



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 15153 of 2026

Chandra Sekar
F2, No 48/38, 1st Floor,
Bhuvi Flats, Dhanapal Street,
Kodambakkam Road,
West Mambalam Post,
Chennai - 600 033.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
E3, Teynampet Police Station,
Teynampet,
Chennai.
Crime No.208 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)


PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.208 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.G.Senthil Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.N.Palanivel
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

Order

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 329(4), 296(b), 319, 351(2), of BNS r/w Section 4 of TNPWH Act, in Crime No.208 of 2026, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that a false complaint was lodged by one Mr. Murali, on 07.06.2026, alleging that the petitioner and two others impersonated police constables attached to the respondent police station and summoned the de facto complainant. It is further alleged that the petitioner, who is an advocate, contacted the impersonators and demanded money for settling the issue. Upon verifying with the respondent police station, the de facto complainant came to know that no such enquiry had been initiated by the police. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is ready and willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, submitted that the petitioner is having one previous case under City Police Act. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent.



6. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and also perused the records available.

WEB COPY

7. From the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), it is seen that the petitioner is involved in one previous case under City Police Act, considering the attitude of this petitioner, he appears to be a man of recidivism. Considering such conduct and attitude of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Further, if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, there exists a reasonable apprehension that he may be emboldened to indulge in similar offences in future. Hence, it is not desirable to enlarge him on anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

16-06-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

AH

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
E-3, Teynampet Police Station,
Teynampet, Chennai.

2.The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet, Chennai.

3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 15153 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN J.

AH

CRL OP No. 15153 of 2026

16-06-2026