



**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.**

**Tuesday, the 10<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026**

**CrI.M.P.No.448/2026  
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000768-2026)**

Dinakaran, (aged 40),  
S/o.Karuppaiah.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

**/vs/**

State, through the Inspector of Police  
Paramakudi Taluk P.S..  
**in Cr.No.20/2026**

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 07.03.2026 U/s.483 BNS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.M.Soundarapandian, M.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners 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 18.02.2026 in Cr.No.20/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s.309(6) of BNS @ u/s.332(C), 127(7), 351(3), 309(6) of BNS, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is engaged in the real estate business. On 10.02.2026 in the evening, two persons came to the defacto complainant's house to inquire about layouts for purchasing plots. Again, on 12.02.2026 at about 7:30 a.m., one of the aforementioned persons, along with another, came to the defacto complainant's house and were discussing the purchase of plots with her. At that time, one of the person covered her mouth with a kerchief, pulled her down, and both persons threatened her with a knife, robbed her of 7 sovereigns of gold jewels, and caused injuries to her left palm and fingers, resulting in her falling unconscious. Further, both persons locked her inside a room and escaped. Upon her complaint, a case was registered under Section 309(6) of BNS against three persons, and subsequently, the sections were altered to 332(C), 127(7), 351(3), and 309(6) of BNS.”

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is in no way connected with the offence and it is a put up case. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 18.02.2026 and that the injured was discharged from the hospital and that most of the investigation is over. He further submitted that no name was mentioned in the FIR, and had the accused been listed earlier, it would have been added after obtaining the details over the phone, and she would have noted the name of the accused. The



FIR does not reveal that the accused had attacked the defacto complainant, but that she had held the knife and thereby sustained injuries.” The accused is in judicial custody for 21 days and hence, he prays to release the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that totally 3 accused are involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A1 and others moved anticipatory bail before this Court and the same are pending. He further submitted that the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 18.02.2026 and that there is similar nature of 5 previous cases are pending against the petitioner for the offences 318(4), 395, 457, 309(4), 109, 4 cases of 309(4) of BNS . He further submitted that only 2 ¼ sovereign of gold jewels are recovered from the petitioner/A1 and he has given a confession that the remaining jewels of 5 ¾ sovereign is in custody of A2 should have filed anticipatory bail. The learned Public Prosecutor strongly objected to releasing the accused on bail stating that he is repeated offender and that the investigation is very beginning stage and other accused yet to be arrested.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner and other accused had entered the house under the guise of purchasing plots and thereafter committed offences against the defacto complainant, who was alone in the house. Even though, the petitioner is arrested and custody for 21 days only 2 ¼ sovereign of gold jewels were alone recovered. The investigation is in very beginning stage and other accused yet to be arrested and the remaining jewels are yet to be recovered.



6. Considering the grave nature of offence and, the period of incarceration and the fact that the remaining jewels yet to be recovered and also considering that there are criminal antecedents of the petitioner and other accused yet to be arrested, 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.

**Pronounced by me in open court, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.**

Principal Sessions Judge,  
Ramanathapuram,  
10.03.2026

- *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](https://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, Paramakudi Taluk P.S.,  
The Petitioner through his Counsel.

TNRM010007682026

