

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 08th day of June 2026, Monday.

Cr.M.P. No.1613/2026

Abubakkar Sidhik (A5)

... Petitioner/Accused.

/ Vs /

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

Cr.No.263/2026

U/s.329(4), 305, 49 of BNS r.w.

Section 3 of TNPPDL Act.

... Respondent/ Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.R.Ponnuchamy, 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/A5 for the offences u/s.329(4), 305, 49 of BNS r.w. Section 3 of TNPPDL Act. The occurrence happened on 23-05-2026 and the petitioner is under custody for the past 13 days from 25-05-2026 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 Joman that unknown persons had broken open the lock of the office. Thereafter, the owner of the Finance Company was informed 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 petitioner and other accused persons came to light.

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. The learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the bail application. It was submitted that the petitioner, along with other accused persons, criminally trespassed into the office of the defacto complainant and caused damage to the office furniture and other properties, including chairs, tables and window glass panes. It was further submitted that the accused committed theft of cash and gold jewels from the office premises.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 25.05.2026 and prayed that he may be enlarged on bail subject to stringent conditions.

Considering the gravity of the offence, the stage of investigation and the fact that the investigation is still pending and the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and relate to criminal trespass, mischief causing damage to property and theft of cash and gold jewels. Admittedly, the stolen properties are yet to be recovered. It is further seen from the records that an earlier bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court in Cr.M.P. No.1523 of 2026, dated 02.06.2026. There is no change in circumstance. The petitioner has neither disclosed the dismissal of the earlier bail petition nor mentioned any change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the matter. In the absence of any changed circumstances, a successive bail application is not maintainable. In Cr.P.C. or BNSS the review is not permissible, In such circumstances, this Court finds no fresh grounds to take a different view from the one already taken while dismissing the earlier bail petition. Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, the Bail Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 08th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.

To

The Inspector of Police, Srivilliputtur Town P.S