WEB COPY

Order QR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.RAMESH

CRL OP No. 30872 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012564172026}

Bharathkumar P

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

Case QR

State rep.by
Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
St.Thomas mount,
Chennai.
Cr.No.19/2026.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with Cr.No.19 of 2026 on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioner(s): Nirmal Krishnan

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Rajasekaran, Govt.Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 64(1), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.19 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and the de-facto

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

complainant were working in the same company. It is alleged that, during an outing, the petitioner compelled the de-facto complainant to consume beer and secretly took her photograph. Thereafter, he threatened to forward the photograph to her husband and induced her to have a physical relationship with him. He also allegedly misbehaved with her by touching her private parts. By continuing to threaten her with the photographs, the petitioner compelled her to accompany him to Yelagiri, where he physically abused her. It is further alleged that the petitioner received Rs.11,000/- through GPay and subsequently demanded another Rs.5 lakhs as a loan, which the de-facto complainant refused. The petitioner thereafter forwarded her photograph to her husband, following which her husband drove her out of the matrimonial home. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any such offences as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent Police reiterated the prosecution case and opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He submitted that the investigation in this

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

case is pending.

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the grave and serious nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner; particularly that he secretly took photographs of the de facto complainant, blackmailed her into a physical relationship, extorted money, and subsequently forwarded the photographs to her husband, resulting in her being driven out of her matrimonial home; and also taking into account that the investigation is at a preliminary stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be required, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

10-11-2026

MPA

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
St.Thomas mount,
Chennai.
Cr.No.19/2026.

2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

N.RAMESH, J.

MPA

CRL OP No. 30872 of 2026

10-11-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis