

**(2026) 06 MAD CK 0236**

**In the Madras High Court**

**Case No : Criminal Original Petition No. 14208 Of 2026**

Vignesh

APPELLANT

Vs

State

RESPONDENT

**Date of Decision : 05-06-2026**

**Acts Referred:**

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 75(2), 125(A), 126(2), 269  
Tamil Nadu Prohibition Of Harassment Of Women Act, 1998 — Section 4

**Citation : (2026) 06 MAD CK 0236**

**Hon'ble Judges : C.Kumarappan, J**

**Bench : Single Bench**

**Advocate : B.Meganathan, S.Yogaraja Sekar**

## Judgement

C.Kumarappan, J

1. The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 19.03.2026 for the alleged offences under Sections 125(a), 126(2), 75(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 r/w Section 4 of the TamilNadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, in Crime No.92 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was found in an intoxicated condition and while riding a motorcycle in a public place, allegedly misbehaved with a woman and caused annoyance to the general public. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the allegations made in the complaint are false and exaggerated and that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. It is further submitted that the case has been foisted against the petitioner due to misunderstanding. The learned counsel would also submit that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 19.03.2026. At this juncture, the learned counsel further submitted that the previous case referred to by the prosecution was also registered on the very same day.

4. The learned Counsel for Government of Tamilnadu (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that this is a case relating to harassment of a woman and that according to the prosecution, the petitioner while under intoxication, misbehaved with the defacto complainant. It is further submitted that one previous case is pending against the petitioner.

5. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side.

6. From the submission of the learned counsel on either side, this Court is of the view that though the allegation relates to harassment of a woman and one previous case is stated to be pending, the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 19.03.2026. Taking into consideration the period of incarceration and the fact that the previous case was also registered on the same day, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only), with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet and subject to the following conditions:

[a] 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 the identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of 30 days 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 the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

[e] on breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions had been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court itself, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)13 SCC 283];

[f] if the petitioner thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR may be registered under Section 269 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.