

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHILA COURT,  
PERAMBALUR.**

**Present: Thiru.S. Giri, B.Sc., M.L.,  
Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court, Perambalur.**

**Monday, this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021.**

**E. Bail No.9/2021**

Kanagaraj (1<sup>st</sup> Accused) (Age 20/2020),  
S/o. Dharmalingam,  
MBC Colony, Kavulpalayam Village,  
Perambalur Taluk and District.

... Petitioner/Accused.

-vs-

Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station,  
Perambalur.  
Crime No.20/2020.

Offences U/Ss. 366, 366(A) of IPC and  
5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act

... Respondent/Complainant.

\* \* \* \* \*

This petition coming on this day before me for order in the form of e-bail by Thiru. P. Ramkumar Advocate for the petitioner and the Special Public Prosecutor for the State and upon perusing the petition objection and other relevant records, this Court has delivered the following...

**ORDER**

1. This petition is filed U/s 439 of Cr.P.C.. before this Court to grant bail to the petitioner / accused herein concerned in Crime No.20/2020 on the file of All Women Police Station for the alleged offences U/Ss.366, 366(A) of IPC and 5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act.

2. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner involved in an offences U/Ss.366, 366(A) of IPC and 5(I) r/w 6 of POCSO Act. Hence a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused submitted that the petitioner did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case due to enmity. There is no previous case against this Petitioner / Accused. This petitioner has been in Judicial Custody 43 days. The Defacto complainant is relying the occurrence, which was taken place before on 17.09.2020. There are no reasons for 2 months delay FIR. The case relating to love affair between victim and 1<sup>st</sup> accused. Since the love affair of the victim and 1<sup>st</sup> accused was known to every persons in the village including the defacto complainant. It express wordings in the FIR itself, the victim was sent to her grandmother house at Perumathur / Kilur Village. Hence, the alleged occurrence spoken by the defacto complainant itself is false. The charges mentioned in the FIR are no way connected with this petitioner / 1<sup>st</sup> Accused. The Statement U/S 164 Crpc was completed, medical examination of the victim, 1<sup>st</sup> accused completed. Hence the investigation was completed. The petitioner will not tamper the witnesses and will not tamper interfere with investigation. Therefore Petitioner Counsel prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Special Public Prosecutor has stated in reply that the accused was involved in an offence U/Ss. 366, 366(A) of IPC and 5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act 2012 and the accused was arrested and remanded on 23.11.2020. Further it is submitted that strongly objected to the granting bail to this accused. The investigation has completed and the accused will

threaten the victim girl and witnesses if released on bail. Therefore, bail cannot be granted to this petitioner at this stage and prays for dismissal of this petition.

5. Submissions of the petitioner counsel heard and objections of the Special Public Prosecutor also heard.

6. Records on hand are perused.

The petitioner was remanded only on 23.11.2020 for an offence U/Ss. 366, 366(A) of IPC and 5(l) r/w 6 of POCSO Act 2012. Special Public Prosecutor strongly objected to release the accused on bail. The investigation has completed and the petitioner / Accused will tamper the witnesses and the victim girl.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the period of incarceration by the petitioner from 23.11.2020, this court is inclined to grant bail to this petitioner subject to the following conditions:

a) that the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- ( Rupees Ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of this Court.

b) that the petitioner shall appear and sign before this Court daily twice viz 10.00 a.m and 5.00 pm until further orders.


c) that the petitioner shall co-operate with the police for investigation.

d) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the

facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

Pronounced by me through E bail, this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January



  
25/1/2021  
Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court, Perambalur.

1. The Special Public Prosecutor, Perambalur.
2. The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Perambalur.
3. The Advocate for the petitioner.

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHILA COURT,  
PERAMBALUR.**

**Present: Thiru.S. Giri, B.Sc., M.L.,  
Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court, Perambalur.**

**Monday this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021**

**E. Bail No.45/2021**

Aravinth (A2) (Age 25/2020),  
S/o. Raj,  
Thuraimangalam Village,  
Perambalur Taluk and District.

.. Petitioner/Accused.

-vs-

Inspector of Police,  
Kunnam Police Station,  
Perambalur,  
Crime No.302/2018.

Offences U/Ss. 302, 114, 341, 354,  
506(i) of IPC r/w 4 of TNPHW Act 2002. ... Respondent/Complainant.

\* \* \* \* \*

This petition coming on this day before me for order in the form of e-bail by Thiru. P. Kamaraj Advocate for the petitioner and the Special Public Prosecutor for the State and upon perusing the petition objection and other relevant records, this Court has delivered the following...

**ORDER**

1. This petition is filed U/s 439 of Cr.P.C.. before this Court to grant bail to the petitioner / accused herein concerned in Crime No.302/2018 on the file of Kunnam Police Station for the alleged offences U/Ss. 302, 114, 341, 354, 506(i) of IPC r/w 4 of TNPHW Act 2002.

2. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner involved in an offences U/Ss. 302, 114, 341, 354, 506(i) of IPC r/w 4 of TNPHW Act 2002. Hence a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused submitted that the petitioner has been charged alleged offence U/Ss. 302, 114, 341, 354, 506(i) of IPC r/w 4 of TNPHW Act 2002. This Hon'ble Court issued NBW on 14.12.2020 for his absence. Based on the NBW the respondent Police have executed the NBW on 22.12.2020. The petitioner is an innocent person, he is not committed any such offence, and he is falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner / Accused undertaking to pay the Court fee, whenever Court orders. The petitioner is ready to abide the conditions which may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court. Therefore Petitioner Counsel prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Special Public Prosecutor has stated in reply that the accused was involved in an offence U/Ss. 302, 114, 341, 354, 506(i) of IPC r/w 4 of TNPHW Act 2002 and the accused was arrested on 22.12.2020 on execution of N.B.W. by the respondent police. Further it is submitted that strongly objected to grant bail to this accused. This case in S.C.No.64/2019 is pending for argument stage and if he released on bail and he will abscond and prayed to dismiss this petition.

5. Submissions of the petitioner counsel heard and objections of the Special Public Prosecutor also heard.

6. Records on hand are perused. The Special Public Prosecutor strongly objected to release the accused on bail and it comes to know that when the case in S.C.No.64/2019 posted for questioning on 14.12.2020


the accused was absent and hence warrant issued against the accused. Hence considering the offence against the petitioner is heinous in nature and the case in S.C.No.64/2019 is at arguments stage, this Court is not inclined to release the petitioners on bail at this stage and that therefore, this petition is liable to be dismissed.

7. Taking into consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case and the strong objection raised by the prosecution and the case is in Argument stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to this petitioner.

Therefore this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me through E bail, this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January



  
25/1/2021  
Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court, Perambalur.

1. The Special Public Prosecutor, Perambalur.
2. The Inspector of Police, Kunnam, Perambalur.
3. The Advocate for the petitioner.

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHILA COURT,  
PERAMBALUR.**

**Present: Thiru.S. Giri, B.Sc., M.L.,  
Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court, Perambalur.**

**Monday this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021**

**E. Bail No.56/2021**

Kuruvel (Age 24/2021),  
S/o. Kannan,  
Middle Street, Krishnapuram Village,  
Veppanthattai Taluk,  
Perambalur District.

... Petitioner/Accused.

-vs-

Inspector of Police,  
Maruvathur Police Station,  
Perambalur.  
Crime No.1124/2020.

Offences U/Ss. Girl Missing @  
366(A) of IPC and  
5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act 2012.

... Respondent/Complainant.

\* \* \* \* \*

This petition coming on this day before me for order in the form of e-bail by Thiru. M. Veramuthu Advocate for the petitioner and the Special Public Prosecutor for the State and upon perusing the petition objection and other relevant records, this Court has delivered the following...

**ORDER**

1. This petition is filed U/s 439 of Cr.P.C.. before this Court to grant bail to the petitioner / accused herein concerned in Crime



No.1124/2020 on the file of Maruvathur Police Station for the alleged offences U/Ss. Girl Missing @ 366(A) of IPC and 5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act 2012.

2. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner involved in an offences U/Ss. Girl Missing @ 366(A) of IPC and 5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act 2012. Hence a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused submitted that the petitioner did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case due to enmity. The above petitioner is not involving the above offence. The POCSO Act 2012 sections not made out in this case. He is innocent. If he released on bail he will not evade trial and he will not tamper any witness. Investigation is also over. Therefore Petitioner Counsel prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Special Public Prosecutor has stated in reply that the accused was involved in an offence U/Ss. Girl Missing @ 366(A) of IPC and 5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act 2012 and the accused was arrested and remanded on 04.12.2020. Further it is submitted that strongly objected to the granting bail to this accused. The investigation is pending and the accused will abscond if released on bail. Therefore, bail cannot be granted to this petitioner at this stage and prays for dismissal of this petition.

5. Submissions of the petitioner counsel heard and objections of the Special Public Prosecutor also heard.


6. Records on hand are perused. The Special Public Prosecutor strongly objected to release the accused on bail and also stated that the accused will abscond and investigation is pending. It would not be proper to release the accused at this stage.

7. Taking into consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case and the strong objection raised by the prosecution and investigation is pending, this court is not inclined to grant bail to this petitioner.

Therefore this bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me through E bail, this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January



  
25/1/2021  
Sessions Judge,  
Mahila Court, Perambalur.

1. The Special Public Prosecutor, Perambalur.
2. The Inspector of Police, Maruvathur,  
Perambalur.
3. The Advocate for the petitioner.