

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Wednesday, the 17th day of June, 2026.

Crl.M.P.No.4947/2026

and

Crl.M.P.No.5306/2026

(Intervene Petition)

in

Central Crime Branch Crime No.62/2026

Tiruchi Suriyaa

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Cell-I,
Central Crime Branch, Vepery,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before this court for hearing in the presence of M/s.S.Vinoth Kumar and G.C.Nelson Britto, the Counsel for the petitioner and of M/s.M.Mohammed Riyaz, the Special Public Prosecutor for respondent police and of M/s.D.R.Law Chambers, Dhanaram Ramachandran, R.Devi, A.G.Vinodh Choudary, R.Reka, S.Elakiya and A.Samyuktha, the counsel for the intervenor and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 04.06.2026 for the offences punishable under Section 75(3), 79 of BNS and u/s 67 of the IT Act and u/s 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.62/2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the 1st accused, who is a Youtuber, had called the petitioner / 2nd accused for a podcast, which commenced on 22.05.2026 and the said video was uploaded to Youtube on the same day. It was the 1st accused who had mentioned about the defacto complainant and had initiated conversation with the petitioner / 2nd accused with respect to the defacto complainant's new born children and that the petitioner / 2nd accused was merely making statements with respect to the same and that the same would not attract the alleged sections as mentioned in the FIR. The petitioner is innocent and a law

abiding citizen and has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody from 04.06.2026. Hence, prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor submits that the petitioner had defamatory comments on the defacto complainant and her two new born children and uploaded the vide through online. He was arrested on 04.06.2026 and detained under Act 14/1982 as per the detention order No.257/BBCDEFGISSSV/2026, dated 16.06.2026. Hence, he strongly opposed the petition.

4. Considering the nature of allegation made against the petitioner and the submission that the petitioner has been detained under Act 14/1982, 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 17th day of June, 2026.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge