

In the Court of Principal Sessions Judge, Kanniyakumari District at
Nagercoil.

Present : Thiru B. Karthikeyan, B.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge.

Thursday, the 12th day of March, 2026.

CrI.M.P. No. 817/2026

(CNR.No.TNKK01-001266-2026)

J.P. Jobin S/o. Johnson (A2)

.. Petitioner

/Vs./

The State of Tamil Nadu,

Through the Sub Inspector of Police,

Palugal Police Station,

Crime No.25/2026 of Palugal Police Station,

Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Nagercoil.

..Respondent

This petition is filed by Advocate Thiru T. Santhosh Kumar, u/s
482 of BNSS, praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

ORDER

Heard both side. Perused the petition.

2. The petitioner/accused is alleged to have committed the
offences u/s 329(3) of BNS and Sec.3(1) of TNPPDL Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 14.02.2026, the
petitioner along with 4 other accused trespassed into the house compound of
one Jose and damaged the house and threatened them and also damaged the

cars which were parked within the compound. Hence, the charge.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and the petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence and he never caused any damage to the house or cars parking therein and he has no intention to cause any damage to the cars or in the house and nothing had happened as alleged in the FIR and the investigation of the case is almost over and the petitioner never involved in any such offence and no other cases pending against him and this is the 2nd anticipatory bail petition and the earlier petition in CrI.M.P. No.645/2026 was dismissed by this court on 26.02.2026 on the ground that the 2nd accused and other accused attempted to kill one Jose by trespassing into his house with deadly weapons and as he was not found there the house was damaged and this is not all correct. In fact the said Jose was employed and is staying in U.S.A. So the submission made by the learned Public Prosecutor is false and the said contention is also against the complaint of the defacto complainant. Moreover, now there is change in circumstances and the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application and submitted that there is a previous enmity between the house owner of defacto complainant namely one Jose and A4 in this case. On 13.02.2026, A1 to A4 and 2 other accused formed themselves into an unlawful assembly and conspired together to commit murder of Jose. So, they came to the house of

Jose in a car with deadly weapons, but Jose was not available in his house. There are several cars parked in front of his house. All the accused damaged the cars and the total damages is Rs.80,000/-. The tenant of the Jose who is the defacto complainant in this case is the owner of the cars. So, he filed a complaint and a case was registered against the accused. The accused committed offences in two other cases including this case consecutively. Two accused were arrested by the Kollencode Police and they have to be remanded in this case under PT warrant and the investigation is not yet over and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is highly necessary. The petitioner stated in paragraph No.8 of the petition that in the earlier petition, the learned Public Prosecutor stated in his objection that the 2nd accused and other accused attempted to kill one Jose by trespassing into his house with deadly weapons and as he was not found there, the house was damaged and this is not all correct and in fact the said Jose was employed and is staying in U.S.A. So the submission made by the learned Public Prosecutor is false and the said contention is also against the complaint of the defacto complainant is not correct and he has serious objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition may be dismissed.

6. Considering the serious nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner/accused and though the learned counsel for the petitioner/accused argued that the objection raised by the learned Public Prosecutor in the earlier petition is not correct, it is not the only ground that

the earlier petition was dismissed. Therefore, considering the fact that the earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this court only on 026.02.2026 after elaborately discussing the matter and there is no change in circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/ accused at this stage. As such, this petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court this the 12th day of March, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Kanniyakumari at Nagercoil.