



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 18.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED

Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

Chelladurai,
S/o.Nataraj Devar,
Udayarkulam North Street,
Naduvakurichi,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
Seitunganallur Police Station,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by,
Prevention of Idol Theft Cell,
Southern Region,
Tirunelveli Zone.
(Crime No.379/2004)

... Respondent

Prayer : This Criminal Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 430 of B.N.S.S. praying to suspend the Sentence imposed upon the Revision Petitioner in C.C.No.4 of 2020, dated 27.02.2023, on the file of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kumbakonam and



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

confirmed in C.A.No.75 of 2023, on the file of the Hon'ble Additional District and Sessions Court (Fast Track Court), Kumbakonam.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Poornachandran

For Respondent : Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad
Government Advocate

ORDER

Heard Mr.S.Poornachandran, learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner and Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad, learned Government Advocate for the Respondent.

2. This Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been preferred seeking to suspend the sentence imposed upon the Revision Petitioner by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kumbakonam in C.C.No.4 of 2020, dated 27.02.2023, which was confirmed by the Additional District and Sessions Court (Fast Track Court), Kumbakonam, in Criminal Appeal No.75 of 2023, dated 13.08.2025, wherein the Revision Petitioner, was convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years and to pay a fine of Rs.2000/-, in



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

default, to undergo simple imprisonment for further three months, for the offence under Section 380(2) of IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment of seven years and to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/-, in default, to undergo simple imprisonment for further three months for the offence under Section 457(2). Challenging the above conviction and sentence, the Revision Petitioner has filed Criminal Revision Petition in Crl.RC(MD)No.1337 of 2025 along with the instant miscellaneous petition, seeking suspension of sentence and bail.

3. The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner submitted that both the Trial Court and the Appellate Court failed to see that PW1 deposed that he was not aware of how many statutes were available in the temple and also failed to see that, according to PW1, the photographs shown to him did not belong to the temple.

4. It was further submitted by the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner that the Courts below failed to see that the occurrence was said to have taken place on 29.09.2004, whereas the Revision Petitioner was



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

arrested only in 2010 based on a coerced confession obtained from him.

The Courts below failed to see that there is no concrete proof or single piece of evidence to show that the Revision Petitioner and other accused stole the statute. Even according to the prosecution's case, there is no recovery from the Revision Petitioner. The Court below failed to see that the entire prosecution case is based on the confession said to have been given by the co-accused in this case. The Courts below failed to see that the Revision Petitioner was taken into illegal custody on 13.03.2010, and only after the filing of HCP(MD)No.236 of 2010 by the wife of the Revision Petitioner, the Revision Petitioner was remanded to judicial custody on 16.03.2010. This itself shows that the police obtained a coerced confession from the Revision Petitioner.

5. In view of the above, it was argued that the conviction recorded by the Trial Court is legally unsustainable. It was further argued that the learned Trial Court as well as Appellate Court also failed to notice the discrepancies in the deposition of witnesses and the crystal part of the evidences was not at all assessed by both the Courts. It was further



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

argued that the judgment passed by both the Courts was based on surmises and conjectures without considering the entire evidence on record.

6. It was further argued that due to pendency of the criminal cases before this High Court, there is a blinking chance that in the near future, this criminal revision case will be finally heard and decided. He further submits that there are arguable points in this Revision and the Revision Petitioner has fair chance of success in this Criminal Revision Case. Thus, he prayed for suspension of sentence and be released on bail, till the disposal of this Criminal Revision Petition, as the Revision Petitioner was already granted bail during trial.

7. Several other submissions in order to demonstrate the falsity of the allegations made against the Revision Petitioner have also been placed forth before the Court. The circumstances which, according to the counsel, led to the false implication of the accused have also been touched upon at length. It has been assured on behalf of the revision



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

petitioner that he is ready to cooperate with the process of law and shall faithfully make himself available before the Court whenever required and is also ready to accept all the conditions which the Court may deem fit to impose upon him. The Revision Petitioner undertakes that, in case, he is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and will cooperate in disposal of revision.

8. Learned Government Advocate appearing for the Respondent filed counter affidavit, which is on record and has opposed the argument advanced by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and submits that the judgments passed by both the Courts are as per law after considering the entire evidence, thus the relief sought by the Revision Petitioner at this stage be refused by this Court.

9. Considering the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and the learned Government Advocate for the Respondent, this Court is of the view that the Trial Court has failed to appreciate the evidence on record and the judgment was passed without



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

considering the entire materials place before it and during trial the Revision petitioner was also on bail.

10. Further, it is observed that when the accused has been under incarceration for sometime and when there are points in the revision, which favour the accused, then the Courts should not shy from granting suspension of sentence, as the liberty of the individual would be at stake if the revision results in acquittal at a later point of time. In this regard, the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Rabi Prakash Vs. The State of Odhisha reported in 2023 Live Law (SC) 533*** is of relevance.

11. The Revision Petitioner has raised substantial grounds in the Revision which require detailed appraisal. Further, the Revision is not likely to be taken up in the near future. In such view of the matter, this Court is of the view that the Revision petitioner is entitled to the relief of suspension of sentence and bail.



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

WEB COPY

12. Accordingly, the relief of suspension of sentence and bail is granted to Revision Petitioner namely Chelladurai, S/o.Nataraj Devar, on the following conditions:

- (i) The Revision petitioner shall surrender before the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kumbakonam, within three weeks from today and on such surrender, the revision petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a personal bond along with two sureties for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each subject to furnishing undertaking that he will co-operate in the hearing of the present Revision.
- (ii) The Revision petitioner and sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the bond and the above said Court may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity; and;
- (iii) The realization of fine, if any, shall also remain suspended during the pendency of the present Revision.



WEB COPY



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

- (iv) The Revision Petitioner shall appear before the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kumbakonam, once in every month, ie., on the first working day, commencing from the month of December 2025, at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

13. On acceptance of his bail bonds and sureties, the learned Trial Court shall transmit photostat copies thereof to this Court for being kept on records of this Revision.

14. With the above directions, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is **ordered**.

18.11.2025

Nsr



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

To:

- 1.The Additional District and Sessions Court,
(Fast Track Court), Kumbakonam.
- 2.The Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kumbakonam.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Seitunganallur Police Station,
Prevention of Idol Theft Cell,
Southern Region,
Tirunelveli Zone.
(Crime No.379/2004)
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

SHAMIM AHMED, J.

Nsr

Order made in
Crl.MP(MD)No.14525 of 2025
in
Crl.RC.(MD)No.1337 of 2025

Dated: 18.11.2025