



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

V.Anbalagan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
S-8 Inspector Police Station,
Adambakkam PS,
Chennai.
(Crime No.377 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.377 of 2025 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Balaji

For Respondent : Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 351(2), 308(3), 131, 115(2), 109, 353(1)(b) and 61(2) of BNS, in Crime No.377 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



Crl.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution, as per the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, namely P. Magesh, S/o. Purusothaman, who is the producer of the movies “RED” and “FOLLOW”, is that in connection with the said films, the prime accused, Shankar @ Savukku Shankar, a journalist, made false and defamatory statements regarding the said movies, which are yet to be released. It is further alleged that the accused made statements that the said movies were financed out of proceeds of crime derived from the sale of NDPS drugs. The complaint further avers that the prime accused demanded a sum of Rs.10 lakhs from the defacto complainant, and that the defacto complainant, having voluntarily gone to the office of A-1 with a sum of Rs.1 lakh, was forcibly dispossessed of the same, sent out of the office, and threatened with dire consequences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the FIR is dated 02.07.2025, and that the respondent police are attempting to arrest the petitioner despite there being no specific allegation against him in the FIR. The learned counsel would also submit that the co-accused have already been granted bail in Crl.O.P.No.4044 of 2026, dated 03.03.2026.



Crl.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioner cannot seek anticipatory bail as a matter of right merely on the ground that the co-accused have been granted bail. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) further relied upon the order passed by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.2627 of 2026 dated 06.02.2026, wherein this Court accepted the contention of the prosecution that custodial interrogation was essential. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation, the involvement of the petitioner came to light, and therefore custodial interrogation is necessary. It is also contended that if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, it would hamper the effective investigation of the case.

5. This Court, upon consideration of the submissions made by both sides, notes that the FIR was registered on 02.07.2025 and that the FIR names four accused persons. Admittedly, the petitioner has not been named in the FIR. Though the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) contended that the petitioner's involvement was unearthed during the course of investigation, even in the custody application filed by the prosecution, no specific allegation has been made against the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

6. In such circumstances, though it is true that the petitioner cannot claim parity with the co-accused as a matter of right, considering the totality of the circumstances, particularly the fact that the petitioner has not been named either in the FIR or in the custody application, this Court is of the view that the benefit of bail granted to the co-accused may be extended to the petitioner. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain 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 (15) days from the date on which the order copy is made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Alandur, Chennai**, on condition that **the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)**, with **two sureties each**, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further conditions:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned learned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice,



CrI.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

2019]'. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioner shall report before the respondent Police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., until further orders;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]***;

(e) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

17.03.2026

cda

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Alandur, Chennai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
S-8 Inspector Police Station,
Adambakkam PS,
Chennai.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

Crl.O.P.No.6107 of 2026

17.03.2026