



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.**

Thursday, the 12th day of March 2026

**CrI.M.P.No.460/2026
(CNR No. TNRM-01-000805-2026)**

1. Pathampiriyal, (aged 43),
W/o.Kannan.

2. Devadharani, (aged 22)
D/o.Kannan.

...Petitioners/Accused No.3,4

/vs/

State, through the Inspector of Police
Uchippuli P.S.,
in Cr.No.08/2026

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 10.03.2026 U/s.483 BNSS to grant bail.

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of Thiru.M.Shanmuganathan, M.A., B.L., the learned Counsel for the petitioners and of Thiru.KR.M.Karunaivel Pandiyan, B.Com., B.L., representing on behalf of the learned Public Prosecutor Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both side submissions, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

The petitioners/A3, A4 who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 04.03.2026 in Cr.No.08/2026 on the file of the respondent police for the offences punishable U/s. 194(3)(i) BNSS @ u/s.103(1), 61(2), 49, 238 BNS, seek bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the deceased was the daughter of the defacto complainant. The deceased had been in an illicit relationship with one Pandi. Due to which her parents arranged a marriage with one another. After their marriage she was continuing illegal relationship with the above said Pandi. At that time, she was pursuing a degree through correspondence. On 16.12.2025, she went with the aforementioned Pandi to appear for her degree examination. When this matter came to the knowledge of her family members, the defacto complainant did not call her back to his house, and the deceased's husband also refused to live with her. After a panchayat was convened, the deceased stayed at her relative's house. Later, she returned to her parental home. On 17.01.2026 at about 8.45 p.m, the deceased's mother found her body in the bedroom and informed the defacto complainant. Subsequently, a case was registered under Section 194(3)(i) of the BNSS. During the enquiry, the petitioners and others were implicated in the offence based on A2's confession, and the charges were altered to Sections 103(1), 61(2), 49, and 238 of the BNS.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners are women and that there is some misunderstanding between the deceased and her husband, due to which she was lived in her parental house and that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected with the offence and other accused only involved with the offence. He further submitted that



the petitioners were arrested on 04.03.2026 and they are in judicial custody for the past 9 days. He further submitted that most of the investigation is over and that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners and that if the petitioners are released on bail, they are ready to obey the conditions imposed if any and they would not abscond and also not tamper or threaten the witnesses. Hence he prays to release the petitioners on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that initially FIR was registered u/s.194(3)(i) BNSS and after based on confession of A2 the section was altered into u/s. 103(1), 61(2), 49, and 238 of the BNS against the petitioners and 5 others and that the petitioners are arrayed as A3, A4 and that A2, A5, A6 are in judicial custody and that A1, A7 are still absconding. He further submitted that A1 is brother and the petitioners are mother and sister of the deceased. He further submitted that the petitioners were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 04.03.2026 and that A1 had committed murder of the deceased Sasikala and these two petitioners have helped to A1 and that there is some specific over-tact against these petitioners as per prosecution and that the offence is grave in nature and that the investigation is in very beginning stage and that if the petitioners are released on bail, they would threaten the defacto complainant.

5. Prima facie, this is a case of harsh killing, which has to be considered as serious offence. Just because these petitioners are women, leniency cannot be



shown. Considering the grave nature of offence and specific over-tact attributed to them and that the investigation is in very beginning stage and that if these petitioners are released on bail there is every possibility that they would erase the evidence and tamper the witnesses and also other accused yet to be arrested. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 12th day of March 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge
Ramanathapuram.
12.03.2026

- *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, Uchipuli P.S.,
The petitioners through their Counsel.