

**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 12th day of June 2026, Friday.

Cr.M.P. No.1596/2026

Vignesh @ Mirugam

... Petitioner/Accused.

/ Vs /

State through the Inspector of Police,

Thiruchuli P.S.

Cr.No.205/2026

U/s.20 r/w. 30,25(1)(a) of Arms Act

... Respondent/ Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.M.Jeyakumar, Advocate for the petitioner 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 petitioner/accused for the offences u/s.20 r.w. 30, 25(1)(a) of Arms Act. The occurrence happened on 24-05-2026 and the petitioner is under custody for the past 31 days from 24-05-2026 onwards.

As per FIR, on 24.05.2026 at about 9.00 a.m., a police party headed by the Sub-Inspector of Police attached to the respondent Police Station was on surveillance duty. At that time, the petitioner was allegedly found standing near the house of one Boominathan situated on G.H. Road, Thiruchuli, in possession of a sword. It is alleged that the petitioner was brandishing the weapon in a manner intended to create fear and alarm among the general public. On noticing the same, the respondent police apprehended the petitioner and seized the weapon under due process of law.

According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any such offence and prays to enlarge the petitioner on bail. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that if the petitioner is released on bail he would commit similar types of offences again and hence he objected to grant bail to the petitioner.

Heard both sides. Records perused. On perusal of records would show that the petitioner was standing in a public place with sword with an intend to create fear over the public.

The learned P.P. strongly opposed to grant bail on the ground that the petitioner was roaming with aruval in a public place in a manner intended to create fear and alarm among the general public and the petitioner is a history sheeted rowdy in H.S.No.680/2025.

Considering the rival submissions, the petitioner has been in custody for the past 34 days. As submitted by the learned Public Prosecutor, the petitioner is involved in 11 previous criminal cases and has also been classified as a history-sheeted rowdy in H.S. No. 680/2025. The records indicate that the petitioner has been repeatedly involved in similar offences. Having regard to the nature, gravity, and severity of the offence, as well as the petitioner's antecedents as a habitual offender, this Court is of the view that, if released on bail, he is likely to commit similar offences again and may cause a threat to public safety. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 12th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.

To

The Inspector of Police, Thiruchuli P.S