



Crl.OP.No.28794 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.28794 of 2025

V.Ajay

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by
The Station House Officer,
Sethiyathope Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
(Cr.No.234 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Cr.No.234 of 2025 on the file of the Station House Officer, Sethiyathope Police Station, Cuddalore District.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Rajmohan

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 11.10.2025 for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 77, 78, 79



and 351(3) of BNS r/w Section 66E, 67, 67E of IT Act 2000 in Crime No.234 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he developed a relationship with the defacto complainant through WhatsApp and used to make video calls to her. Thereafter, he allegedly started threatening the defacto complainant by stating that he was in possession of certain obscene photographs of her and had committed certain unnatural acts. Since she refused to continue the relationship, on 08.10.2025, the petitioner allegedly sent various obscene videos and photographs of the defacto complainant to her husband and other relatives. When the same was questioned, the petitioner is said to have criminally intimidated them indiscriminately. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that there was no relationship whatsoever between the petitioner and the defacto complainant and that a false complaint has been lodged against him. He further submitted that the petitioner did not possess any such photographs and therefore prayed that anticipatory bail may be granted to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that



certain photographs have been seized from the petitioner's mobile phone, which has been sent for forensic examination. He further submitted that the investigation is still at a nascent stage and that the petitioner was arrested only on 11.10.2025. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner is alleged to have recorded the videos and photographs of the victim and subsequently threatened her, and that when the defacto complainant refused to accede to his demands, he had sent her obscene photographs to her husband and other relatives, and as the investigation is still pending, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

25.10.2025

Vv



Crl.OP.No.28794 of 2022

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-I,
Chidambaram.
2. The Station House Officer,
Sethiyathope Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.28794 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.28794 of 2025

25.10.2025