

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO II,  
RAMANATHAPURAM**

**Present: Thiru. S.B. Sujith, B.A.,B.L.,(HONS)  
District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Rameshwaram  
Judicial Magistrate No II(FAC), Ramanathapuram  
Wednesday, the 18<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026  
CIS Cr.M.P No.267/2026  
CNR NO. TNRM02-000801-2026**

Fayaz Khan,  
S/o. Shafeer Ahamedkhan

..... Petitioner/ Accused

Versus

State represented by the Sub Inspector of Police,  
Kenikarai P.S,  
Ramanathapuram  
Cr.No. 39/2026

..... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Tr.R. Rajagandhi.Advocate  
For Respondent : Tr. Chokkesan. APP.

This Petition taken on file on 10.03.2026 and coming up for final hearing on 18.03.2026. Upon hearing the arguments of both sides and upon perusal of the records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivers the following.

**ORDER**

1. This is a petition filed by the petitioner/accused under section 480 of the BNSS for bail.
2. The Petitioner is accused in Cr.No. 39/2026 of Kenikarai Police Station for the offences punishable under sections 331(3), 305(a) BNS. The nature of offence is non bailable.

3. The Learned counsel for Petitioner/accused has argued that, the Petitioner/Accused is innocent and no way connected with this offence. The Petitioner/Accused was remanded to judicial custody on 01.03.2026. He is in the Judicial Custody for the past 18 days. The respondent police has falsely foisted a case against him. The petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. The petitioner assured that if released on bail he would not tamper the evidence. The petitioner is ready to abide any condition imposed by this court and produce sufficient sureties for his bail.
4. On the other hand, the Respondent Police has opposed to release the petitioner/Accused on bail by stating that, if released on bail the petitioner/Accused would abscond, tamper with the witnesses, flee from justice, would not appear before this court during trial and also he would commit the same kind of offences. Further submitted that there is one previous criminal case pending against the accused.
5. The defacto complainant in this case has appeared in person and filled intervenor/objection petition. It is submitted that jewels and cash has been stolen from house by breaking inside the house and submitted that the defacto complainant has suffered huge loss and mental agony because of the incident. Hence submitted that accused persons shall not be released on bail they may commit similar offence.
6. Heard. Records perused.Considering the rival submissions put forth by either sides and on perusal of entire materials on records, it is found that, the

petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 01.03.2026. The Petitioner/Accused is in judicial custody for the past 18 days. The investigation is in preliminary stage. If released on bail, the petitioner would pollute the process of justice and there are likelihood of him tampering the evidence of this case. If released on bail, there are high likelihood of petitioner committing similar kind of offences.

7. Therefore considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the fact that custodial interrogation of this accused is necessary at this point of time and all the above said aspects, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused.

**In the result, bail petition is dismissed.**

**Dictated by me to Steno typist directly and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me on 18.03.2026.**

**Judicial Magistrate No.II(FAC)  
Ramanathapuram**