

WEB COPY



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23 / 01 / 2026

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in
W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.No(CrI)1791 of 2025 and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

W.P.M.P.No.14 of 2026

1.The State of Tamil Nadu Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J1-Saidapet Police Station, Chennai
(Crime No.519 of 2025)

2.The Inspector of Police,
S8, Adambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.


... Petitioners

Vs.

1. A.Kamala

2. The Superintendent of Prison,
Puzhal Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.

... Respondents



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

Prayer in W.P.M.P.CrI.No.14 of 2026 : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to accept the affidavit and cancel the interim bail granted to respondent/petitioner's son A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607) in W.P.M.P.(CrI.)No.839 of 2025, dated 26.12.2025 passed by this Court and direct the investigation officer / petitioner herein to remand him to judicial custody.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Muniapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John
Advocate

For Respondents : Mr.G.Purushothamman for R1


**W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025
and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025**

A.Kamala
W/o.Late Achimuthu

... Petitioner in
W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839
of 2025 in W.P(CrI)No.1791
of 2025 and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

-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)



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY


3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Puzhal Central Prison - II
Puzhal, Chennai.

... Respondents in
W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839
of 2025 in
W.P(CrI)No.1791 of 2025
and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

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.



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Petitioner in
W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025
and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025 : Mr.G.Purushothamman


For Respondents in
W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025
and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025 : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

Assisted by
Mr.M.Sylvester John
Advocate

COMMON ORDER

(By P.VELMURUGAN. J.,)

This petition in W.P.M.P.(CrI)No.14 of 2026 has been filed seeking cancellation of the interim bail granted to the respondent's son, namely A. Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607), by order dated 26.12.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.M.P.(CrI.) No.839 of 2025, in connection with Crime No.519 of 2025 on the file of J1 Saidapet Police Station.




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. The facts leading to the filing of the present petition are that the respondent's son was arrested on 13.12.2025 for offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 353(1)(c), 308(5), 61(2) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, (in short "BNS") and was remanded to judicial custody. The first respondent / mother of the accused approached this Court seeking interim bail on the ground that her son was suffering from serious cardiac ailments, diabetes and hypertension and required specialised medical treatment. Taking note of the medical condition projected, and considering the repeated curtailment of personal liberty, this Court, by order dated 26.12.2025, granted interim bail for a period of twelve weeks, subject to stringent conditions, including that the accused shall not interact with or intimidate witnesses, shall not tamper with evidence, shall cooperate with the investigation, shall inform his place of residence to the Investigating Officer, and that the grant of interim bail shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the criminal cases. For better appreciation, the relevant conditions are extracted hereunder:-

- 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;



WEB COPY



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

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;

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

As the bail conditions stipulated by this Court vide order dated 26.12.2025 have been violated, the petitioner-State has filed the present petition seeking cancellation of the interim bail granted to the accused.

3.1. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the petitioner-State submitted that though interim bail was granted exclusively for the purpose of medical treatment, the accused merely visited a private




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

hospital as an outpatient and thereafter actively engaged in publishing numerous videos on YouTube and posts on social media platforms, thereby demonstrating that the medical grounds projected before this Court were exaggerated and misleading.

3.2. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submitted that the accused has been threatening and intimidating the complainant and witnesses in the present case through videos and online posts, resulting in several complaints and registration of CSR in different police stations. It was contended that such acts squarely violate the specific condition imposed by this Court restraining the accused from interacting with or intimidating witnesses.

3.3. It was further submitted that the accused has interfered with the investigation by publicly commenting on the merits of the pending cases, disclosing summons issued by the police, refusing to cooperate with the Investigating Officer, suppressing material evidence including mobile phones used for the commission of the offence, and thereafter openly displaying the same on social media platforms with the intent to ridicule the investigative process. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor also




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

submitted that the accused has abused and made defamatory allegations against the Investigating Officers by name, including making false allegations of administering poison during custody, which were never raised before the Magistrate at the relevant time.

3.4. It was also pointed out that the accused has failed to inform his place of residence to the Investigating Officer, has obstructed enquiry by forcibly removing a co-accused from investigation, and has continuously made adverse comments on the merits of the criminal cases, in clear violation of the conditions imposed by this Court. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the cumulative conduct of the accused demonstrates a deliberate attempt to subvert the course of justice and derail a fair investigation. Hence, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor prays to cancel the interim bail granted by this court dated 26.12.2025.

4.1. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/the mother of the accused, submits that the petition for cancellation of bail is wholly misconceived and is yet another attempt by the State to persecute a dissenting journalist under the cloak of law. It is




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

the case of the respondent that her son is a well-known investigative journalist and social activist, who has consistently exposed corruption, maladministration, and abuse of power in the State of Tamil Nadu. He runs a digital media platform titled *Savukku Media*, which has more than eight lakh subscribers and over two thousand videos, and has become a credible voice of dissent. His fearless journalism has brought to light several scams and irregularities, including the “cash-for-jobs” scam, irregularities in Dalit sanitation schemes, corruption in statutory bodies such as CMDA and TASMAL, illegal sand quarrying, custodial killings, fake encounters, and misconduct in sensitive POCSO cases.

4.2. The learned counsel submits that because of these exposés, the accused has been relentlessly targeted by the State machinery. He was dismissed from service in the Vigilance Department for voicing criticism, and thereafter devoted himself full-time to whistle-blowing. From May 2024 onwards, he was subjected to a spate of criminal cases as many as sixteen FIRs were registered against him across different districts arising out of a single interview. In one instance, ganja was allegedly planted in his vehicle after he had already been taken into custody, and in another, he was




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

brutally assaulted inside Coimbatore Central Prison, resulting in fractures to his right hand. These incidents were judicially recorded, with the District Legal Services Authority confirming custodial violence.

4.3. It is further submitted that detention orders branding him as a “Goonda” and later as a “drug offender” were quashed by this Court and condemned by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, which granted him interim protection. The learned counsel highlights that even a Division Bench of this Court recorded in its order that “two highly placed persons” had attempted to influence the judicial process to ensure his continued incarceration, thereby exposing the extent of political animus against him.

4.4. Learned counsel also points out that the accused has also been subjected to unlawful seizures of his professional devices, freezing of bank accounts (including his mother’s pension account), sealing of his office, and leaking of private photographs. In March 2025, his residence was vandalized, with human excreta poured inside. The police, despite being aware, deliberately delayed taking action. The learned Counsel submits that these acts do not amount to lawful enforcement but instead reveal a coordinated attempt to suppress his journalistic activities.




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

4.5. With regard to the medical condition of the accused, the learned counsel submitted that he had undergone major cardiac surgery in October 2024, including stent implantation for 95% arterial blockages, and is also a chronic diabetic. Despite his precarious health condition, he was repeatedly transported across districts under police custody, subjected to solitary confinement, and denied adequate medical care. In these circumstances, the first respondent was constrained to approach this Court by filing W.P.No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025, seeking specialized medical treatment and protection from custodial harassment. Considering the urgency and gravity of the medical condition of the accused, this Court was pleased to enlarge him on interim bail on 26.12.2025.

4.6. The learned counsel strongly denies the allegation that the accused misused the liberty granted. It is submitted that he has scrupulously complied with bail conditions, consulted doctors, undergone medical tests, and continued prescribed medication. The suggestion that he exaggerated his medical condition is unfounded. On the contrary, the police have continued to harass him even after his release, registering




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

further FIRs based on journalistic statements, particularly at the instance of bar owners previously found to be involved in narcotics trafficking. The learned counsel emphasizes that multiple FIRs filed by the same complainant, despite judicial findings against the bar, are clear evidence of malicious prosecution.

4.7. It is further submitted that the allegations of threatening witnesses or intimidating investigating officers are fabricated. The accused has only exercised his constitutionally protected right to free speech under Article 19(1)(a), and his criticisms of police excesses cannot be equated with interference in investigation. The learned counsel stresses that the liberty granted by this Court has not been abused, and that the petition for cancellation of bail is nothing but a continuation of the State's vindictive campaign to silence a dissenting journalist.

4.8. In conclusion, learned counsel submits that the respondent's son has been relentlessly targeted for his journalistic work, subjected to custodial violence, false cases, and malicious prosecution. The interim bail granted by this Court was on sound medical and constitutional grounds,




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

and there has been no violation of its conditions. Hence, the learned
counsel seeks to dismiss the petition.

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

6. It is settled that interim bail, whether granted on medical grounds or otherwise, is not a matter of right but a concession extended by the Court in exceptional circumstances. Such concession is always subject to strict adherence to the conditions imposed, which are intended to balance the liberty of the accused with the fairness and integrity of the investigation and the protection of witnesses. Any conduct that disturbs this balance cannot be lightly overlooked.


7. In the present case, interim bail was granted to the son of the respondent / Mr.A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar (PID No.450607), on 26.12.2025 primarily to enable him to obtain urgent medical treatment for serious cardiac ailments, diabetes, and hypertension, while ensuring that the investigation in Crime No.519 of 2025 was not impeded. Keeping in mind the need to balance these competing interests, this Court imposed



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

strict conditions requiring the son of the respondent to cooperate with the Investigating Officer, provide details of his residence, avoid influencing witnesses, not tamper with evidence, and not interfere with the investigation in any manner. The order granting interim bail was passed without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, and it was clearly stipulated that the continued liberty of the respondent's son was conditional upon strict compliance with the terms imposed.

8. The grievance of the petitioner-State is that the accused has materially violated these conditions. It is alleged that instead of confining himself to medical treatment, the accused has actively engaged in conduct inconsistent with the terms of interim bail, including making public statements and releasing video clippings on social media commenting upon the pending investigation, referring to the complaint, the complainant, the Investigation Officer, and the summons issued, interacting with co-accused, and allegedly intimidating witnesses. It is further alleged that the accused has failed to cooperate with the investigation and has suppressed material information, including his place of residence.



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, the accused concealed the mobile phone used to threaten the complainant and did not cooperate with the investigation. After being released on interim bail, he provided false information about the phone and, on the next day, publicly displayed it on YouTube and other media, asking, “Is it the police who are searching for this?” To substantiate this, he also showed video clippings and included the same clips in the typed set of papers submitted to the Court. Such conduct, prima facie, does not appear to be conducive to the smooth progress of the investigation and raises concerns regarding compliance with the conditions of interim bail.


10. It is further submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor that on 04.01.2026, the Investigation Officer issued summons under Sections 35(3) and 94 of BNSS to A3/Nithish Kumar to appear on 05.01.2026 for enquiry. A3/Nithish Kumar appeared at the petitioner’s premises around 11.00 AM and, after completing the initial enquiry, was asked to wait briefly for signature verification in his statement. In these circumstances, at about 1.25 PM, the accused forcibly took A3/Nithish Kumar without the knowledge of the Investigation Officer and interfered



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

with the enquiry. This conduct further shows that the accused did not cooperate with the investigation and obstructed the co-accused from cooperating and to substantiate this misconduct, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor also produced video clippings.

11. Condition (IV) of the interim bail order dated 26.12.2025 expressly stipulated that the respondent's son, shall not interact with any witnesses or attempt to hamper, influence, or tamper with them in the criminal cases. Despite this clear restriction, the submissions of the learned Additional Public Prosecutor demonstrate that this condition has been materially violated. The respondent's son concealed the mobile phone alleged to have been used to threaten the complainant, provided false information regarding the same after being released on interim bail, and publicly displayed the phone on YouTube and other media. In addition, he forcibly took A3/Nithish Kumar during an ongoing enquiry without the knowledge of the Investigating Officer. These actions obstructed the investigation, intimidated potential witnesses, and clearly constitute a deliberate breach of the interim bail conditions dated 26.12.2025.




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

12. Though the learned counsel for the respondent contended that the accused is entitled to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India, this Court cannot accept the said submission in its absolute form. The right guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a) is subject to reasonable restrictions. When a criminal investigation is pending and the person making such statements is himself an accused, public commentary on the complaint, the complainant, the investigating agency, or the evidence cannot be claimed as a protected right. Such conduct has the potential to prejudice the investigation, influence witnesses, and obstruct the administration of justice, and therefore falls outside the protective ambit of Article 19(1).

13. At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kaushal Kishor v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2023) 4 SCC 1***, wherein it has been held as follows

188.1. Articles 19(1)(a) to (f) of the Constitution guarantee certain fundamental rights to the citizens of India. These fundamental rights are however, subject to reasonable restrictions as enumerated in Articles 19(2) to (6) thereof which could be imposed by the State. These



WEB COPY



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

fundamental rights are in the nature of inalienable rights of man or basic human rights which inhere in all citizens of a free country. Yet, these rights are not unrestricted or absolute, and are regulated by restrictions, which may be imposed by the State, which have to be reasonable. The object of prescribing restraints or reasonable restrictions on the fundamental freedoms is to avoid anarchy or disorder in society. Hence, the Founding Fathers of our Constitution while enumerating the fundamental rights, have alongside prescribed reasonable restrictions in clauses (2) to (6) of Article 19 and the laws enacted within the strict limits of such restrictions are constitutionally permissible.

14. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of ***Jaideep Bose v. M/s. Bid and Hammer Auctioneers Private Limited [(2025) INSC 241]***, held as follows:

"21. Before parting, we find it necessary to emphasise that right to freedom of speech and expression guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India is paramount. At the same time, it is reiterated that those working in the media, particularly, individuals in key positions, authors, etc., must exercise utmost caution and responsibility before publishing any statements, news, or opinions. The power of the media in shaping public opinion is significant and the press possesses the ability to influence public sentiments and alter perceptions, with remarkable speed. As aptly stated by Bulwer Lytton, "The Pen is mightier than the sword". Given its vast reach, a single article or report can resonate with millions, shaping their beliefs and judgments, and it has the capability to cause severe damage to the reputation of those concerned, with consequences that may be far-reaching and enduring. This highlights the critical need for accuracy and fairness in media reporting, especially when dealing with matters having the potential to impact the integrity of individuals or institutions. Keeping these aspects in mind, publication of the news articles must be done in public interest and with good faith."

15. It is also well settled that bail, including interim bail, is liable to be cancelled if the accused misuses the liberty granted or acts in a manner




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

that interferes with the investigation or the administration of justice. Interim bail granted for a limited purpose, particularly on medical grounds, cannot be converted into a licence to engage in conduct that defeats the very object for which such concession was granted. In the present case, as noted above, the respondent's son concealed the mobile phone during interrogation, which was alleged to have been used to threaten the complainant, and subsequently displayed the said device publicly on YouTube and other media platforms on the following day, stating, 'Is it the police who are searching for this?'" Further, during the enquiry, he forcibly took A3/Nithish Kumar in the midst of an ongoing enquiry without the knowledge of the Investigating Officer. These acts clearly obstructed the investigation, had the potential to intimidate witnesses, and amount to a wilful and conscious violation of the interim bail conditions imposed on 26.12.2025, thereby justifying cancellation of the interim bail.

16. In the present case, interim bail was granted solely to safeguard the medical and constitutional rights of the accused. Prima facie, the materials placed on record indicate conduct on the part of the respondent's son which goes beyond this limited purpose and tends to interfere with the ongoing investigation.




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

17. At the same time, having regard to the seriousness of the medical condition of the respondent's son and the medical records produced, this Court is of the view that outright cancellation of interim bail at this stage may not be warranted. However, the conduct complained of cannot be condoned and necessitates strict regulation to safeguard the investigation and the interests of justice.


18. It is also relevant to note that, with regard to the medical condition of the accused, this Court observes that interim bail, though granted on medical exigency, was subject to strict scrutiny. The records placed before the Court reveal that the respondent's son has received treatment at different hospitals at different points in time. It is made clear that there is no restriction on the respondent's son in seeking medical treatment at a hospital of his choice. However, the manner in which such treatment has been pursued, when viewed in the light of the overall conduct placed before the Court, including the attitude of the respondent's son as adverted to earlier, assumes relevance for the limited purpose of



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

examining whether the concession of interim bail is being bona fide

WEB COPY
availed. A perusal of the records indicates that after release pursuant to the interim bail granted by this Court on 26.12.2025, the respondent's son initially took treatment at Kauvery Hospital on 30.12.2025, where he was advised to follow up after two weeks. However, the subsequent records disclose that the respondent's son did not continue treatment at Kauvery Hospital and instead took treatment at Dr.Kamakshi Hospital, where he was admitted on 16.01.2026 and discharged on 17.01.2026. Upon discharge, he was advised bed rest for 15 days and review with a cardiologist after five days in the Outpatient Department. No material has been placed before this Court to show that the respondent's son complied with the said advice or underwent any further medical review thereafter. When interim bail was granted by this Court on 26.12.2025 solely on medical grounds, the stand taken by the petitioner-Police cannot be lightly brushed aside. In order to dispel any ambiguity and to objectively assess the present medical condition of the respondent's son, this Court is of the considered view that an independent evaluation by a Government Medical Board is necessary. Such a course would subserve both the interest of the respondent's son and the interest of justice, and would ensure that the concession of interim bail is not misused on untenable grounds.




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY

19. Accordingly, the Dean, Rajiv Gandhi Government General Hospital, Chennai, is directed to constitute a specialized Medical Team for the purpose of examining the medical condition of the respondent's son, viz., A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar, with reference to the ailments claimed. **The respondent's son, viz., A. Shankar @ Savukku Shankar, is directed to appear before the Medical Board at Rajiv Gandhi Government General Hospital, Chennai, on 02.02.2026 at about 8.00 a.m. Upon such appearance, the Medical Board shall examine him and submit a report on his present medical condition with reference to the ailments claimed.** The Medical Board shall submit its report in a sealed cover before this Court on or before 03.02.2026. The Registry is directed to communicate this order forthwith to the Dean of Rajiv Gandhi Government General Hospital, Chennai, for necessary compliance, including the constitution of the Medical Team and submission of the report.

20. Therefore, while this Court is not inclined to cancel the interim bail at this stage, additional and more explicit restrictions are warranted. Such restrictions are required to ensure that the liberty granted is not misused, that the investigation proceeds unhindered, and that the rights of the complainant and witnesses are adequately protected.



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025


WEB COPY

21. Accordingly, in addition to the conditions already imposed vide order dated 26.12.2025, while granting interim bail, the following modified conditions are imposed:

(i) The son of the first respondent, viz., A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar, shall not make any statement or comment, directly or indirectly, in any manner whatsoever, regarding the case under investigation in Crime No.519 of 2025 or any other pending cases. This includes statements concerning the complaint, the complainant, the Investigating Officer, or the conduct of the investigation, whether through social media, electronic media, print media, or any public forum.

(ii) The son of the first respondent viz., A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar shall not contact, interact, or communicate with the co-accused or any of the witnesses in the case, either personally, telephonically, electronically, or through any third party, and shall not attempt to influence, intimidate, or interfere with them in any manner.

(iii) The son of the first respondent viz., A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar shall confine his movements strictly to the purpose of medical treatment and legal consultation and shall not engage in any activity that may impede or prejudice the investigation.




W.P.M.P.(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P.(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY (iv) Any violation of the above conditions shall be viewed seriously and may result in cancellation of interim bail without further reference to this Court.

22. It is made clear that these directions are issued without expressing any opinion on the merits of the pending criminal case, the writ petition, or the habeas corpus petition. The observations made herein are confined solely to the consideration of cancellation of interim bail and regulation of the conduct of the son of the respondent viz., A.Shankar @ Savukku Shankar during the pendency of investigation.

23. Before parting, this Court wishes to observe that video journalists must adhere to high ethical standards to maintain public trust and credibility. In the digital age, they are on the front lines in combating misinformation and disinformation.

24. With the above observations, directions, and modified conditions, Miscellaneous Petition in W.P.M.P.(CrI)No.14 of 2026 stands disposed of.



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

WEB COPY


25. List the main writ petition along with the habeas corpus petition
on 03.02.2026 for production of the Medical Board report.

(P.V. J.,) (M.J.R. J.,)
23 / 01 / 2026

Index: Yes.
Neutral Case Citation: Yes.
Speaking Order: Yes.

r n s

Note: The Registry shall comply with the direction given in
paragraph No.19 of the order forthwith.




W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

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 Dean,
Medical Board at Rajiv Gandhi Government General Hospital,
Chennai,
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.(CrI)No.1791 of 2025 and H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

P.VELMURUGAN, J.
AND
M.JOTHIRMAN, J.

r n s

W.P.M.P(CrI)No.14 of 2026 in
W.P.M.P(CrI)No.839 of 2025 in
W.P.No(CrI)1791 of 2025 and
H.C.P.No.2754 of 2025

23 / 01 / 2026