



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 13th day of March 2026

CrI.M.P.No.447/2026

(CNR No. TNRM-01-000772-2026)

and

Intervene Petition CrI.M.P.No.473/2026

(CNR No. TNRM-01-000828-2026)

1. Velchamy, (aged 63)
S/o.Devasahayam.

2. Devasahayam, (aged 65),
S/o.Vellaiyan.

3. Vennila @ Venniladevi,
W/o.Sakthi.

...Petitioners/Accused No. 1 to 3

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police,
Kamuthi P.S., ,
in Cr.No.57/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant

Sudha

.... Intervener/Defacto
Complainant.

Petition dated 07.03.2026 U/s.482 BNSS to grant anticipatory bail.

Intervene Petition dated 12.03.2026 u/s.339(2) of 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 petitioners and of Thiru. Ajithkumar, B.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the intervener and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides submissions,



this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners/A1 to A3 who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police in Cr.No.57/2026 for the offences punishable U/s.296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) BNS, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there was a previous enmity between the defacto complainant and A1. Due to which, on 05.03.2026, the petitioner leftout the defacto complainant's goats to the cotton field, which was questioned by her, at that time all the accused abused her in filthy language and A1 assaulted her with knife hook on her forehead and others attacked with hands and pushed her down and A1 torn her nighty and caused injureis threatened them with dire consequences. Based on the complaint, the case was registered.

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

4. The learned Counsel for the intervener contended that the injured had



sustained injury on his forehead and she was taking treatment as an in-patient for 6 days. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, there is every possibility that they would threaten the injured and objected to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the injured was discharged from hospital on 11.03.2026 and that five witnesses have been examined and that there are no previous case is pending against the petitioners.

6. Considering the nature of the offence, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, that a substantial part of the investigation is over and that there are no criminal antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with the following conditions;

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi**; on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and if the petitioners/accused did not surrender within 15 days from the date of this order, this anticipatory bail stand cancelled automatically and on further conditions that:

ii) that the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left



Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the learned Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass book to ensure their identity;

iii) that the **petitioners shall report before the Inspector of Police, respondent police station daily once at 10.30 a.m for a period of one month** and on further condition that they shall make available themselves for interrogation as and when required by the investigation Officer;

iv) that the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witnesses either during investigation or trial;

v) that the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

vi) that on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji-vs- State of Kerala(2005) AIR SCW 5560;**

vii) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered U/s.269 BNS, 2023.

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

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 13th day of March 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
13.03.2026.



- *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 District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi, (through e-mail)
The Public Prosecutor, Ramanathapuram,
The Inspector of Police, Kamuthi P.S,
The petitioners through their Counsel.
The Intervener through her Counsel.