitioner and no previous case against him and that if they are released on bail, there is every possibility that they would threaten the witnesses and also they would indulge in similar offence again and has objected to release the petitioners on bail at this stage.

5. There are antecedent against the petitioners and they are in judicial custody for only 5 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 petitioners at this stage. Accordingly, this petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:30:23 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

➤ *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:

TNRM000001482026



The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Paramakudi Town 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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.136/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000147-2026)

Ganesamoorthy, (aged 40),
S/o.Muthuramalingam.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi P.S.,
in Cr.No.202/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.K.Jafar Nainar, 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 was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 22.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.202/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 351(3) of BNS r/w section 25(1A) Arms Act, seeks bail.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
18:43:48 +0530



2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has made an endorsement that he is not pressing this petition. In view of the endorsement made by the petitioner's Counsel, the petition is dismissed as not pressed.

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
18:43:53 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026.



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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.137/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000144-2026)

Ganesamoorthy, (aged 34),
S/o.Muthuramalingam.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

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

in Cr.No.202/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

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

ORDER

The petitioner/sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 22.05.2026 by the respondent police in Cr.No.202/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 351(3) of BNS r/w section 25(a) Arms Act, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of vehicle inspection conducted by the respondent police on 22.05.2026 at about 9.00 a.m and they found that the petitioner has illegally possessed sword and threatening the public. Further



both were apprehended by the police along with weapon and in consequences, the present case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and that he was arrested on 22.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 6 days. . He further submitted that most of the investigation has been completed that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 22.05.2026 and that the property involved in this case has been secured and that the investigation is in initial stage and that 3 previous NDPS cases are pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence and also he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. The petitioner is in judicial custody for only 6 days. Considering the nature of offence, the short period of incarceration and the fact that investigation is in nascent stage, and that criminal antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

TNRM000001442026



In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:30:53 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

- *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, Sayalkudi 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 27th day of May 2026

Crl.M.P.No.141/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000138-2026)

Arupadai Murugan, (aged 50),
S/o.Mariyappan.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Kamuthi P.S.,
in Cr.No.104/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.R.Rameshkannan, 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 side submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/ sole accused who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 25.04.2026 in Cr.No.104/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 49, 103 BNS @ u/s. 296(b), 115(2), 103 BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the daughter and the petitioner is brother of the deceased. On 24.04.2026 at about



9.00 a.m a wordy altercation between the defacto complainant and the petitioner's family. On the same day, at about 2.45 p.m while the defacto complainant was bathing at her mother/deceased house, the petitioner came there and knocked the door which was questioned by the defacto complainant, the petitioner pulled her hair and pushed her down, it was asked by the deceased. Due to which, the petitioner abused them in filthy language and assaulted the deceased with hands and pulled her hair and pushed her down and trampled on her chest and caused death 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 that there is no intention to murder the deceased. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 25.04.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 33 days and that most of the investigation has been completed and that earlier application was dismissed by this Court on 20.05.2026 and that there is no previous case and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions and he will not threaten the witnesses and abscond. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the offence is grave in nature and that the petitioner was arrested on 25.04.2026 and he is in judicial custody for only 26 days and that the earlier application was dismissed by this Court on 20.05.2026 and that the investigation is not yet complete and that two previous cases are pending against the petitioner and that if released on bail, the



petitioner would threaten the witnesses and tamper the evidence. So, he objected to releasing the petitioner on bail.

5. Earlier application was dismissed on 20.05.2026 and there is no change of circumstances. Considering the grave nature of offence and the short period of incarceration and the fact that the investigation is not yet complete and that there is criminal antecedents against the petitioner. Hence this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date: 2026.05.27
19:31:18 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

- ***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, Kamuthi 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 27th day of May 2026

CrI.M.P.No.146/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-00-000139-2026)

Thetchinamoorthy, (aged 42),
S/o.Ramanathan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Paramakudi Taluk P.S.,
in Cr.No.105/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 25.05.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before this court, in the presence of Thiru.K.Anbuchelian, 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 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 13.05.2026 in Cr.No.105/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offence punishable U/s.123 of BNS r/w section 24(1) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Acts 2003, seek bail.

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



patrolling duty on 10.05.2026, based on the information that there was an accident on Paramakudi – Ramanathapuram road they went to the occurrence place and found that the petitioner and another were illegally transported 272 pockets of Ganesh 701 Premium Tobacco(each 225 grams), 56 packets of Cool lip filter (each 51.87 grams), 52 packets of Happy Holi V-1 Tobacco, 52 packets of Saffron Blended Vimal Pan Masala without any valid permit or licence, for the purpose of selling them at higher prices to the public. Further, the petitioner was apprehended by the police, and the properties involved in this case along with the vehicle (Swift car) bearing Reg.No.TN07 AR 8750 were seized. In consequence thereof, the present case was registered against the accused.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and that he was arrested on 13.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 15 days and that the properties involved in this case have been recovered by the police and that earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.81/2026 dated 13.05.2026 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 has prayed to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally two accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and that A2 moved for



anticipatory bail. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 13.05.2026 and that huge quantity of cantra band were secured along with damage vehicle which is involved an accident and the properties worth about Rs.1,32,068/-. (607 Kg) He further submitted that earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.81/2026 on dated 13.05.2026 and that seven witnesses have been examined and that if the petitioner are released on bail, he would indulge in similar offence again.

5. The earlier application was dismissed on 13.05.2026, and the petitioner has been in judicial custody for more than 15 days. Considering the nature of the offence, the period of incarceration, the fact that the property has already been seized, the fact that a substantial part of the investigation has been completed, and that no previous cases are pending against the accused, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following stringent conditions:

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

ii) Before execution of bond, **the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.25,000/-(Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only)to the Credit of in Crime No.**



105/2026 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi on the file of the respondent police station, without prejudice to his defence before the Judicial Magistrate concerned.

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

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

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

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

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

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



released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji-vs- State of Kerala(2005) AIR- SCW- 5560;

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of May 2026.

Digitally signed
by
BALAMURUGAN
T
Date:
2026.05.27
19:31:58 +0530

Vacation Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
27.05.2026

- *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, Paramakudi , (through E-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Paramakudi Taluk P.S.,
The petitioner through his Counsel,
The Superintendent, District Prison, Ramanathapuram.(through E-mail)