



WEB COPY



Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16548 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 10.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.M.P(MD)No.16548 of 2025

in

Crl.A(MD)No.1184 of 2025

Yoburaja

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Tamil Nadu rep.
by the Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kamudhi, Ramanathapuram District.
Crime No.5 of 2016.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 430(1) of BNSS, to suspend the sentence of imprisonment imposed in S.C.No.11 of 2017 on the file of the learned Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethi Mandram (FTC) Ramanathapuram, dated 24.10.2025 and enlarge the petitioner/appellant on bail pending disposal of the above appeal.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Mayil Vahana Rajendran,

For Respondent : Mr.K.Gnanasekaran,
Government Advocate (criminal Side)



Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16548 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been filed to suspend the sentence imposed in S.C.No.11 of 2017 on the file of the learned Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethi Mandram (FTC) Ramanathapuram, dated 24.10.2025 and enlarge the petitioner/appellant on bail pending disposal of the above appeal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and the victim girl were in love with each other; that on 08.05.2016, at about 11.45 p.m., the petitioner called the victim over the phone and requested her to come to the motor pump-set, and that when she came there, he had sexual intercourse. When the same was known to the victim's parents, they went to the petitioner's house along with their relatives to talk about the marriage between the petitioner and the victim, but the accused 2 to 5 refused to talk with them and caused criminal intimidation. On the basis of the complaint lodged, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.5 of 2016 for the alleged offences under Sections 417, 376(2)(n), 506(2) IPC.



Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16548 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The respondent police, after completing the investigation, has filed the final report and the case was taken on file in S.C.No.11 of 2017 and the same was pending before the learned Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Ramanathapuram.

4. During trial, the prosecution examined 19 witnesses as P.W.1 to P.W.19 and exhibited 14 documents as Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.14. The accused exhibited two documents as Ex.D.1 and Ex.D.2.

5. The learned Sessions Judge, upon considering the evidence, both oral and documentary and on hearing the arguments on both the sides, has passed the impugned judgment dated 24.10.2025 convicting the petitioner/accused for the offence under Section 417 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.3,000/- in default to undergo two months simple imprisonment and acquitted him for the offence under Section 376(2)(n) and 506(ii) of IPC. The Trial Court has suspended the sentence imposed on the petitioner till 22.11.2025. Challenging the above said conviction and sentence, the



Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16548 of 2025

petitioner has preferred the present Criminal Appeal along with the above Miscellaneous Petition seeking suspension of sentence.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the State would submit that there are enough materials available on record against the petitioner and hence, he strongly opposed to grant suspension of sentence.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there are several infirmities in the prosecution case and further there are contradictions in material particulars between the evidence of the prosecution witnesses. He would further submit that the petitioner has already paid the fine amount.

8. This Court has carefully considered the rival contentions put forward by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the State and also perused the materials available on record.



Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16548 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner pointed out that certain infirmities and inconsistencies in this case and also certain contradictions in material particulars. The fact remains that there are arguable points involved in this criminal appeal and further the criminal appeal is not likely to be taken up for final hearing in the near future and considering the health issues, this Court is of the view that the petitioner herein is entitled to the relief of suspension of sentence.

10. In the result, the Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is ordered. Accordingly, the relief of suspension of sentence and bail is granted to the petitioner on the following conditions :

(i) the petitioner is directed to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethi Mandram (FTC), Ramanathapuram ;

(ii) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the learned Trial Judge may obtain a copy of any valid identity proof to ensure their identity ;



Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16548 of 2025

(iii) The petitioner shall appear before the trial Court once in a month i.e., on the first working day of every English calendar month at 10.30 a.m., until further orders and if he is not able to appear before the trial Court on any day, he shall make arrangements to file an application under Section 317 of Cr.P.C (355 of BNSS) and shall appear before the trial Court on any other day in lieu of the date of his absence, as directed by the trial Court.

10.11.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
das

To

- 1.The Sessions Judge, Magalir Neethi Mandram
(FTC), Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kamudhi, Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.M.P.(MD)No.16548 of 2025

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

Order made in
Crl.M.P(MD)No.16548 of 2025
in
Crl.A(MD)No.1184 of 2025

Dated: 10.11.2025