



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.**

Friday, the 06th day of March 2026

CrI.M.P.No.403/2026

(CNR No. TNRM-01-000665-2026)

and

Intervene Petition CrI.M.P.No.425/2026

(CNR No. TNRM-01-000728-2026)

Vairaprakash, (aged 40),
S/o. Karuppasamy.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Nainarkovil P.S..
in Cr.No.128/2025

...Respondent/Complainant

Manoharan,
S/o.Arumugam.

... Intervener/Defacto
Complainant.

Petition dated: 26.02.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

Intervene Petition dated 03.03.2026 u/s. 339(2) BNSS.

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



ORDER

The petitioner/A1 who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 10.02.2026 in Cr.No.128/2025 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 296(b), 118, 351(2) BNS, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner/accused and the defacto complainant are friends, and both were working in the Military and are now retired. The petitioner approached the defacto complainant seeking a loan for the development of his business. Believing his words, the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.29,30,420/- through G-Pay to the accounts of the petitioner and his brother/A2 on various dates from November 2021 to December 2021, based on a loan agreement executed by the petitioner. After one year, when the defacto complainant approached the petitioner/accused for repayment of the said amount, the petitioner abused, threatened and attacked him and also criminally intimidated him. Thereafter, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint on 15.07.2025, and the same was registered on 21.11.2025 against the petitioner and his brother/A2.”

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that it is a purely civil dispute and that there is no ingredients for the section 318 of BNS and that the petitioner was arrested on 10.02.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 25 days and that most of the investigation is over . He further submitted that the earlier



application was dismissed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi in CIS. CrI.M.P.N o. 122/2026 on 25.02.2026 and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and he would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. Even, the intervener submitted that the petitioner/accused has executed an agreement for the amount received by him. However, it is specifically alleged that when the defacto complainant approached the petitioner/accused for repayment of the said amount, he had abused, threatened and attacked him and also criminally intimidated. He further submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is no possibility to recover the said amount and has objected to release the petitioner.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally two accused were involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and that his brother/A2 is still absconding. He further submitted that the amount involved in this case is very huge and that the investigation is not yet complete and that the petitioner is presently a resident of Idukki District, Kearala and there is every possibility that he would absconding if he released on bail and objected to release the petitioner on bail at this stage.



6. Therefore, Considering that though the offence u/s.420 IPC is not made out due to civil nature of the dispute, the offence u/s.351(2), 118 are non-bailable and the petitioner/accused is residing in Kerala, there is every possibility that he would abscond if he released on bail and also that the investigation is not yet complete, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

As far as in respect of the intervene petition is closed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 06th day of March 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,
06.03.2026

➤ *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, Nainarkovil P.S.,
The Petitioner through his Counsel.
The Intervener through his Counsel.

TNRM010006652026

