



WEB COPY



**CRL MP(MD) NO. 17281 of 2026**

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED: 19.08.2026**

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.KARTHIKEYAN**

**CRL MP(MD) NO. 17281 of 2026**

**in**

**CRL A(MD)No.1004 of 2026**

**Veereshwaran**

**Petitioner(s)**

**Vs**

1.The State of Tamil Nadu through,  
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Oddanchathiram Sub Division,  
Dindigul District.

2.State through,  
The Inspector of Police,  
Kallimandayam Police Station,  
Dindigul District.  
Crime No.35/2013

**Respondent(s)**

**For Petitioner(s):**

Mr.R.Venkatesan

**For Respondent(s):**

Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

**Prayer:**

To suspend the sentence and release the petitioner on bail against the judgment in Special Sessions Case No.365 of 2023, on the file of the Mahila Fast Track Court, Dindigul, dated 24.04.2026 on such terms and conditions as may be deemed fit pending disposal of the Criminal Appeal before this Court.



## **ORDER**

The petitioner/appellant has come up with the present application seeking to suspend the sentence imposed on the petitioner by the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul, in Spl.S.C.No.365 of 2023 dated 24.04.2026 and grant bail.

2. The petitioner/appellant was charged for the offences punishable under Sections 366(A), 376(2)(h) of IPC, Section 4 of the POCSO Act and Section 3(2)(vi) of the SC/ST (POA) Act. The Trial Court, after trial, found the petitioner guilty of the offences punishable under Section 366 of IPC and Section 4 of the POCSO Act. He was found not guilty of the offences punishable under Sections 366(A), 376(2)(h) of IPC and Section 3(2)(vi) of the SC/ST (POA) Act. The petitioner was convicted and sentenced as follows:

(i) to undergo five years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.5000/-, in default, to undergo three months simple imprisonment for the offence punishable under Section 366 of IPC;

(ii) to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.5000/-, in default, to undergo six months simple imprisonment for the offence punishable under Section 4 of the POCSO Act.

The petitioner has preferred the present appeal and sought for suspension of sentence and bail.



3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/appellant submitted that the petitioner was aged about 18 years and the victim was aged about 17 years and 7 months at the time of occurrence. Both were in love with each other. However, the said relationship was not accepted by the members of both families. Both of them are now married separately and living peacefully. The petitioner was on bail during trial and was taken custody on the date of judgment of the Trial Court, i.e., on 24.04.2026 and he is in incarceration since then. Hence, the learned counsel prays for suspension of sentence and bail to the petitioner/appellant.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent Police submitted that the petitioner was tried for the offences punishable under Sections 366(A), 376(2)(h) of IPC, Section 4 of the POCSO Act and Section 3(2)(vi) of the SC/ST (POA) Act and convicted for the offences punishable under Section 366 of IPC and Section 4 of the POCSO Act. The Trial Court has rightly acquitted the Accused from the offences punishable under Sections 366(A), 376(2)(h) of IPC and Section 3(2)(vi) of SC/ST (POA) Act. Only after appreciation of facts and circumstances, the Trial Court has come to the conclusion that the Accused is guilty of the offences punishable under Section 366 of IPC and Section 4 of the POCSO Act. Hence, the learned Government Advocate strongly opposed to grant suspension of sentence and bail to the petitioner/appellant.



5. This Court has given its thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions put forth on either side.

WEB COPY

6. On careful perusal of records, it is found that the petitioner was aged about 18 years and the victim was aged about 17 years at the time of occurrence. It is a case of Romeo-Juliet. In cases of this nature, out of emotional entanglement, the petitioner and the victim exceeded their limit and indulged in sexual intercourse. Now, it is brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner and the victim were married separately and living peacefully with their respective spouses. Considering all the above circumstances, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence imposed by the Trial Court and grant bail to the petitioner/appellant.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is allowed and the substantive sentence of imprisonment alone is suspended pending disposal of the Criminal Appeal and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on the following conditions:-

i. The petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul;

ii. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Trial Court may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity;



iii. The petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court, daily at 10.30 a.m.,  
until further orders.

WEB COPY

On violation of any of the above conditions by the petitioner, the respondent  
police shall move an application for cancellation of the bail.

**19.08.2026**  
**(S.K.,J.)**

Lm

To

1.The Fast Track Mahila Court,  
Dindigul.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Oddanchathiram Sub Division,  
Dindigul District.

3.The Inspector of Police,  
Kallimandayam Police Station,  
Dindigul District.

4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court.

5.The Central Prison,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



**S.KARTHIKEYAN, J.**

Lm

CrI.M.P.(MD).No.17281 of 2026  
in  
CrI.A.(MD).No.1004 of 2026

19.08.2026