

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHILA COURT, PERAMBALUR,
STATE OF TAMILNADU.

Present: Tmt.M. S. Manimekalai,L.L.M.,
Additional District Judge,
Ariyalur,
(FAC) Sessions Judge,
Mahila Court, Perambalur.

Thursday, this the 04th day of June, 2026.

Crl.M.P.No.492/2026

Vigneshkumar, 30/2026,
S/o.Mahendran.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

-vs-

The State rep by
Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Perambalur,
In Cr.No.28/2026.

... Respondent/Complainant.

Offence U/S. 5(1),6(1),16,17 of POCSO Act and U/s. 9 and 10 of Prohibition of
Child Marriage Act.

This petition coming on this day before me for order in the presence of
Thiruvalargal. D. Elavarasu, M. Mohamed Rasul, Advocates for the petitioner and
the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides, this Court has
delivered the following...

ORDER

This petition has been filed U/s.482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to
the petitioner for the offences U/S.5(1),6(1),16,17 of POCSO Act and U/s. 9 and 10
of Prohibition of Child Marriage Act.

1. On service of notice through Investigation officer, defacto complainant,
who is the mother of the victim was present and filed her written objection and she
objected that if the accused is released he may cause endanger of her daughter and

Problems will arise with two families and therefore, she strongly objected to grant bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner argued that the date of alleged occurrence took place on 14.04.2026 and the FIR registered on 20.05.2026 with delay complaint for 36 days and he never involved in said offence and he is no way connected with the alleged offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case based on a third-party complaint lodged by a social worker of the child welfare committee, and he is a specially-abled person who is deaf and dumb from birth and no similar anticipatory bail application filed before Hon'ble High Court or any other Court.

3. Reply received. The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the accused and the victim belongs to different castes and that the accused yet to be arrested and the same the accused medical examination yet to be conducted and he is released on anticipatory bail law and order problem may arise between two parties and therefore, he strongly objected to the grant of anticipatory bail.

4. Both side arguments heard. Case records perused. Considering the alleged offences U/S.5(1),6(1),16,17 of POCSO Act and U/s. 9 and 10 of Prohibition of Child Marriage Act against the accused and the petitioner counsel argued that the petitioner is a specially-abled person who is deaf and dumb from birth and that the accused medical examination yet to be conducted and hence this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail with condition to co-operate the said investigation by the petitioner on the following conditions:

(a) that the petitioner/accused is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- along with two sureties each for a like sum each to the satisfaction of this Court;

(b) that the petitioner/accused shall produce proof for their permanent residence.

(c) that the petitioner/accused shall appear and sign before the respondent police daily once at 10.00 a.m. until further orders;

(d) that the petitioner/accused shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer and should not enter the premise of the defacto complainant.

(e) that the petitioner/accused shall surrender before this Court on or before 16.06.2025 or else the anticipatory bail granted to them shall stand automatically cancelled.

Pronounced by me in open Court, this the 04th day of June, 2026.

Sessions Judge,(FAC)
Mahila Court, Perambalur.