

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT AT SRIVILLIPUTTUR.

Present: **Thiru.A.Kanthakumar, M.L.,**
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at Srivilliputtur.

Dated this the 15th day of June 2026, Monday.

Cr.M.P. No.1661/2026

1. Nasurdeen (A1)
2. Muthu (A4)

... Petitioners/Accused.

/ Vs /

State through the Inspector of Police,
Srivilliputtur Town P.S.

Cr.No.263/2026

U/s.329(4), 305, 49 of BNS and Section 3 of TNPPDL Act. ... Respondent/ Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.Y.Bala Manikandan, Advocate for the petitioners and Thiru.S.Thirumalaiappan, Public Prosecutor for the respondent and upon hearing the argument of both sides, this court made the following

ORDER

It is an application for bail u/s.483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS)

FIR was registered against the petitioners/A1 and A4 for the offences u/s.329(4), 305, 49 of BNS and Section 3 of TNPPDL Act. The occurrence happened on 23-05-2026 and the petitioners are under custody for the past 14 days from 01-06-2026 onwards.

As per the FIR, the defacto complainant is employed as a Collection Agent in PKR Finance, Srivilliputtur. It is alleged that the owner of the Finance Company had gone out of station after keeping a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- in the office locker. On 23.05.2026 at about 9.00 p.m., the defacto complainant is stated to have kept a further sum of Rs.2,00,000/- in the locker, secured the office and left the premises. On 24.05.2026 at about 4.40 a.m., he received information from one Azhagar @ Joman, who is the shopping complex owner informed that four persons had broken the lock of the office and looted the things in it. Thereafter, the owner of the Finance Company was informed and the incident and upon inspection of the office premises, it was found that the glass doors, air-conditioner and CCTV cameras had been

damaged. It was further found that cash amounting to Rs.3,00,000/- and gold jewels, namely one gold ring weighing one sovereign and another gold ring weighing about 2½ sovereigns, were missing. Based on the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, the respondent police registered the present case. During the course of investigation, the involvement of the petitioners and other accused persons came to light.

According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any such offence and prays to enlarge the petitioners on bail. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that the petitioners have 3 previous cases each and that if the petitioners are released on bail they would commit similar types of offences again hence he objected to grant bail to the petitioners.

Heard both sides. Records perused.

A perusal of the records shows that the petitioners have been in judicial custody for the past 14 days.

The learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the bail petition on the ground that the petitioners, along with the other accused, had caused damage to glass doors, an air-conditioner, and CCTV cameras. It was further submitted that cash amounting to Rs.3,00,000/- and gold jewellery, namely, one gold ring weighing one sovereign and another gold ring weighing about 2½ sovereigns, were robbed during the occurrence. The learned Public Prosecutor also submitted that the first petitioner/A1 is involved in six previous criminal cases and that the second petitioner/A4 is involved in five previous criminal cases. It was further pointed out that both of them are history-sheeted rowdies.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that no person sustained any injury in the occurrence and that the petitioners have been in custody for the past 14 days. It was further submitted that the co-accused, A3 was released on custody bail in CrI.O.P.NO.10698/2026 dated 10-06-2026 and A2 and A6, have already been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court. In support of the said contention, the learned counsel produced a copy of the bail order passed by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P. No.10698 of 2026, dated 10.06.2026, in respect of A3.

Considering the rival submissions, the nature of the offence, the existence of a dispute between the parties relating to the borrowing of money, the fact that the co-accused have already been granted bail, and the period of custody undergone by the petitioners for the past 14 days, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions

Accordingly the petition is allowed and the petitioners/A1 and A4 are ordered to be released on bail on the following terms:-

i) The petitioners shall execute a personal bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for the likesum each to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Srivilliputtur.

ii) The petitioners/accused shall appear before the repondent PS, everyday at 6-00 pm until further orders.

iii) The petitioners shall not abscond either during the investigation or trial, that the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

iv) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Judicial Magistrate 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 Judicial Magistrate himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala (2005) AIR SCW 5560.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 15th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Srivilliputtur.

The Inspector of Police, Srivilliputtur Town P.S

The Superintendent, District Jail, Virudhunagar. (Through e-Mail).