

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos. 12466 and 12468/2021**

in

**G-7 Chetpet P.S. Crime No. 211/2021**

Karamani @ Vinothkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.  
in Crl.M.P.No. 12466/2021

Ragul @ Ragulraj

.. Petitioner/Accused  
in Crl.M.P.No. 12468/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-7 Chetpet 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. N. Selvarajan, M. Jaikumar, L. Vinothkumar, P. Kamaraj, T. Lavanya, S.H. Vazhavankarthikeyan, P.S.Mercy Gnanammal, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12466/2021 and of M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12468/2021 and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12466/2021, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12468/2021 was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148. 302 IPC in Crime No. 211/2021 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 of offence. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. These

petitioners being the friend of prime accused, they have been falsely implicated in this case. The deceased was a notorious rowdy element. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioners are in custody for more than one month and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, on 15.6.2021, these petitioners along with others conspired together and assaulted the victim using deadly weapons and stones. Due to which he sustained severe injuries and later he died on the way to hospital. Investigation is underway. If the petitioners are released on bail, they will tamper the witnesses and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the gravity of offence, objection made by the CPP and the stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, both the petitions are 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**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12469/2021**

in

**P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 753/2021**

Mari @ Lodongu Mari

.. 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. S. Muralidharan, U. Yuvaraj, M. Elayakumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 753/2021 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 of offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. All the co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 6.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.6.2021, this petitioner along with 3 others waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted him using hands and pelted stones against the complainant due to which he sustained injuries.
5. Learned CPP seriously objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 29 previous cases.

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

7. 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**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12471/2021**

in

**P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 758/2021**

Mari @ Lodongu Mari

.. 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. S. Muralidharan, U. Yuvaraj, M. Elayakumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397 and 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 the petitioner is innocent of offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. All the co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 6.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that on 18.6.2021, this petitioner along with 3 others waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.800/- from him at knife point.
5. Learned CPP seriously objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 29 previous cases.

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

7. 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**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12470/2021**

in

**P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.905/2021**

Imran

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Muralidaran, U.Yuvaraj and M.Elayakumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 323, 366 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.905/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is only an Auto-driver. The victim girl and the accused / A1 travelled in the Auto. Meanwhile, they quarreled between themselves and thus, he stopped his auto and demanded the Auto charges. There was a quarrel. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the other accused. There is no specific overt-act attributed as against the petitioner. No offence u/s 366 IPC, prima facie, attracted against the petitioner and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of kidnapping for compelling the victim girl for marriage. The petitioner knowingly accompanied the prime accused and kidnapped the victim girl in his Auto and seriously objects granting bail.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. According to counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner is only a auto driver. On perusal of the FIR, no specific overtact attributed as against this petitioner. He is in custody for more than three weeks.

Considering the duration of custody and no previous case reported as against the petitioner, 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 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 respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above 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**

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12470/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12476/2021**

in

**P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 975/2021**

Sudha

.. Petitioner/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. T.V. Somasundaram, U.Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a) r/w 4(1-A) of TNP Act and Sec. 328 of IPC in Crime No.975/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. She has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on her only for statistical purpose. She is in custody from 24.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner was found in possession of 15 bottles of TASMAL brandy in opened state and also banned tobacco products for sale without valid licence when search made by the police. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 15 previous cases. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent. Hence, he objects the granting of bail.

5. No one is reported as hospitalized after consuming the tobacco products. The petitioner is a woman aged 51 years. Considering the nature of offence, age and gender of the petitioner, 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 her 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 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 respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above 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**

Copy to :

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12476/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.Nos. 12478 and 12480/2021**

in

**K-11 C.M.B.T. Crime No.405/2021**

Karuppiah

.. Petitioner/Accused  
in Crl.M.P.No.12478/2021

Stanley

.. Petitioner/Accused  
in Crl.M.P.No. 12480/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-11, C.M.B.T. 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. J.William Shakesphere, V.Ravi, T. Srikanth, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 12478/2021 and M/s. D. Gopi Krishnan, S. Nagaraj, U.Yuvaraj, A. Vinoth Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 12480/2021 and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12478/2021, who was arrested on 16.7.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 12480/2021 was arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 364-A r/w 34 of IPC in Crime No.405/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are no way connected with the offence. Since, these petitioners are friends of one Periyasamy, they have been roped in this case. The petitioners have no bad antecedents. They are in custody for more than two weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that prime accused Periyasamy is not yet arrested and that investigation is still pending. Earlier bail application was

dismissed on 27.7.2021 and that there is no change in circumstance and objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past two weeks. Prime accused is one Periyasamy. These petitioners are his friends. According to CPP, prime accused is not yet arrested. However, 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 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 petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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 above petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above 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**

Copy to :

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12481/2021**

in

**K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 725/2021**

V. Valli

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-10 Koyambedu Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K. Suresh Kumar, Y. Venkatesan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 725/2021 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 of offence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. She is no way connected with the alleged offence. This petitioner has no bad antecedents. Her daughter is now 7 months pregnant. She is in custody from 10.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of a purse from the defacto complainant, which contains cash Rs.2000/- and a cell phone. However, according to him, the properties were recovered from the petitioner.
5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody from 10.7.2021. It is reported by the CPP that the properties involved in this case

has been recovered. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and 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 her 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 respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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**

Copy to :

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison (Women Wing) , Puzhal, Chennai

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12481/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Cr.L.M.P.Nos.12487/2021**

in

**J.6, Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Cr.No.654/2021**

1. Dheena @ Kuthirai Dheena

2. Anwar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J.6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 19.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379, 417 @ 395 of IPC in Cr.No.654/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Property recovered. The petitioners are in custody from 19.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused who came in an Auto, under the guise of giving away free clothes and bedsheets, took the defacto complainant in the Auto and robbed her gold ornaments weighing 1 ½ sovereigns. He further submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 4 previous cases and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 1 previous case and if the petitioners are released on bail, they will again indulge in similar offence and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the objection made by learned CPP, 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**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12304/2021**

in

**D.3, Ice House P.S. Crime No.370/2021**

Nawaz

.. 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. M. Hussaini Basha, I. Gowri Shankar, Shaik Abu Thahir, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 406, 420 of IPC in Crime No.370/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. As per FIR, the defacto complainant/Alwin Gnanadurai, who is a Sub-Broker in ICICI Direct had given Rs.87,50,000/- collected from various persons, to the petitioner for money transaction through RTGS. But the said Alwin is not entitled to do so. Other accused A2, A3 and A4 were arrested and from them entire money was recovered. This petitioner has nothing to do with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is the prime accused. The defacto complainant/Alwin Gnanadurai is a Sub-Broker in ICICI Direct and he is doing E-Commerce business and also hotel business. On 17.7.2021, he went the petitioner's office and had given office money Rs.87,50,000/- to the petitioner for money transaction through RTGS. This petitioner under the guise of counting the money escaped from the place with cash and thus committed cheating. He further submits that investigation is pending and other arrested accused are still in custody and thus strongly objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a grave case of cheating. The amount involved is huge in nature. Other accused were arrested. This petitioner is the prime accused as per FIR. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12409/2021**

in

**H.6, R.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No.1193/2021**

Velu

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H.6, R.K. Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Illiyas, A.Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.294(b), 323, 506(i) of IPC and u/s. 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.1193/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Dispute between members of two political parties. A false complaint has been given against the petitioner. This petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. No one sustained injury. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner belongs to a political party came to the defacto complainant's house along with 40 women and hooligans and abused her husband in filthy language and also threatened him with dire consequences. He objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

5. On perusal of FIR, it appears that dispute between political parties. No offence u/s.4 of TNPHW Act is prima facie attracted. As far as other offences are concerned, except Sec.506(i) IPC other offences are bailable. No injury was reported. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to following conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute 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 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 petitioner 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[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 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H.6, R.K. Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

**Crl.M.P.No.12409/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12410/2021**

in

**H.1, Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.1923/2021**

Saravanan @ Appu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H.1, Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M.Iliyas and A. Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148, 324, 294(b), 307 of IPC in Crime No.1923/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petty quarrel between the petitioner's and the defacto complainant's group under the influence of alcohol. An exaggerated complaint has been given. It is a case and counter case. Arrested accused were enlarged on bail. One of the co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11038/21 dated 5.7.2021 and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC and objects granting anticipatory bail.
5. It is a case and counter case. Victim sustained only simple injury. Already arrested accused were granted bail as well as anticipatory bail by this court. Considering

the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to following conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute 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 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 petitioner 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[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 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H.1, Washermenpet Police Station, Chennai.

**nmk CrI.M.P.No.12410/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12413/2021**

in

**N-2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.657/2021**

1. Janaki

2. Desappan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

N-2, Kasimedu Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M.Nithiyavel and R.Mukesh Kannah , Counsel for the petitioners and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s. 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.657/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. False complaint has been lodged. It is a case and counter case. Arrested accused in this case was granted bail by the Court below. The accused in counter case Cr.No.656/2021 were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12131/2021 dated 28.7.2021. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners and others abused the defacto complainant and her family members and assaulted them.

5. Dispute between neighbours. Case and counter-case has been registered. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Arrested accused was already enlarged on bail. The



accused in counter case were already granted anticipatory. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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 XVI 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 respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, N-2, Kasimedu Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.12413/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12414/2021**

in

**J.6, Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No.1304/2020**

R. Manikandan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J.6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. J. Gokulakrishnan, Y. Venkatesan, Counsel for the petitioner and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s. 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1304/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

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

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that while the petitioner and others damaged the vehicles parked in the street using wooden log, the defacto complainant questioned them. Over which, the petitioner and others assaulted the defacto complainant with knife and caused injuries. However, he submits that victim has already been discharged.

5. It is a case of the year 2020. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the then Investigating Officer of the investigation has not chosen to arrest the petitioner. However, after arrival of new Investigating Officer, who had taken charge of the police

station, this petitioner is apprehending arrest and hence moved before this court for anticipatory bail. Considering the nature of offence and the fact that except 506(ii) IPC, other offences, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute 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 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 petitioner 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[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 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, J.6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.12414/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12415/2021**

in

**K.8, Arumbakkam P.S. Crime No.944/2021**

Arun @ Arun Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.8, Arumbakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A.M. Ravindranath Jeyapal, T. Balachandran, P. Ilayabharath, Counsel for the petitioner and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s. 341, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.944/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Only wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given. No one sustained injury. Arrested accused granted bail by the Court below. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Petty quarrel between the parties. Victim sustained simple injuries and discharged from the hospital. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Hence, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute 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 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 petitioner 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[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 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. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K.8, Arumbakkam Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

**Crl.M.P.No.12415/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12105/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.11346/2021**

**in**

**CCB, Team V, Forgery Wing Cr.No.126/2021**

Maria Ramesh

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch, Team V,  
Forgery Wing, Veperiy,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11346/2021, dt:12.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11346/2021 on 12.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 14.7.2021 to till date. Now the matter has been settled between the parties and for the amount due to the defacto complainant, the accused have registered the property at Perumbakkam in the name of the defacto complainant towards full and final settlement and hence prays for relaxation of the condition. Learned counsel for the defacto complainant entered appearance through VC and agreed the settlement between the parties and the factum of registration of the property in the name of the defacto complainant. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition is relaxed in toto.

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**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12416/2021**

**in**

**CrI.M.P.No.11495/2021**

**in**

**PEW Annanagar P.S. Cr.No.221/2021**

Sampathkumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

PEW Annanagar Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Sasikumar, S. Thiyagarajan, V. Manimaran, A. Tamilselvan, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11495/2021, dt:13.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11495/2021 on 13.7.2021 for the offence u/s.4(1)(aaa), 4(1-A) of TNP Act and Sec.188 and 269 of IPC with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 15.7.2021 to till date. Investigation is almost over and hence prays for relaxing the condition. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has been complying the condition. However, considering the nature of offence, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows:



“The petitioner shall appear before the respondent police once in a week, on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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  
Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12417/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.11597/2021**

in

**EOW-II, Cr.No.14/2021**

1. Kasthuri
2. S. Priya
3. A. Sampath Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
EOW.II, Head Quarters Police Station,  
Guindy,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Balaji, K. Easwar, P. Kumar, S. Gugapriya, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.11597/2021 on 16.7.2021 for the offences u/s.420, 409 r/w. 34 of IPC on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a like sum and to deposit Rs.2,00,000/- each to the credit of the above said crime number before the court concerned and also to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

2. Now the present petition has been filed for extension of time.

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

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that due to present pandemic situation, the petitioners are facing financial crisis and they are unable to mobilize the funds to comply the order within the stipulated time. Hence, prayed to extend the time to deposit the condition amount.

5. The petitioners were already granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the representation made by the petitioners' counsel, this court is inclined to extend the time for further period of 10 days from today. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to:

1. Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. Inspector of Police, EOW-II Headquarters Police Station, Guindy, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12417/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

CrI.M.P.No.12418/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.6994/2021

in

C.A.No.83/2021

in

C.C.No.6355/2017

M/s. Ayyanar Constructions  
Rep. by its Managing Partner,  
S. Sekar  
No.1/34, Bharathidasan Street,  
Palavakkam,  
Chennai -41.

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

M/s. Madanlal Sales Pvt. Ltd.,  
Rep. by its POA,  
V. Ramadoss  
No.99, Harrington Road,  
E-1, Harrington Court,  
15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Chetpet,  
Chennai – 31.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. N. Rajesh Kannan, R. Rajesh, N. Hemalatha, Counsel for the petitioner, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner is accused in C.C.No.6355/2017 on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-II, Chennai. While suspending sentence, the petitioner was granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.6994/21, dt:9.4.2021 on execution of bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the said Magistrate within two weeks from the date of the order and further condition to deposit 20% of the cheque amount to the credit of CC number on the file of the Trial Court within 60 days from the date of the order.

2. Now the petitioner has come forward with this petition for extension of time.

3. Heard the petitioner's counsel through Video Conference.

4. As per Sec.148 N.I. Act (Amendment Act), the court is competent to give 60 days time for payment of 20% of the compensation amount. Further, as per Sec.148(ii) of N.I. Act, the court is competent to extend the period for 30 days. In this case, the original order was passed on 9.4.2021. So, 60 days time expired in the month of 9.6.2021 itself. The maximum period of 90 days as contemplated in the Act expired on 9.7.2021. This petition has been filed on 29.7.2021 after completion of 90 days. Hence, this court has no power to extend beyond 90 days. Under such circumstances, this court finds no justification to entertain the petition. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to:

1. Learned II Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-II, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12418/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.12419/2021

in

**Crl.M.P.No.9148/2021**

in

**C.A.No.111/2021**

in

**C.C.No.908/2016**

G. Chidambaram

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

Raja

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Senthilkumar, G. Ganapathy, B. Sridhar, M. Madhankumar, Counsel for the petitioner, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner is accused in C.C.No.908/2016 on the file of the learned XX Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai. While suspending sentence, the petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9148/21, dt:29.4.2021 on execution of bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the said Magistrate within two weeks from the date of the order and further condition to deposit 20% of the cheque amount to the credit of CC number on the file of the Trial Court within 60 days from the date of the order. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.11405/2021, dated 12.7.2021, the time was extended for further period of 30 days.

2. Now the petitioner has come forward with this petition for extension of time.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner through Video Conference.

4. As per Sec.148 N.I. Act (Amendment Act), the court is competent to give 60 days time for payment of 20% of the compensation amount. Further, as per Sec.148(ii) of N.I. Act, the court is competent to extend the period for 30 days. In this case, the original order was passed on 29.4.2021. So, 60 days expired in the month of June 2021 itself. On

petition, time was extended for a further period of 30 days by order dated 12.7.2021. This petition has been filed on 29.7.2021. However, the maximum period of 90 days as contemplated in the Act expired on 29.7.2021 itself. This court has no power to extend beyond 90 days. Under such circumstances, this court finds no justification to entertain the petition. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to:

1. Learned XXII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. Learned XX Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai.

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.12419/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12482/2021**

in

**B-1, North Beach P.S. Cr.No.923/2021**

1. Mohamed Sidhik
2. Mohamed Faisal

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
B-1, North Beach Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.M.Mohamed Riya and M.Manimaran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.923/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was a clash between two groups of Muslims. In fact, the petitioners are the affected parties. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.13176/2021 on 29.7.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there is a counter case in Cr.No.922/2021. Apart from that, one more case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered at the instance of police officials. Injured has been discharged from the hospital.
5. Co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail.



6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing 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 learned VII 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 petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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**

Copy to :

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

ss

Cri.M.P.No.12482/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.12472, 12473 and 12474/2021**

in

**B-1, North Beach P.S. Crime No.922/2021**

1. Jinthamathar
2. Abibullah
3. Sheik Abubacker
4. Basheer Ahmed

.. Petitioner in  
Crl.M.P.No.12472/2021 / Accused

Haji @ Mannadi Haji

.. Petitioner in  
Crl.M.P.No.12473/2021 / Accused

Shahul Hameed @ Muttai Shahul

.. Petitioner in  
Crl.M.P.No.12474/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
B-1, North Beach Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.  
in all the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.A.Abrar Ahmed, T.R.Udaya Kumar, Jainul Abideen and R.Selvi and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 448, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.922/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was a clash between two groups of Muslims. The petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged. The accused in the counter case in Cr.No.923/2021 has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.13176/2021 on 29.7.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there is a counter case in Cr.No.923/2021. Apart from that, one more case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered at the instance of police officials.

5. The accused in the counter-case has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing 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 learned VII 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 petitioners shall appear before the Inspector of Police, C-1, Flower Bazaar Police Station, Chennai daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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**

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.Nos.12472, 12473 and 12474/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12475/2021**

in

**B-1, North Beach P.S. Cr.No.924/2021**

1. Jinthamathar
2. Abibullah
3. Sheik Abubacker
4. Basheer Ahmed
5. Sahul Hameed @ Muttai Sahul
6. Haji @ Mannadi Haji

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
B-1, North Beach Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.A.Abrar Ahmed, T.R.Udaya Kumar, Jainul Abideen and R.Selvi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 353 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.924/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was a clash between two groups of Muslims. The petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The accused in the counter case in Cr.No.923/2021 has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.No.13176/2021 on 29.7.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that case and counter case in Cr.Nos.922 and 923/2021 were registered against both parties. As far as this case is concerned, on 13.7.2021, at 9.40 p.m., when the police party were on the guard duty, more than 50 persons came near the Angappan Naicken Street and when the police personnel

stopped them, they abused the police and also assaulted them with stones, thereby prevented them from discharging their duty.

5. The accused in the counter-case has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing 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 learned VII 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 petitioners shall appear before the Inspector of Police, C-1, Flower Bazaar Police Station, Chennai daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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**

Copy to :

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

ss

Cri.M.P.No.12475/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrL.M.P.No.12303/2021**

in

**E-1, Mylapore P.S. Crime No.931/2021**

Sivanandham

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E-1, Mylapore Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.K.Shanmugam, K.Sampath, P.Surendran, N.Selvam, L.Manikandan, K.Rathi Devi and G.Pandian and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 279, 337, 506(i) of IPC r/w 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Women Harassment Act in Crime No.931/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no offence u/s 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Women Harassment Act is attracted. It is a case of accident. An exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it appears there was a road accident and there was a wordy quarrel. The petitioner was under the influence of alcohol. The pillion-rider of the defacto complainant, who is his sister, has been abused in vulgar words and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears, prima facie, it is a case of road accident. As per the complaint given by the defacto complainant, the petitioner was under the influence of alcohol. The petitioner's bike and the two-wheeler ridden by the defacto complainant met with an accident. There are chances for exaggeration. Though it has been alleged in the complaint as if it is a case of drunken driving, the case has not been registered u/s 185 of M.V.Act. Under such circumstances, this court is of the considered view that it is a road

accident. There is no allegation of abuse of word by the petitioner against the defacto complainant's sister. There are chances for exaggeration. Hence, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute 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 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 petitioner 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[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 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, E-1, Mylapore Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.12303/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12299/2021**

in

**D-2, Anna Salai P.S. Cr.No.657/2021**

Rajesh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

D-2, Anna Salai Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.657/2021 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 there was a wordy quarrel. The victim is the friend of the defacto complainant. In fact, there was a compromise between them. An affidavit also filed by the defacto complainant to show that they have entered into a compromise and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. The duration of custody is very short.

5. The defacto complainant, in fact, appeared in person on 30.7.2021 in the court and filed an affidavit about the compromise. The injury inflicted is measuring 4x2 cm, not appears to be a deadly injury. Considering the factum of compromise between the parties and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.



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 II 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 respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(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**

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.12299/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12210/2021**

in

**CCB Cr.No.4/2021**

Sree Kandan @ Kodambakkam Sree

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Central Crime Branch,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.L.Infant Dinesh, R.Surendar, A.John and K.Ragavan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 323, 347, 354, 420 IPC r/w Sec.4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.4/2021 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 no way connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody for more than three weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP filed written objection stating that there was some money transaction between one Siva and Venkatesh. In this connection, the Thirumangalam Police conducted enquiry. The defacto complainant herein is one Rajesh. He has some business dealings with the said Venkatesh. There was some money transferred to the account of the defacto complainant. Taking note of it, the defacto complainant, his friend Sangeetha and his mother Vidhya were forcibly taken from their residence to Chennai and illegally confined them in Redhills and obtained the original documents of the property purchased by the defacto complainant and also executed sale deed under the instruction of the petitioner and others. As such they have committed

serious offences. The amount involved in running to crores. The investigation is at the budding stage and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the petitioner and some other police officials are also involved in the offence. Some of the accused are yet to be arrested. Prima facie, the offence appears to be grave in nature. Considering the stage of the investigation and gravity of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

ss