

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 10900 and 10993/2021

in

N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Crime No. 609/2021

Purusothaman

.. Petitioner/Accused
in CrI.M.P.No. 10900/2021

Arun @ Arun Mozhi

.. Petitioner/Accused
in CrI.M.P.No.10993/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-2 Kasimedu Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.10900/2021, M/s. M. Nithiyavel,R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Kokila, Counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No. 10993/2021 and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 609/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. They are in custody from 18.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.600/- from him at knife point. According to CPP both the petitioners are having one previous case and objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past two weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to :

1. The XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11097/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 750/2021

Deepan @ Deepan Raj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-5 MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P.N. Veeramani, N. Naresh, D. Kannan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 750/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. The petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with five other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1800/- from him at knife point.
5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11097/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11099/2021

in

K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 470/2021

Thangaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-9 Thiru Vi-Ka Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Nagaraj, P. Sathish, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 427, 392 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 470/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.1000/- from the defacto complainant at knife point and also attacked him using wooden log and caused injury on his head and back side. He further submits that this petitioner is having one previous case.
5. According to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the fact that injured was discharged from the hospital and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to :

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11099/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11104/2021

in

G-3 Kilpauk P.S. Crime No. 242/2021

Aasaithambi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-3 Kilpauk Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. Durai, Kannan, R. Vijayalakshmi, B.M. Goshinraj, G. Naresh Kumar, M. Senthil Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 242/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.200/- from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is a history sheeter and having 9 previous cases. If he is released on bail, he will again indulge in similar nature of crime and objects the grant of bail.

5. The antecedents as against the petitioner would go to show the petitioner is a unruly element. According to CPP, this petitioner is a history sheeter and having several previous cases. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioner and the objection raised by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11148/2021

in

R-6 Kumaran Nagar P.S. Crime No.380/2021

K. Vijay

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-6 Kumaran Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Magesh Kumar, E. Rammurthy, M. Kadhivel, R. Rathinavel, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324,506(ii) and 397 IPC in Crime No. 380/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 22.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, they forcibly taken away cash Rs.16,500/- from him at knife point. He further submits that co-accused bail petition was dismissed by this court on 28.6.2021 in Crl.M.P.No. 10992/2021 and seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11149/2021

in

D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 297/2021

Harish @ Chinna Harish

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-3 Ice House Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Mohan Raj, V. Vinodha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.297/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Already co-accused were enlarged on bail. The petitioner is in custody from 10.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1,200/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 8 previous cases and the petitioner was also convicted in one case in the year 2016and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The antecedents as against the petitioner would go to show the petitioner is a notorious rowdy element. According to CPP, he was convicted in one case in the year 2016. The petitioner is having 8 previous cases. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11150/2021

in

R-2 Kodambakkam P.S. Crime No. 60/2021

1. Malickbasha

2. Saravanan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R-2 Kodambakkam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Murugesan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 13.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.60/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are noway connected with the offence. Their name does not find a place in the FIR. Injured was discharged from the hospital. They are in custody from 13.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. Two persons sustained injury. The petitioners came in support of two other accused/A1 and A2, who took Briyani in the defacto complainant's shop and refused to pay money for that, over which there was a quarrel. The present petitioners came along with other accused subsequently went to the defacto complainant's house and assaulted him.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it appears that there was a dispute over non payment of money for Briyani taken by one Kumaresan and Guna from the defacto complainant's shop.

There was a quarrel over which one month back. At that time one Prasath intervened. Being aggrieved at, the said Kumaresan and Guna along with other accused including these petitioners, on 18.3.2021 came to the shop of the defacto complainant and assaulted the defacto complainant and proceeded to the house of the Prasath and there, they have assaulted the Prasath also. These petitioners' name not mentioned in the FIR. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. No previous case is reported as against the petitioners. The petitioners are in custody from 13.6.2021. Considering the above aspects and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the following condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Chengalpet.

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11155/2021

in

C.C.No. 5512/2017

(on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

in

K-5 Peravallur P.S. Crime No. 356/2017

Krishnakanth @ Kisan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-5 Peravallur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Krishna Moorthy, K.S. Raja, P. Harish Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.10.2020 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 356/2017 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 8 months. He was detained under Act 14/1982 and now the detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court in HCP No. 67/2021 dated 21.6.2021. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him and prays for granting bail.

3. Learned CPP submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 5 previous cases. However, it is represented by the CPP that the detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court.

4. Considering the fact that the detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court and the long duration of custody, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the said court on all hearing dates.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me in open court today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11155/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 2nd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11157/2021

in

K-7 ICF P.S. Crime No. 118/2021

Danush

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-7 ICF Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Hussaini Basha, I. Gowri Shankar, Shaik Abu Thahir, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 118/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is aged 19 years. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He has no bad antecedents. The petitioner is in custody from 26.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner along with two other accused came in a two wheeler and snatched the mobile phone from the defacto complainant and escaped from the spot.

5. It is a case of mobile snatching. The petitioner was arrested only on 26.6.2021. Very recent arrest. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 2nd day of July , 2021**

Crl.M.P.No. 11152/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 667/2021

Magesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-1 Sembium Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. U.Yuvaraj, D. Gopi Krishnan, A. Vinoth Kumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 667/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned CPP submits that this petitioner is not arrested in this crime number. He was arrested in P3 Vyasarpadi Police Station Crime No.492/2021.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not pressing this application as against the petitioner.

5. In view of the representation made by the CPP, this petition is dismissed as not pressed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 2nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11162/2021

in

P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Cr.No.758/2021

Santhosh Kumar @ Reegan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P.1, Pulianthope Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. B. Kalaiarasan, D. Percivul Pericles, S.M.Raghuram, R. Surendar Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.758/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, they assaulted him and at knife point robbed Rs.800/- from him. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 12 previous cases.

5. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 2nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11132/2021

in

R.1, Mambalam P.S. Crime No.608/2021

1. Saravanan @ G.P. Saravanan
2. Gunasekar @ Gunasekar Vedhachalam @ Sekar .. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R.1, Mambalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A. Lokesh Babu, K. Manikandan, R. Rajashamagayathri, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 323, 294(b), 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.608/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. Petitioners and the defacto complainant are neighbours. There was a wordy quarrel between them. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners are noway connected with the offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. Wordy quarrel between the neighbours. Except Sec.506(i) IPC, other offences areailable. No deadly weapon was used. According to learned CPP, the victim sustained only simple injury. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to following conditions.

5. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each(Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R.1, Mambalam Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11132/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 2nd day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11131/2021

in

P.4, Basinbridge P.S. Cr.No.299/2021

1. Nandhini
2. Nandhakumar
3. Sanjai

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P.4, Basin Bridge Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Senthilkumar, M. Madhankumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148 IPC r/w. Sec.3, 4 of TNPPDL Act @ Sec.147, 148, 427, 436, 448 IPC in Cr.No.299/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners and the defacto complainant are relatives. The defacto complainant and other assaulted the petitioners and their family members, for which counter case were registered in Cr.No.298/21 and 300/2021. In order to escape from the clutches of law, this false complaint has been lodged against the petitioners and others. Co-accused were granted bail by this court and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused came to the defacto complainant's shop and quarreled with her and damaged the articles and also damaged the household articles from the house

of the defacto complainant and her brother. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case and counter case. There was a quarrel between the defacto complainant and petitioners' family. FIR does not speak about the value of the property alleged to be damaged. Already arrested accused were enlarged on bail by this court. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to following conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each(Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P.4, Basin Bridge Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11131/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 2nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11160/2021

in

K.9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar P.S. Cr.No.161/2021

S. Vijay

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police, (Law & Order)

K.9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Ravindra Ram, R. Vinu Priyanga, S. Deendayalan, R. Anu Priyanga, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 302 IPC in Crime No.161/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody from 19.4.2021 for more than 70 days. Investigation is over and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP objects granting bail stating that it is a case of brutal murder due to previous enmity and submitted the Case Diary for perusal.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, though the investigation appears to have been completed, the photographs available in the CD would go to show the gravity of the

assault made on the deceased. According to learned CPP, nearly 31 cut injuries were made. The photographs would go to show the severance on the parts of the body due to cut injuries. Considering the number of injuries inflicted and the brutal attack made on the deceased, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 2nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11134/2021

in

CCB, EDF-II, IV Team, Crime No.31/2018

1. K. Rajendrakumar

2. Vikas Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Central Crime Branch, EDF-II, IV Team,

Vepery,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Krishnan, V. Balaji, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 448, 323, 294(b), 506(i) and 420 of IPC in Crime No.31/2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is a civil dispute. A false complaint has been given by the defacto complainant as if a sum of Rs.3.10 Crore is due from the petitioners and others over Mobilephone trading. On that basis, a false case has been registered before the Uthiramerur Police and the Uthiramerur Police in the year 2015 conducted enquiry and closed the case as the matter was likely to be settled and civil in nature. In furtherance of that there was a settlement. The petitioner and others paid a sum of Rs.8 lakh towards full and final settlement of the amount due to the defacto

complainant. However, at the instigation of the defacto complainant by moving the Hon'ble High Court, direction has been issued to register the case before the CCB and Cr.No.31/2018 was registered for the very same complaint, in which one of the accused(Hamith Jain) was arrested and subsequently released on bail by this court in the year 2018 itself. Thereafter, the petitioners moved the Hon'ble High Court for quash and the said application was dismissed on 29.6.2021 with a direction to appear before the Investigation Officer and produce relevant records. Meanwhile, the petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent and thus, they prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon the Settlement arrived between the parties dated 25.7.2015. It is a Memorandum of Understanding alleged to have been signed by the defacto complainant. But, thereafter, the defacto complainant moved the Hon'ble High Court for direction. The alleged settlement dated 25.7.2015 is true or not is the subject matter of investigation. In the so called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.7.2015, the thumb impression of the defacto complainant is available. Some photographs were also filed by the petitioners to show the presence of the defacto complainant and execution of the document. When the claim is to the tune of Rs.3.10 Crore, the settlement for Rs.8 lakh, prima facie appears to be doubtful. Whatever it be, the amount involved is huge in nature. The Hon'ble High Court had already dealt with the dispute and pleased to dismiss the quash petition on 29.6.2021. After dismissal of the quash petition, the petitioner moved this court for anticipatory bail within a day. When the matter has been dealt with by the Hon'ble High Court and quash petition was dismissed, granting anticipatory bail on the next day by this court may not be proper. The order passed by the Hon'ble High Court in the quash petition is also not placed before this court. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 2nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11145/2021

in

R.6, Kumaran Nagar P.S. Crime No.305/2021

1. N. Dinesh @ dineshkumar

2. Akash

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R.6, Kumaran Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. N. Prabakaran, S. Prabudoss, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.305/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that an exaggerated complaint has been given. No offence u/s.307 IPC is attracted. The quarrel is over the road accident. Arrested accused already released on bail and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is grave case of 307 IPC and objects granting anticipatory bai;

5. The FIR itself would go to show the root cause for the quarrel is road accident. AR copy produced by the CPP is not showing serious injuries. Already arrested accused

were released on bail. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to following conditions.

5. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each(Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R.6, Kumaran Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11145/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 2nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11161/2021

in

P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.910/2021

Kevin @ Rajesh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
P.6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Ashok Kumar, M. Chandru, P. Parthipan, J. Jayashree, J. Ram Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 354(D), 448, 323, 427, 509, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.910/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was arrested on 18.6.2021. There was a wordy quarrel between the defacto complainant's family and the petitioner. Now, the petitioner realised his mistake. He was sufficiently in custody and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner and others teased the defacto complainant's daughters, over which, the defacto complainant's husband

questioned the petitioner. He has been chased with knife by the petitioners and others. When he bolted himself in the house of the defacto complainant, the petitioners and other brutally knocked door with knife and also caused damage to the Borewell pipes and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that the petitioner and others are teasing the daughters of the defacto complainant. There are CCTV footage also available to show the petitioner with long knife in his hand chasing somebody. Further, the photographs available in the CD would go to show the damage caused to the door of the defacto complainant and PVC pipelines etc., Considering all these circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**