

In the court of the Communal Clash Cases, Madurai  
Present: **D.Jeyakumari Jemi Rathna, B.Com., B.L.**,  
District and Sessions Judge  
Communal Clash Cases Court,  
Madurai  
Dated this the 7th Day of March 2026, Saturday

**CrI.M.P.No.560/2026**

**in**

**C.C.No.219/2017**

...

Ajith @ Ajithkumar (A3),  
S/o Raja,  
W-2, Ulaga Thevar Street,  
Cumbum.

...Petitioner/Accused

- /Versus/-

The State through the Inspector of Police,  
Cumbum North Police Station,  
Theni District,  
Crime No.153/2016

...Respondent/Complainant

This bail application is coming on this 7th Day of March 2026 before this Court in the presence of Thiru.I.Seeman Mohaideen, A,K Advocate for the petitioner and Thiru.R.Ramasubramanian, Special Public Prosecutor for the State and having stood over for consideration this Court delivered the following:-

ORDERS

**Petition averments in nutshell:**

The Respondent Police has registered this case against the petitioner. This Court issued Non Bailable Warrant on 25.10.2024, for the reason that on 25.10.2024, Police represent that the whereabouts of the accused is not known and they are taking steps to service the summon. The Petitioner submits that he was living in same locality and of year 2023 to 2024, taking treatment in various hospitals in Theni. After he was working

as one of famous School Van Driver at Cumbum. The respondent police wrongly informed that Hon'ble Court. The Petitioner was remanded on 11.09.2025. The petitioner/accused has been implicated in this case with an ulterior motive. Hence he has to be enlarged on bail.

**Reply in nutshell:**

This petitioner was found in possession of 03.00 Kg of Ganja. If this Petitioner is enlarged on bail he will not appear for case hearing which will reflect in the progress of this case. Also he will indulge in committing very same crime, which affects the kids and Children. Hence strongly objected to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Rival contentions were heard.

Petition, Reply and Material records were carefully considered.

**Point for consideration:**

Whether this petition is to be allowed?

The Petitioner would contend that the respondent police has wrongly represented to this court that the whereabouts of this Petitioner/accused is not known. Hence Non-Bailable Warrant was issued against this Petitioner. The Petitioner is residing in the very same address.

On perusal of Petition, it seems that it has been pleaded that the petitioner is residing in the same locality.

On perusal of daily adjudication it seems that till 25.10.2024, this case was pending at service stage. On that day police concerned present and represented that the whereabouts of accused is not known and summon on accused could not be served. Hence NBW was issued against the petitioner. Though learned counsel for petitioner represented that the accused is residing in the same address, in the petition, it has been narrated that he is residing in the same locality. Whereas the Aadhar card reveals a very different address.

On the above said circumstances, this court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail on condition, that

- 1) the petitioner shall produce his Aadhar card and Family card in proof of his residential address.
- II) shall execute a bond for Rs.25,000/- with two sureties, one of them shall be a blood related surety.
- III) shall also deposit a cash sum of Rs.25,000/- as security with in 3 days for his due appearance.
- IV) shall also appear and sign before this court on all working days daily twice at 10.30 Am and 5.30 Pm until further orders.
- V) If the petitioner fails to appear for any hearing or failed to comply the above condition, the cash deposit of Rs.25,000/- shall be forfeited and confiscated to the state.

In the result, Petition is allowed on condition

Hand written by me and typed by Typist in computer and corrected and pronounced by me in open court, on this the 7<sup>th</sup> Day of March 2026

District and Sessions Judge,  
Communal Clash Cases Court,  
Madurai

