

**IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
MAYILADUTHURAI.**

Present: Dr. L.S. Sathiyamurthy, M.A., M.L., Ph.D.,
District and Sessions Judge, Mayiladuthurai.
State of Tamil Nadu.

Saturday, this the 07th day of March 2026.

Crl.M.P. No. 335/2026

A1. Sivakumar, S/o. Gajendran.
A2. Murugan, S/o. Govindasamy.
A3. Karthiyamoorthy, S/o. Panjamoorthy. ...Petitioners / Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,
Anaikaranchathiram P.S in Cr. No.70/2026 ... Respondent/Complainant.

U/s. 296(b) 118(1), 351(3) BNS r/w 25(1A) of Arms Act.

This petition came up today for the hearing before me in the presence of Thiru. V. Muthuraman, Advocate for the Petitioner and Tmt. A. Aruna on behalf of Public Prosecutor for the State and after careful consideration of the materials available on record and the submissions made on behalf of the parties, this court passed the following:

ORDER

1. This is a petition filed U/s. 483 of BNSS, 2023.

2. Heard, the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners/accused would submit that the respondent police has originally registered a case against the petitioners for the offences U/s. 296(b) 118(1), 351(3) BNS r/w 25(1A) of Arms Act. The petitioners were subsequently arrested on suspicion and remanded to judicial custody on 15.02.2026 and is in judicial custody for more than 21 days. This is the 2nd bail application. More over this false case has been registered against the petitioners and they have no connection with this case. The petitioners are innocent and they did not commit any offences as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this Court and prayed to grant bail to the

petitioners.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that there was previous enmity between both the parties, in which on 14.02.2026 at 9.00 a.m the petitioners came to the defacto complainant's house, scolded him in filthy language, assaulted him using Aruval over his head and over various places of the body and threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the case. There are 12 previous cases registered against the petitioner/A1 and he is history sheeted rowdy in HS No. 464/2016. and objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. This court carefully considered the submission made by either side. The petitioners are arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.02.2026 for the alleged offence punishable U/s. 296(b) 118(1), 351(3) BNS r/w 25(1A) of Arms Act. They have been in incarceration for the past 20 days. The injured person got medical treatment and discharged from the hospital. A2 and A3 in this case have no previous cases but there are about 13 cases pending against A1. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that there is no cases registered against A1 for the past one year. The cases said to have pending against him are old cases. Therefore, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners on conditions.

In the result, this petition is allowed. Consequently, the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bail bond as defined in section 2(d) BNSS 2023 along with similar bail bonds from two persons each for a sum of Rs. 25,000/- to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sirkali for undertakings their appearance for further proceedings, and with other conditions that,

(i) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the learned Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Passbook to ensure the identity.

(ii) the petitioners shall report before the Respondent police station daily at 10.00 A.M for a period of 30 days.

(iii) The petitioners should co-operate for the investigation and should not threaten the witnesses.

(iv) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(v) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(vi) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji/Vs/State of Kerala, [(2005) AIR S.C.W.5560]***.

(vii) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 07th day of February 2026.

District and Sessions Judge,
Mayiladuthurai.

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Sirkali.
2. The Inspector of Police, Anaikaranchathiram P.S.
3. The Petitioner through his counsel.