



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.1493 of 2026

1.Dr.S.G.Suryah
2.Vignesh
3.Padmanaban
4.Manikandan
5.Hari Prasath
6.Lal Prasath

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,
The Inspector of Police,
G-1, Vepery Police Station,
Chennai. (Crime No.16 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.16 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.Ananthakrishna
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 296(b), 115(2), 196(1)(a), 189(2),
309(6), 351(2), 352 r/w 3(5) of BNS, in Crime No.16 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 television channel, and that, during the said programme, the petitioners, headed by A1 surrounded the victim, assaulted him with hands and legs, and snatched her chain. Hence the case has been registered against the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the alleged occurrence have taken place on 09.01.2026, whereas the FIR was lodged only on 16.01.2026, resulting in a delay of seven days. He further submitted that the said delay clearly indicates a false complaint and that the petitioners are ready to cooperate with the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that it is not the case of attacking the defacto complainant alone but it is the case of the chain snatching. He further submitted that the petitioners claim themselves to be political party leaders 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 of seven days in registering the FIR, therefore, 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.1493 of 2026

(3/3)

28.01.2026