



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.35355 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 26.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

CrI.O.P.No.35355 of 2025

Nijamuddin

... Petitioner / Accused No.5

Vs

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police
R-11 Ramapuram Police Station
Chennai.
(Crime No.141/2024)

... Respondent / Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.Senthilvel

For Respondent : Mr.R.Vinothraja
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner / A5 who apprehends arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 3(2)(a), 4(1), 5(1)(a) of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956, in connection with Cr.No.141 of 2024, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that as per the orders of Inspector of Police, when the Assistant Inspector. R11 Ramapuram Police Station was on duty on 30.03.2024 at 1300 hours near Arasamaram Junction, one Manoharan had approached him and informed him that one of his friend is running a Family Saloon & Spa, in which girls are available for brothel. He took him to the Spa Centre and introduced his friends Shankar (alias) Indran and Ganesan. Few girls who were exploited for prostitution were shown to him and demanded Rs.3,000/-. The complainant somehow managed and left that place and came straight to the police station, and requested his higher officials to rescue those girls who are in the clutches of the accused persons. Hence, a case was registered in Cr.No.141/2024 for the alleged offences under Sec.3(2)(a), 4(1), 5(1)a of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the FIR was registered against three accused namely Manokaran, Sankar (a) Indiran and Ganeshan. The name of the petitioner do not find place in the FIR, however he has been implicated as A5. The petitioner would submit that he is working as a Coiffeur in the Spa Centre and there is no specific overtact attributed to him. He was not present in the scene of occurrence and has been falsely implicated in the case. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent would submit that investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature, however, co-accused A1 to A3 who were arrested, were already released on bail. There is no previous case pending as against the petitioner (A5). Since the petitioner had indirectly involved in the alleged offence, this Court may dismiss the anticipatory bail petition now filed by him.

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

6. Considering the nature of the offences and that the co-accused were already released on bail and that the petitioner (A5) who is working as Coiffeur in the Spa and also no previous case is pending against him, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Poonamallee**, on condition that the petitioners shall 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 Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

WEB COPY

[a] the petitioner shall report before the respondent-police daily at 10.30 a.m., for 30 days.

[b] 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 him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

[c] the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned 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].

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.2023.

26.12.2025

ds/nvi

4/5



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.35355 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.,

ds/nvi

Crl.O.P.No.35355 of 2025

26.12.2025