

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENNAI

Present: Thiru.S.Karthikeyan, M.A., M.L., M.Sc., PGDCFSc., PGDDF.,

Principal Sessions Judge.

Monday, the 15th day of June, 2026.

Crl.M.P.No.4906/2026

in

R-10, M.G.R.Nagar P.S. Crime No.157/2026

S.Shakir

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R-10, M.G.R.Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before this court for hearing in the presence of M/s.D.Manickavelu and V.Senthilkumar, the Counsel for the petitioner and of the CPP for respondent police and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.05.2026 for the offences punishable under Section 126(2), 75(1), 351(3) of BNS r/w 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.157/2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner herein, who found the defacto complainant on the road, stopped his vehicle and subjected her to sexual harassment.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner's name was not found in the first information report. It was not made clear as to how the petitioner was identified by the respondent police. The petitioner was falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays for bail.

4. Per contra, the learned CPP has submitted that the petitioner herein, who came in a motor-cycle, stopped his motorcycle, on seeing the defacto complainant on the road, he misbehaved with her. The involvement of the petitioner was identified through CCTV and he produced the video footage recording in a pendrive

for perusal of the court. He strongly opposed the petition as it is a crime against woman.

5. This court has given its thoughtful consideration to the rival submission put forth by either side. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner herein has given sexual harassment to the defacto complainant. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that it was not made clear as to how the involvement of the petitioner was identified. From the CCTV recordings produced by the learned CPP, it is found that the petitioner is the one who had driven the motorcycle, stopped his motorcycle and had interaction with the defacto complainant, subsequently, with fear, the defacto complainant was running through the road. The CCTV footages prima facie shows the involvement of the petitioner herein. As contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it requires a deep and thorough investigation, including the forensic examination of the CCTV footage. At this stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Dictated to Steno-typist, typed by him directly, corrected and pronounced by me in open court this the 15th day of June, 2026.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge