



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CrI.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

Rajaram

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By the Inspector of Police,
K-4, Anna Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.
(Crime No.115 of 2026)

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner's
anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.115 of 2026 pending
investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Karthik

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

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent
police for the offences punishable under Sections 125, 272, 318(3), 336(2) of
the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Section 15 of the Indian Medical
Council Act, 1956. Subsequently, the FIR was altered to include Sections 123
1/6



Crl.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Section 15(3) of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956. The altered Sections are 123, 125, 272, 318(3), 336(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, r/w Section 15(3) of Indian Medical Council Act, 1956, which corresponds to Sections 328, 336, 270, 418, 465 and 120B of Indian Penal Code, 1860, in Crime No.115 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that a medical inspection team headed by the Joint Director (Law), Directorate of Medical and Rural Health Services, inspected a clinic functioning in the name and style of “Mister Hair Clinic”, where the petitioner was working as an Anaesthesia Assistant. The inspection team found that no qualified Allopathic doctor was present and that anaesthesia assistance was being given by unqualified persons to the patients. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has authorisation to operate the facility and has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the co-accused/A3, A4, A5 and A8 have already been enlarged on bail by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of

2/6



Crl.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police opposed the anticipatory bail application on the ground that there are totally eight accused in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2. He further submitted that the petitioner has no authorisation and that there were no properly qualified persons to run the clinic.

5. Taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances and taking note of the fact that the co-accused/A3, A4, A5 and A8 have already been enlarged on bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.Nos.5445, 6228, 6320 and 7674 of 2026, dated 04.03.2026, 11.03.2026, 13.02.2026 and 26.03.2026 respectively, this Court is of the firm view that, in order to maintain parity with the earlier orders in the said Crl.O.Ps., and at this stage, no custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail, subject to the following conditions:

6. 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



Crl.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

the date on which the order copy is made ready, before the learned V

Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, 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, 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 daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of four weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(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



Crl.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

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.

21.04.2026

cda

To

- 1.The V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
K-4, Anna Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

Crl.O.P.No.9933 of 2026

21.04.2026