

Aathish Vs The State of Tamilnadu

Aathish Vs The State of Tamilnadu

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1662863

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Jul-03-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice K.Rajasekar

Appeal No. : CRL OP(MD)/13215/2026

Appellant : Aathish

Respondent : The State of Tamilnadu

Judgement :

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT (Criminal Jurisdiction) Date : 03/07/2026 PRESENT The HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR Aathish, S/o.Yesudhasan, Chettithottam Street, Koodankulam, Radhapuram Taluk, Tirunelveli District.. ... Petitioner/Sole Accused Vs The State of Tamilnadu Rep By, The Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli District. Cr.No.640 of 2026.. ... Respondent/Complainant For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vidhya Sagar for Mr.S.Subash Chandar, Advocate. For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian, Counsel for State of TN (Crl.Side) PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS PRAYER :- C-33B. For Bail in Cr.No.640 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/Sole Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.06.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 132, 296(b) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25(1A) of Arms Act, in Crime No.640 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail. 2.The allegation against the petitioner is that he was found in possession of an Aruval and exhibits the same to threat general public, and thereby, the respondent police suo motu registered the case against him and arrested him. 3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and a false case has been foisted against him, since he is having some previous cases. He is ready to cooperate with investigation. The petitioner has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.06.2026. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for State of TN (Crl. Side) appearing for the

respondent would submit that the petitioner is having nine previous cases. Since he was found in possession of Aruval, he was arrested and remanded to judicial custody. He would further submit that the investigation is still pending. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel

on either side and the nature of offences levelled against the petitioner and considering the fact that it is a case of possession of Aruval, no one sustained any injuries in this case and though the petitioner has some previous cases, I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions: [a] Accordingly, this petition is ordered and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent Police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation. [c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to

the offence of which she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which she is suspected; [d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial; [e] 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 her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence; [f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]. [g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

(K R S J) 03.07.2026 VSG TO 1.The learned Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram.

2. The Superintendent, Palayamkottai Prison, Tirunelveli. 3.The Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli District.

4. The Additional Public Prosecutor, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai. K. RAJASEKAR,J., vsg

ORDER

IN CRL OP(MD) No.13215 of 2026 Date : 03/07/2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com