



IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANATHAPURAM.

PRESENT: Thiru. A.K.MEHBUB ALI KHAN, B.L.M. L.L.M., PG.D.PM/IR, `
Dip.in.J.J & J.Psy., PG.D.D.F.,
Principal Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram.

Saturday, the 07th day of March 2026

CrI.M.P.No.401/2026

(CNR No. TNRM-01-000671-2026)

Alagumalai, (aged 45),
S/o.Kayambuthevar.

...Petitioner/Accused

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Kovilangulam P.S.,
in Cr.No.05/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 26.02.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.K.Muthuduraisamy, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioner and of Thiru.B.Karthikeyan, B.A., B.L., the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioner/A2 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.05/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.105 BNS and section 135(1)(a) of Electricity Act, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the brother of the deceased and the petitioner has a field adjacent to the deceased's field. On 16.02.2026, at approximately 5:00 p.m., the deceased went to his field for harvesting



work and did not return home, nor did he respond to phone calls. Thereafter, the deceased's son and others went to the field and found the deceased lying unconscious on the electric line fencing. He was immediately rushed to the Government Hospital, where the duty doctor declared that the deceased had succumbed to an electric shock. The electric post in question was allegedly installed illegally by the petitioner/accused without obtaining the necessary permit from the authorities. Based on this complaint, a case was registered.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has not committed any such offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that most of the investigation is complete and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any by this court and he would not abscond and tamper the witnesses and he prays to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that offence is grave in nature and that the investigation is in initial stage and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and that if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, there is every possibility that he would threaten the witnesses and abscond and objected to



release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

5. Considering that the offence is grave in nature and that the investigation is in very beginning stage and also that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required, without taking the accused into custody the investigation could not be proceeded, hence this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 07th day of March 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
07.06.2026

➤ *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 for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from
Android or iOS.*

Copy to

The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Kovilangulam P.S,
The petitioner through his Counsel.