



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10126 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 22.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 10126 of 2026

Arokiajohn Bosco

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Sattur Town Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.223 of 2026)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Gowtham
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.C.M.Arumugam

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Cr.No. 223 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 24.04.2026, for the offences punishable under Sections 331(4) and 305(a) of BNS, in Crime No.223 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police,



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10126 of 2026

seeks bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 13.04.2026 when the defacto commercial went to his father-in-law's house at Sattur and stayed there, some persons were entered into the house and stolen 122.200 grams gold jewels, 800 grams silver ornaments and Rs.45,000/-. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he prayed bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (crl. Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that the offence are grave in nature. Part of the properties were recovered. The petitioner has 27 previous cases, out of which 25 previous cases are similar in nature. Hence, he opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that huge quantity of jewels are involved in this case, only part of the jewels along were



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10126 of 2026

recovered. The petitioner has so many previous cases and the entire jewels have to be recovered. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, considering the nature of charges levelled against the petitioner, already the properties were partly recovered, this petitioner was taken into police custody, that was also over, though the prosecution has stated that the petitioner has 27 previous cases, most of the cases were already disposed of and in remaining cases he was already granted bail and considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Sattur**, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the **concerned**



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10126 of 2026

Jurisdictional Magistrate, at 10.30 a.m., on all working days until

WEB COPY further orders:

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he/she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he/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.

(P D B J)
22.06.2026



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10126 of 2026

WEB COPY
To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Sattur.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Sattur Town Police Station,
Virudhunagar District. (Crime No.223 of 2026)
- 3.The Superintendent, Sub Jail, Srivilliputhur.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10126 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 10126 of 2026

Date : 22.06.2026