



IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE DINDIGUL

**PRESENT: Tmt. A. MUTHUSARATHA, B.L., P.G.D.P.M**  
**Principal Sessions Judge, Dindigul.**

**Thursday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.**

**CrI.M.P. No.615/2026**  
**CNR No.TNDG01-001539-2026**

1.Sakthivel, 32/2026

S/o.Koppan

.. Petitioners/A1,A2,A4

2.Soundharmani, 34/2026

S/o.Jeganathan

3.Ramesh, 30/2026

S/o.Rajendran

/vs/

State through

The Sub-Inspector of Police, Town South PS.

Cr. No.66/2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

This petition came before this Court for final hearing today in the presence of Thiru.G.Maheshnath, learned Counsel for the petitioners and of Thiru.R.Udhayanithi learned Public Prosecutor(I/c) for the respondent and heard either side and perusing all the records, this Court delivered the following.....

**ORDER**

Petition filed u/s. 483 of BNSS Act. Petitioners/A1, A2 and A4 pray to enlarge them on bail for the alleged offence punishable U/S. 310(4), 310(5) of BNS 2023 in Cr. No.66/2026 of the respondent police. The alleged occurrence took place on 20.2.2026 and he was remanded on the same day.

Heard both sides.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that there is no nexus between the petitioners and the alleged occurrence, that as per direction of higher officials and for statistical purpose, the respondent police has filed this false case against this petitioners, that the petitioners belong to respectable family, that the petitioners are ready to abide any condition imposed by this Hon'ble Court, that the petitioners have permanent abode, hence there is no chance for absconding, that the petitioners were remanded on 20.2.2026 and he is in custody for the past 21 days and he prays for bail.

The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the defacto complainant is the

S.I. attached to respondent police, that on the basis of reliable information received, that on 11.11.2025 the defacto complainant along with his police party were making on surveillance and reached at the place near Dindigul West graveyard, the accused conspired themselves for preparing dacoity, the police party surrounded them and made on interrogation, they confessed their criminal activity, hence the defacto complainant arrested the accused and registered this case.

Rival contentions are taken into consideration. Records perused. The case was registered against the accused for the alleged offences punishable U/S. 310(4), 310(5) of BNS 2023. The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that it is purely put up case, that with intent to put the petitioners in custody, the respondent police arrested these petitioners nearby the Court after attended his case hearing in S.C. No.166/2024 on 20.2.2026, but, the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged, that the co-accused A5 & A3 have already been enlarged on bail by this Hon'ble Court and that the petitioners are in custody for the past 21 days and they prays for bail. The learned Public Prosecutor has raised objection that 7 previous cases are pending against the A1, 2 previous cases each are pending against the A2 and A4. However, he has reported that the properties have been recovered and that the co-accused A5 & A3 have already been enlarged on bail by this Hon'ble Court.

Considering the fact that previous cases are pending against the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/A1, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/A1. At the same time, considering the facts that properties have been recovered, the petitioners 2 and 3/A2 and A4 are in custody for 21 days, co-accused A5 has already been enlarged on bail, the period of incarceration and on considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners 2 and 3/A2 and A4 with conditions.

In the result, the petitioners 2 and 3/A2 and A4 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for Rs.25,000/- along with two sureties each for a like sum each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul subject to conditions and **the bail petition in respect of 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/A1 is dismissed.**

1. After release the petitioners 2 and 3/A2 and A4 shall appear and sign before the S.H.O., respondent police station daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 30 days and shall also make themselves available for interrogation by the police officer as and when required.

2. The petitioners 2 and 3/A2 and A4 shall co-operate with the investigation or trial and they shall not threaten the witnesses. They shall not induce witnesses and shall not cause obstacles to the pending investigation or trial.
3. If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is within his discretion to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned for cancellation of bail even though bail granted by the Sessions Court as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in P.K.Shaji/Vs/State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W.5560.

Pronounced by me in open Court this the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.

**Principal Sessions Judge,  
Dindigul.**

- This order is electronically generated and issued with Digital Signature.
- 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](https://ecourts.gov.in) for updates or download mobile app “e-Courts Services” from  
[Android or iOS](#)

**Copy to**

The Judicial Magistrate No.III. Dindigul.

The Public Prosecutor, Dindigul .

The Sub-Inspector of Police, Town South PS.

Thiru.G.Maheshnath, Counsel for the petitioners.

They are requested to download this order from the above said official web site link.