



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 10187 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-05-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP No. 10187 of 2026

Sathishkumar @ Kannan,
S/o.Chandramohan

..Petitioner

Vs

The State Rep. by,
Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Valasaravakkam,
Tiruvallur District.
(Crime.No.6 of 2026)

..Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.6 of 2026 on the file of Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Valasaravakkam, Tiruvallur District.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Prabakaran

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

For Intervenor : Ms.C.Ritika

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 25.03.2026 for the alleged offence under Sections 75, 79, 351(ii) of BNS / Section 354A, 509 and 506 of IPC, and Sections 67, 66 of Information



Technology Act, and Section 4 of the TNPHW Act, in Crime No.6 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is the maternal uncle of the defacto complainant, who returned to India after completing her MBBS studies in Ukraine. While the petitioner's son was staying with the defacto complainant's family, he clandestinely took private photos of her, which was kept in hidden gallery and sent the same to the petitioner. The petitioner having such photos, started to threaten the defacto complainant to fulfill his lust and continuously harassed her and threatened that he would upload her private photos in the social media and other website. Hence, the case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner neither threatened nor published any post in any social media as alleged in the complaint. But only for the purpose of the case, such exaggerated allegation was made and the ingredients to constitute the offences mentioned in the complaint was not made out. He further submits that he is an innocent person and has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he prayed to grant bail.



4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that though mobile phone was recovered by the investigating agency, however the statement u/s 183 BNSS of the victim has not been recorded. However, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submits that the statement u/s 183 BNSS of the victim has not been recorded. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the nature of the offences, and also considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, and also considering the fact that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing 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 **Judicial Magistrate Court No.1, Poonamallee, Tiruvallur District**, and on further conditions that:-



[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he is suspected;

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

[e] 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 or tamper with the evidence;

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

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

13-05-2026
(2/2)

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
sp



To

WEB COPY

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court No.1,
Poonamallee, Tiruvallur District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Valasaravakkam,
Tiruvallur District.

3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai.

4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 10187 of 2



P.DHANABAL, J.

sp

CRL OP No. 10187 of 2026

13-05-2026
(2/2)