

(2026) 06 MAD CK 0638

In the Madras High Court

Case No : Criminal Original Petition No. 14695 Of 2026

Venkadesan

APPELLANT

Vs

State

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 11-06-2026

Acts Referred:

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 75, 269, 296(B), 351(2)
Tamil Nadu Prohibition Of Harassment Of Women Act, 1998 — Section 4

Citation : (2026) 06 MAD CK 0638

Hon'ble Judges : G.K. Ilanthiraiyan, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : M. Prema Sudha, S.Yogaraja Sekar

Judgement

G.K. Ilanthiraiyan, J

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.05.2026 and remanded to judicial custody on 20.05.2026 for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 75, 351(2) of BNS and Section 4 of TNPHW Act, 2002 in Crime No.131 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution that the petitioner is that on 20.05.2026 the petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and abused her in filthy language and grabbed the hands of the defacto complainant and tried to hug her and thereby rried to molest her, since she screamed for help, the petitioner escaped from the spot. Hence, a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 20.05.2026 and is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail.

4. The learned Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu (Crl side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the

petitioner there was no previous cases pending against the petitioner. However, he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and also considering the period of incarceration by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. 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) each with two sureties, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate at Madhavaram and on further conditions that:

[a] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

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

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.