



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.1360 of 2026

1.Manikandan  
2.Hari Prasath

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-1, Vepery Police Station,  
Chennai.  
(Crime No.11 of 2026)

.. Respondent

**Prayer:-** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.11 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.C.Paul Kanagaraj  
for Mr.Abhilash Gopinathan

For Respondent : Mr.J.Ravindran, AAG  
assisted by Ms.J.R.Archana  
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

### **ORDER**

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 189(3), 296(b), 115(2), 74, 79, 351(3) of BNS r/w 3(5) BNS r/w 4 of TNPHW Act, in Crime No.11 of 2026 registered on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.



2. ⌚ The allegation against the petitioners is that they allegedly participated in a TV debate programme organised by a political party and that, during the said programme, the petitioners, headed by A1 surrounded the victim lady, assaulted her with hands and legs, pulled her saree, and thereby outraged her modesty. Hence the case has been registered against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the alleged occurrence had taken place on 09.01.2026 at about 20.30 hours, whereas the FIR was lodged only on the next day i.e., on 10.01.2026 at about 8.00 a.m after the defacto complainant was admitted to the hospital. He further submitted that this delay clearly indicates a false complaint. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to cooperate with the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that it is not only the case of attacking the victim, but also the case of the outrage the modesty of the victim. He further submitted that the petitioners claim themselves to be political party leaders required to behave properly in public places and that granting anticipatory bail would encourage them to



indulge in similar offence. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record.

6. On perusal of the FIR and other connected materials, this Court finds that there was a delay in registering the FIR, and nature of injuries alleged, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary for the purpose of investigation. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the *learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai*, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only), each with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left



thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

**(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, daily at 5.30 p.m., for a period of one week and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;**

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioners 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 petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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]***; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

**28.01.2026**

*drl*



**To**

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate,  
Egmore, Chennai.

2. The Inspector of Police,  
G-1, Vepery Police Station,  
Chennai.

3. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

drl

**CRL.O.P.No.1360 of 2026**

(2/3)

**28.01.2026**