

W.P.M.P.Crl.No.839 of 2025
in
W.P.No.1791 of 2025
and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.12.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

W.P.M.P.Crl.No.839 of 2025

in

W.P.No.1791 of 2025

and

H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

A.Kamala
W/o.Late Achimuthu

... Petitioner
in all petitions

-vs-

1. The Inspector of Police,
J1-Saidapet Police Station,
Chennai (Crime No.519 of 2025).
2. The Inspector of Police,
S8 - Adambakkam Police Station,
Chennai. (Crime No.377 of 2025)
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Puzhal Central Prison - II
Puzhal, Chennai.

... Respondents
in all petitions

Prayer in W.P.M.P.No.839 of 2025 : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to enlarge the petitioner's son A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607), who is presently confined in Central Prison-II, Puzhal on Temporary Bail for the purpose of undergoing necessary medical treatment, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition.

Prayer in W.P.No.1791 of 2025 : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to forthwith provide the petitioner's son A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607) S/o.Achimuthu, aged about 49 years, confined in Central Prison-II, Puzhal, with specialized medical treatment, including a comprehensive evaluation and appropriate medical monitoring by a Cardiologist and a Diabetologist and consequently, forbearing the respondents from subjecting the petitioner's son Shankar @ Savukku Shankar to any further custodial harassment prejudicial to his health.

Prayer in H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, forbearing the 3rd respondent from isolating the petitioner's son, A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607), S/o.Achimuthu, aged about 49 years, from other inmates and from subjecting him to solitary confinement at Central Prison - II, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Ramamoorthy
in all petitions for Mr.L.Christopher

W.P.M.P.Crl.No.839 of 2025
in
W.P.No.1791 of 2025
and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

For Respondents : Mr.M.Suresh Kumar
in all petitions Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

COMMON ORDER

(By.S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.,)

The present WPMP(Crl.) No.839 of 2025 has been filed to enlarge the petitioner's son Mr.A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607), who is presently confined in Central Prison-II, Puzhal on temporary bail for the purpose of undergoing necessary medical treatment, pending disposal of the above writ petition.

2. The facts in brief as narrated in the affidavit by the petitioner, who is the mother of the prison inmate would show that Mr.A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar a video journalist and the CEO of Savukku Media (OPC) Private Limited, has been engaged in exposing corruption and malpractices in various Governmental and Administrative Functions through his YouTube Channel, "Savukku Media". Due to his whistle blowing activities and investigative journalism, the petitioner's son has been subjected to continuous hardship and harassment by the

authorities, who are attempting to silence him. Unable to tolerate the exposure of illegalities, misuse of power and the critiques and comments made by the petitioner's son, the politicians wielding power and police officials have persistently foisted one criminal case after another against him. The detention order was passed against the petitioner's son on 12.05.2024 which was set aside by the High Court. Thereafter another detention order came to be issued and before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the Government itself withdrew the said detention order.

3. As far as the present writ petition is concerned, the petitioner would submit that one Nithish is engaged as an Anchor in the Shankar's media platform, "Savukku Media". On 12.12.2025, an unknown person transferred a sum of Rs.94,000/- to Nithish's mobile number linked with his Gpay account without any authorisation. While the said Nithish was in the process of lodging a complaint regarding the unauthorised transfer of money, the police abruptly arrested the petitioner's son on 13.12.2025, alleging that an FIR had been registered on 12.12.2025. It is pertinent to note that the alleged Gpay transfer is stated to have taken place at about 3.30 p.m. on 12.12.2025, whereas the FIR was registered at 7.45 p.m. on the same day and the 1st respondent arrived to secure him at

6.30 a.m. on 13.12.2025. The sequence and timing of these events clearly establish that the alleged transfer was orchestrated as a trap to falsely implicate the petitioner's son and secure his arrest in a fabricated criminal case. Several other facts and registration of various other criminal case as narrated in the affidavit would show that the petitioner's son has been frequently harassed by the Law Enforcement Agency.

4. This Court is unable to understand as to why one particular individual, who is an YouTube Journalist has repeatedly been incarcerated by the Law Enforcement Agency. It raises suspicion as to whether the petitioner's son herein has become a target of the ruling dispensation as alleged by her. The history of this individual showcases instances where Goondas Act has been invoked against this individual repeatedly for expressing his views on YouTube videos on the actions of the State Government. It was brought to the notice of this Court that on 12.05.2024, a detention order was passed against the petitioner's son Mr.A.Shankar (Shankar @ Savukku Shankar S/o.Achimuthu) under Act-IV of 1982. The detention order was set aside by this Court in its order dated 09.08.2024 in H.C.P.No.1163 of 2024 and immediately on the third day after the first detention order was set aside, a second detention order was passed on

12.08.2024. This raises serious questions as to whether there has been any abuse of process of law on the part of the State Government's Law Enforcement Agency. This is highly unusual where the same individual has been slashed with two detention orders and the 2nd detention order was passed immediately after the 1st detention order was set aside by this Court.

5. Reliance is placed on an earlier order dated 09.08.2024, passed by this Court, wherein judgment was authored by one of us (SMSJ) in the Division Bench, while setting aside the detention order passed against Mr.A.Shankar, holding as under:

“(C) FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND EXPRESSION:

46. This Court shall never stifle or attempt to strangle Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India. The Spirit of Article 19(1)(a) shall be ever evolving and the reasonable restrictions shall also shift its shape to stay in tune with Article 19(1)(a). The vision of our Law Makers is to ensure free voice for all and that shall be protected under the Constitution. The freedom of thought and expression shall be set free and any individual or State Machinery affected by the views of another shall fetch appropriate remedy available under relevant Criminal Laws, Cyber Laws and Defamation Laws instead embarking on indirect censorship by detaining persons under Goondas Act or unnecessary bridling of Article 19(1)(a) will be a hopeless pursuit with no end. Further, scope of conflict in decisions may arise so the best possible

remedy for any aggrieved party is to take appropriate action with the aid of laws in place on commission of offence, if any. Selective detention of persons, spreading false information is also a threat to democracy.

47. In the Age of Internet, informations are overflowing from all quarters and booking each and every person for spreading false information is an impossible exercise. The threshold shall be to see if the publication of information cause any threat to public disorder. There are lakhs of people expressing their view in various forms across various medium. If the State Machinery starts hunting down each and every views and opinion, the voices will neither be brought down nor will this yield any viable result.

48. A People-s Government as large as such should avoid engaging in such fruitless actions. We cannot be a democracy, if we receive same plausible views from all the citizens. There is bound to be discontent, which might be acceptable and unacceptable, but the duty of the State is much larger than engaging in legal battles to prevent such unacceptable opinions. Choice of reaction is with the individual and the State as large as ours should show restraint, when reacting to people-s opinions.

49. A State going behind each and every social media post or YouTube videos will not change any one-s views instead it will make the people feel stifled of their Right to Speech. The beauty of our democracy lies in the Constitutionally guaranteed freedom and when the State Machinery themselves starts stifling with litigations, the people lose a faith in the democracy.

(D) CRITICISM AND UNFAIR OPINION:

50. The Institutions derive powers from the Constitution, which is made by the collective Will of the People of India are working for the people. Our duty is towards the people of our Great Nation. In the course of performance of duty, there is bound to be criticism from all quarters and appropriate remedial measures are to be undertaken, if the dissent holds good. In this

process there is also scope for unacceptable criticism based on false premises and prejudiced views. Can the voices of everyone be strangled to curb these small groups spreading unpleasant opinions? The people consuming information in social media are the best judges of these views and opinions. The Constitutional Institutions cannot indulge in a process to influence the views of the people. Actions of the Institution speaks for themselves and the views may come and go.

(E) SOCIAL MEDIA AND HUMAN MIND IN TANDEM WITH FREEDOM OF SPEECH:

51. There is a need to differentiate between views / opinions and facts. In the absence of any satisfactory ground that the said act caused public disorder, mere publication of false information cannot constitute an offence under Section 3(1) of Act 14 1982. Question also arises with reference to expression of one-s own opinions / views through social media platforms. How far can these expressions be made accountable? This gives rise to another relevant question. Whether the social media opinions influence us or does our already influenced mind search for content that aligns with our opinions? The choice of viewership is with the consumer. At an innate level, based on the parts of information at the disposal of a person, he tends to form an opinion based on what he perceives to be the truth. Once we perceive certain information with our own prejudiced values and morals, we tend to form an opinion by merging the unverified information with our own inborn principles and values and we tend to form a judgement about a particular person or the political ideologies or a political leader or a political party so on and so forth. But this cannot be ordained as the Truth. It is a -mind perceived truth- which may differ from one person to another.

52. Views and opinions are subjective and based on one-s own perception of information available at their disposal. No one can alter or change other-s views or opinions. Once the power to change others views is taken away, a human mind then tries to

block their views from reaching others. But is this the right way to go about? How many views/opinions can be blocked? Can we change the thoughts of a human mind, we can to some extent curtail the speech and expression but freedom of thought cannot be touched. It is the most unbridled.

53. Each and every human mind is different. The information at one's disposal is processed differently by each mind. The external interference in shaping people's opinions is limited only to the extent of delivery of information but how the mind processes and takes it further on is purely subjective and changes from person to person.

54. It is with all these innate perceptions in mind that the viewer states viewing his/her preferred content on social media. The news content providers post their own perceptions on the social media platform. So the viewer tends to connect himself/herself to the content provider, who provides content aligning or affirming his/her own views. Viewers, who find contradictory content not ascribing to their own notions tend to disregard such content or criticise such content. This has so far been the basic nature of social media operation in today's scenario. So addressing the question aforewith, the content provider may not be held solely responsible for influencing a viewer, It can also be taken in another context that a viewer with a pre conceived notion has found affirmation in the views of a content provider. So the social media content is not thrust upon and pressurised into a viewer. The choice to consume a content is always at the disposal of the viewer. The viewer has a right to know the opinions of a fellow citizen on the policies or actions of the government or any other institution working for the people. Censorship against such views is unhealthy for good governance.

55. Dissenting views may be in different mediums, forms, languages. Some may even be unfair and prejudicial. If an individual feels affected by such views he/she can proceed against such content providers in manner known to law. But

institutions like the State and its Machinery shall impose restraint, when taking legal course of action against its own citizen.

56. To illustrate further; 'Y' may post a content unfairly criticising a policy of the government which though a good policy and is in accordance with the laws in force. But 'Y' feels that it is a wrong policy and has to go. 'A', 'B' and 'C' are viewers watching the content. 'A' agrees with 'Y', 'B' agrees partially and 'C' does not agree with 'Y'. 'A', 'B', 'C' is believed to have their own views about the said policy. Can it be said that 'Y' is influencing them against the government thereby causing public disorder with his opinions.

57. The only difference is that 'Y' freely expressed his views whereas 'A', 'B' and 'C' stopped short of expressing their views. Instead they chose to agree or disagree with Y's view by sharing the content with others. Can viewership of such content itself be made an act of inducing public disorder. **Therefore, by taking such stricter construction of content on social media the State is embarking on a never ending, unproductive journey. The spirit of Article 19(1)(a) will begin to loose its sheen through such endless narrowing down of its contours.** Instead focus must be placed on allowing a harmonious expansion of Article 19(1)(a) and at the same time striking a balance through effective regulatory mechanisms not encroaching too far into Article 19(1)(a).

6. The allegations in the affidavit are serious in nature alleging mental harassment and repeated harassment meted out to the petitioner's son. This can cause serious disrepute to the Law Enforcement Agency. This Court has time and again reiterated that due process of law shall not be misused to target specific individuals, who have fallen out of favour with

the State Government. The professionalism and discipline of the uniformed personnel shall not be compromised under any circumstances by indulging in such forceful action unnecessarily. This series of allegations and the nature and mode of arrest as detailed in the affidavit raise suspicion as to the veracity of the allegations against the petitioner's son.

7. The repeated clamping down of an individual, who has the right to dissent under Article 19(1)(a) will not send right signal to the citizens of our great nation. This Court feels that the right to personal liberty of Mr.A.Shankar / Prisoner under Article 21 has been repeatedly curtailed, which can only be construed as an abuse of process of law.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arnab Manoranjan Goswami vs The State of Maharashtra**, reported in **AIR 2021 SC 1** observed as follows:

“61 Mr Kapil Sibal, Mr Amit Desai and Mr Chander Uday Singh are undoubtedly right in submitting that the procedural hierarchy of courts in matters concerning the grant of bail needs to be respected. However, there was a failure of the High Court to discharge its adjudicatory function at two levels – first in PART J declining to evaluate prima facie at the interim stage in a petition for quashing the FIR as to whether an arguable case

has been made out, and secondly, in declining interim bail, as a consequence of its failure to render a prima facie opinion on the first. The High Court did have the power to protect the citizen by an interim order in a petition invoking Article 226. Where the High Court has failed to do so, this Court would be abdicating its role and functions as a constitutional court if it refuses to interfere, despite the parameters for such interference being met. The doors of this Court cannot be closed to a citizen who is able to establish prima facie that the instrumentality of the State is being weaponized for using the force of criminal law. Our courts must ensure that they continue to remain the first line of defense against the deprivation of the liberty of citizens. Deprivation of liberty even for a single day is one day too many. We must always be mindful of the deeper systemic implications of our decisions.

62. It would be apposite to extract the observations made, albeit in a dissenting opinion, by one of us (Dhananjaya Y Chandrachud, J.) in a decision of a three judge bench in *Romila Thapar vs Union of India*³⁸: —[T]he basic entitlement of every citizen who is faced with allegations of criminal wrongdoing, is that the investigative process should be fair. This is an integral component of the guarantee against arbitrariness under Article 14 and of the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21. If this Court were not to stand by the principles which we have formulated, we may witness a soulful requiem to liberty. □ (2018) 10 SCC 753 PART J The decision was a dissent in the facts of the case. The view of the leading majority judgment is undoubtedly the view of the court, which binds us. However, the principle quoted above is in line with the precedents of this court.

63 More than four decades ago, in a celebrated judgment in *State of Rajasthan, Jaipur vs Balchand*³⁹, Justice Krishna Iyer pithily reminded us that the basic rule of our criminal justice system is bail, not jail⁴⁰. The High Courts and Courts in the district judiciary of India must enforce this principle in practice,

and not forego that duty, leaving this Court to intervene at all times. We must in particular also emphasise the role of the district judiciary, which provides the first point of interface to the citizen. Our district judiciary is wrongly referred to as the subordinate judiciary'. It may be subordinate in hierarchy but it is not subordinate in terms of its importance in the lives of citizens or in terms of the duty to render justice to them. High Courts get burdened when courts of first instance decline to grant anticipatory bail or bail in deserving cases. This continues in the Supreme Court as well, when High Courts do not grant bail or anticipatory bail in cases falling within the parameters of the law. The consequence for those who suffer incarceration are serious. Common citizens without the means or resources to move the High Courts or this Court languish as undertrials. Courts must be alive to the situation as it prevails on the ground – in the jails and police stations where human dignity has no protector. As judges, we would do well to remind ourselves that it is through the instrumentality of bail that our criminal justice system's primordial interest in preserving the presumption of innocence finds its most (1977) 4 SCC 308 These words of Justice Krishna Iyer are not isolated silos in our jurisprudence, but have been consistently followed in judgments of this Court for decades. Some of these judgments are: State of U.P. vs Amarmani Tripathi, (2005) 8 SCC 21 and Sanjay Chandra vs CBI, (2012) 1 SCC 40. PART J eloquent expression. The remedy of bail is the —solemn expression of the humaneness of the justice system 41. Tasked as we are with the primary responsibility of preserving the liberty of all citizens, we cannot countenance an approach that has the consequence of applying this basic rule in an inverted form. We have given expression to our anguish in a case where a citizen has approached this court. We have done so in order to reiterate principles which must govern countless other faces whose voices should not go unheard.

9. In the case of **Mukesh Kishanpuria vs. State of West Bengal**, reported in **(2010) 15 SCC 154**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the power to grant regular bail includes the power to grant interim bail, particularly in view of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

10. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Arvind Kejriwal v. Directorate of Enforcement**, reported in **2024 INSC 400** held as follows:

“13. Athar Pervez v. State⁸, a judgment of the Delhi High Court authored by one of us (Sanjiv Khanna), on the power to grant interim bail in cases registered under the NDPS Act, in addition to the judgments noted, refers to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra and others, which decision leans on the Constitutional Bench judgment in Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia and Others v. State of Punjab¹⁰, and Central Inland Water Transport Corporation Limited and Another v. Brojo Nath Ganguly and Another¹¹, and observes: “20. The expression “interim” bail is not defined in the Code. It is an innovation by legal neologism which has gained acceptance and recognition. The terms, “interim” bail/“interim” suspension of sentence, have been used and accepted as part of legal vocabulary and are well known expressions. The said terms are used in contradistinction and to distinguish release on regular bail during pendency of trial or appeal till final adjudication. Applications for “interim” suspension or bail are primarily moved and prayed for, when the accused or convict is not entitled to or cannot be granted regular bail or suspension of sentence, or the application for grant of regular bail is pending consideration and is yet to be decided. “Interim” bail entailing temporary release

can be granted under compelling circumstances and grounds, even when regular bail would not be justified. Intolerable grief and suffering in the given facts, may justify temporary release, even when regular bail is not warranted. Such situations are not difficult to recount, though making a catalogue would be an unnecessary exercise.”

14. Power to grant interim bail is commonly exercised in a number of cases. Interim bail is granted in the facts of each case. This case is not an exception.”

11. It is pertinent to note that the petitioner’s son herein is a Cardiac Patient and underwent a major cardiac procedure with two stents implanted due to 95% blockages in his coronary arteries and is also stated that he is a chronic diabetic. Article 21 includes the right to health, which is an important facet of the Constitution of India and it extends to the Prison Inmates and is widely recognised as a fundamental human right. Various instances of mental harassment has been alleged in the affidavit filed by the petitioner.

12. The writ petitioner has today filed yet another habeas corpus petition in HCP No.2754 of 2025 to forbear the Superintendent of Prison, Puzhal, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai from isolating the petitioner’s son Mr.A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607), Son

of Achimuthu, aged about 49 years from other inmates and from subjecting him to solitary confinement at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai.

13. It is informed by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the prisoner is kept in solitary confinement without any valid reason. Therefore, the HCP has been filed urgently.

14. The history regarding the registration of criminal cases against the petitioner's son would show that the Law Enforcement Agency are not only harassing, but causing mental torture to the prisoner as well as to his family members. Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed by the aged mother of the prisoner.

15. Regarding the medical condition of the prisoner, the petitioner has produced the discharge summary given by the Kauvery Hospital, Chenani, which would show that he has underwent a major cardiac surgery with two stents implanted due to 95% block in his coronary arteries.

16. The learned Additional Advocate General produced a copy of medical report signed by the Civil Assistant Surgeon, Central Prison-II, Puzhal stating that the health condition of the prisoner is well maintained.

17. The representation given by the prisoner A.Shankar to the learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai reveals that on 18.12.2025 by 12.00 p.m., the prisoner developed fever and asked for medical treatment. He was taken to Saidapet Government Hospital and the Doctor has taken ECG test and found variation. They referred the prisoner to the Government Royapettah Hospital for opinion. When the prisoner asked as to why he is being referred to GRH, the Medical officer replied, considering the past cardiac history, they do not want to take a chance. The prisoner was given few medicines and asked to lie down. After about 20 minutes, the same Doctor changed his opinion and gave a different opinion that all is well with his health. The prisoner told the Doctor that there will not be proper medical facility inside the prison and the prisoner expressed his apprehension about his health. But the same Doctor, who decided to refer the prisoner to GRH and did not want to take any chance, said "Nothing to worry".

18. The learned Magistrate has recorded that heart ailments for chronic diabetics would not give any indication about the cardiac disease. Previously in October 2024 when the prisoner suffered cardiac disease, he did not feel any discomfiture. In prison, there is no proper medical treatment facility for cardiac ailments. Even medical report produced on behalf of the respondent would show that there is no detailed consideration about the past medical history of the prisoner. The Civil Assistant Surgeon, simply issued a report stating that the health condition of the prisoner is good. Therefore, the said report in the absence of clear details regarding the medical history of the prisoner need not be accepted by this Court.

19. In the light of the submissions placed before this Court and taking into consideration the medical condition of the Prison Inmate / petitioner's son and repeated curtailment of his personal liberty, this Court finds it fit to release the petitioner's son / Prisoner, namely, Mr.Shankar on interim bail for a period of 12 weeks **from 26.12.2025** in connection with i) Crime No.60 of 2024 on the file of Kanchipuram S.V.Chathiram Police

Station, ii) Crime No.42 of 2024 on the file of Chennai City D1 Triplicane Police Station, iii) Crime No.221 of 2022 on the file of Chennai City E1 Mylapore Police Station, iv) Crime No.154 of 2024 on the file of Chennai City Delta-4, v) Crime No.323 of 2024 on the file of Chennai City Dlta-1, vi) Crime No.241 of 2024 on the file of Chennai City LFIW-II Gamma-5, vii) Crime No.187 of 2025 on the file of Chennai City C3 Seven Wells Police Station, viii) Crime No.10 of 2025 on the file of Trichy CCD-III, ix) Crime No.17 of 2025 on the file of Chennai City South CCD-1, x) Crime No.185 of 2025 on the file of Chennai City St.Thomas Mount Police Station, xi) Crime No.22 of 2025 on the file of Chennai City South Zone Cyber, xii) Crime No.11 of 2025 on the file of Trichy City Cyber Crime Police Station, xiii) Crime No.377 of 2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent police herein, xiv) Crime No.662 of 2025 on the file of F-3, Nungambakkam Police Station, xv) Crime No.619 of 2025 on the file of F-3, Nungambakkam Police Station, xvi) Crime No.519 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police herein and xvii) Crime No.493 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police herein and he shall surrender before the Prison Authority **on or before 25.03.2026** on the following terms and conditions:

i) The petitioner's son / Prisoner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh Only) before the Superintendent of Prison;

ii) On execution of such bond, the prisoner namely, Mr.A.Shankar @ Savikku Shankar (PID No.450607) shall be released on interim bail forthwith;

iii) The petitioner's son / Prisoner shall not leave the Country without the permission of the concerned jurisdictional Magistrate Court;

iv) The petitioner's son / Prisoner shall not interact with any of the witnesses or make any attempt to hamper or tamper the witnesses involved in the criminal cases

v) The petitioner's son shall inform his place and address of residence with the Investigation Officer and cooperate for investigation;

vi) A copy of the order be sent to the Superintendent of Prison, Puzhal-II, Chennai for information and necessary compliance to release the Prisoner forthwith;

W.P.M.P.Crl.No.839 of 2025
in
W.P.No.1791 of 2025
and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

vii) The grant of interim bail will not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the criminal cases.

(S.M.S,J.,) (P.D.B,J.,)
26.12.2025

Index: Yes
Internet: Yes
ar / mk / ms

Note: Registry is directed to communicate this order by email and ensure that the Prisoner is released from the Prison forthwith.

W.P.M.P.Crl.No.839 of 2025
in
W.P.No.1791 of 2025
and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
P.DHANABAL, J.
ar/mk/ms

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
J1-Saidapet Police Station,
Chennai (Crime No.519 of 2025).
2. The Inspector of Police,
S8 - Adambakkam Police Station,
Chennai. (Crime No.377 of 2025)
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Puzhal Central Prison - II
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

W.P.M.P.Crl.No.839 of 2025
in
W.P.No.1791 of 2025
and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

26.12.2025
(2/2)