

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 11979/2021

in

K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 392/2021

Lawrance

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-11 CMBT Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. N. Selvarajan, M. Jaikumar, S. Vijayakumar, L. Vinothkumar, P. Kamaraj, T. Lavanya, S.H. Vazhavankarthikeyan, P.S.Mercy Gnanammal, Counsel for the petitioner and of 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, 294(b), 323, 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 392/2021 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 has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 8.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.2,240/- from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 5 previous cases of similar nature. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for more than three weeks. 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 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 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Cri.M.P.No. 11979/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 11980/2021

in

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

Chandrasekar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-7 Chetpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is 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 and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 302 IPC in Cr.No.211/2021 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. He is noway connected with the murder of the deceased. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the deceased (Karuppu @ Vadivazhagan) repeatedly with knife on his head and he died on the way to hospital. He further submits that investigation is not yet completed and thus, he objects granting of bail.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not a named accused and he was falsely implicated by the respondent police. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that there is CCTV footage to connect the accused with the crime. Any how, it is a case of 302 IPC. A valuable life has been lost. The petitioner was arrested only on 17.6.2021. Considering the gravity of offence, the availability of CCTV footage to connect the accused with the crime and the fact that investigation is at crucial stage, 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**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 11989/2021

in

E-1 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 887/2021

Annadurai

.. 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 M/s. S. Vellidoss, M. Gopalakrishnan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 887/2021 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 has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 1.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.600/- from him at knife point.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. 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 XVIII 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11989/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12077/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 693/2021

1. M. Karthick @ Karthickraja

2. J. Aadhi @ Aadhitya

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R-5 Virugambakkam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 29.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 341, 397, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 693/2021 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 these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 29.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money for consuming liquor. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.1200/- from his shirt pocket at knife point. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 7 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 2 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Though the petitioners are having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, they are in custody for more than one month. 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 XXIII 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12077/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12078/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 694/2021

1. M. Karthick @ Karthickraja

2. J. Aadhi @ Aadhitya

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R-5 Virugambakkam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 29.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 341, 397, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 694/2021 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 these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 29.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant's auto and demanded money from him. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.750/- from his shirt pocket at knife point. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 7 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 2 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Though the petitioners are having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, they are in custody for more than one month. 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 XXIII 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12078/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 12087/2021

in

P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 1011/2021

Sridhar

.. 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. C. Johnson Samuel, M.B. Prabhu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1011/2021 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. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 18.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him using knife and due to which the complainant sustained head injury.

5. According to CPP, injured has been discharged from the hospital. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for more than 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 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. 12087/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12394/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 734/2021

Sivaraman

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-5 Virugambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Rajkumar, P. Surendran, G. Pandian, 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), 336, 307 IPC in Crime No. 734/2021 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. Due to previous enmity, wordy quarrel arose between the petitioner and the victim and both of them attacked each other. There is no grievous injuries. The petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that when the defacto complainant's son spoke with his friends, at that time this petitioner along with other accused picked up wordy quarrel with him and assaulted him with knife. He further submits that the petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021. It is a very recent arrest. Investigation is at budding stage. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. The petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021. Considering the nature of offence, investigation is at an early stage and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. 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**

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12395/2021

in

J-6 Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No. 279/2021

Vigneshwaran

.. 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. T. Saraganan, S. Raji, 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 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 279/2021 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. This petitioner has no knowledge about prime accused. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. This petitioner is a prime accused. He is in custody for one week only. Occurrence took place in the month of April 2021. But, the police is able to arrest him only on 26.7.2021. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. According to CPP, this petitioner is a prime accused. He was arrested only on 26.7.2021. Considering the short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. 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
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 12477/2021

in

P-3 Vyasarpadi P.S. Crime No. 666/2021

Raj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-3 Vyasarpadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 341, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 666/2021 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 has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 27.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with 5 other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and his friend at knife point and snatched their motor bikes (2 nos) and escaped from the spot. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. 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 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. 12477/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12483/2021

in

P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 1009/2021

1. Jai @ Jayakumar

2. Irfan

.. Petitioners/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. Shankar, Mohammed Aasif, V. Venkatesan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 18.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b),307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1009/2021 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 petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are aged 19 years. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 18.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused went to the defacto complainant's Stove shop at Ambattur, attacked him using knife and caused injury to him. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 1 previous cases . The 2nd petitioner has no previous cases.

5. According to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 18.7.2021. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the age of the

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

vv

Cri.M.P.No. 12483/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August , 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 12577/2021

in

W-10, A.W.P.S. Crime No. 6/2021

M.Sivakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-10, All Women Police Station,
Flower Bazaar,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s. R.S.Indira and M.Dhanraj and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 14.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 376 r/w 417 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.6/2021 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 no offence u/s 376 IPC is attracted. There was a love affair between the petitioner and defacto complainant, which was broken due to the relationship of the defacto complainant with some other persons. Being aggrieved at, a false and exaggerated complaint has been given. The accused is in custody for more than two weeks and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 376 IPC. Investigation is not yet completed and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears there was relationship and sexual intercourse between the defacto complainant and petitioner on several occasions. As per the complaint, the first sexual intercourse with the defacto complainant is by administering sedative drugs. So, the first occurrence is without valid consent. The investigation is at crucial stage. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 22.7.2021. No change in circumstance

was brought to the notice of this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Considering the stage of the investigation and offence against a woman, that too, a sexual assault, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 12579/2021

in

D-1, Triplicane P.S. Crime No.484/2021

Porchelvan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-1, Triplicane Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, 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 23.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 448 and 506(ii) of IPC @ 326 r/w 34 of IPC in Crime No.484/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there are three accused in this case. According to the defacto complainant, he was assaulted by three persons. Even as per the F.I.R., the petitioner has not used any weapon, thus, offence u/s 326 IPC is not made out against him. The petitioner is in custody from 23.6.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused went to the shop of the defacto complainant and demanded Rs.300/- for each, when the defacto complainant refused to give the same, they assaulted him with iron rod and due to which, the victim lost his left side eye sight. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the F.I.R. the assault was made with iron rod. The defacto complainant lost his vision on the left eye. Considering the nature of injury inflicted and that investigation is not yet completed, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. 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

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 12582/2021

in

V-4 Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No. 722/2021

Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V-4 Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Chandra Sekar, M. Sathyasai Eswari, 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 offence punishable under Section 328 IPC and sec. 24(1) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act 2003 in Crime No.722/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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 has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner was found in possession of 550 Kg of banned tobacco products at the time of search made by the police. He further submits that this petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021 and objects the grant of bail.
5. Considering the fact that huge quantity of banned tobacco products were seized from the petitioner during the search made by the police 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**

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 12583/2021

in

PRC No. 93/2018

(On the file of X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 551/2018

Anbu @ Anbarasu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
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. D. Manoj Kumar, J. Krishna Kumar, R. Ram Kumar, R. Stephen Shadhurak, S. Pavithra, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.3.2021 on execution of N.B.W. for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 302, 506(ii) r/w 149 IPC in PRC No. 93/2018 on the file of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai, in Crime No. 551/2018 on the file of 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 N.B.W. was issued against the petitioner on 12.9.2019 due to his non-appearance before the Committal Court. Due to Covid pandemic situation, this petitioner is unable to recall the warrant. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereinafter, the petitioner will regularly appear before the court and prays for granting bail.

4. Learned CPP submits that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 12.9.2019 for his non-appearance. He was absent for the past 1 ½ years. NBW was executed on 3.3.2021.

After much effort, the petitioner was secured by the police. Now, the case is pending for committal. He further submits that this petitioner is having 4 previous cases. If the petitioner is released on bail, again, he will abscond and the case could not be proceeded further and therefore, opposes the grant of bail.

5. According to counsel for the petitioner due to pandemic situation, the petitioner is unable to recall the warrant. The petitioner is in custody for the past 5 months. 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 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 daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond during 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. 12583/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.12584/2021

in

K.7, ICF P.S. Cr.No.120/2021

Immanuval

.. 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. Melvin, S.Y. Syed Parvez, P. Ramki, G. Krishna Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.120/2021 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 has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 26.6.2021. Co-accused was already granted bail by this court. Hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused came to the defacto complainant' Cool-drinks shop and after purchasing Maaza(2 litre bottle) and Gaaja Beedi, refused to pay money, that on demand, the accused assaulted him and at knife point robbed cash Rs.360/- from the cash box. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 7 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is aged about 20. He is in custody for the past 39 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 7 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, his age and the fact that co-accused was already enlarged on bail, 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 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 learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12584/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.12585/2021

in

CCB, Team VII, Crime No.67/2020

P. Sridhar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Team-VII,
Vepery,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Stephen, C.P. Shibu Kumar, N. Senthil Viswarooban, M. Prabaharan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 420, 506(i) IPC and u/s. 76(1) of Chit Funds Act in Crime No.67/2020 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 as per FIR, petitioner's sister/Usha Rani/A1 had conducted the chit and the defacto complainant gave money to A1 alone. Entire allegation is against A1. This petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offence committed by his sister Usha Rani. This petitioner has no personal dealings with the defacto complainant. This petitioner has no knowledge about the document executed by A1 in favour of the defacto complainant. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioner is in custody from 29.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 3 accused involved in this case. This petitioner is arrayed as A2. He along with his sister A1 Usha Rani and brother

Devendran was running a unauthorised chit. In the said chit, several persons joined as subscribers. The accused collected several lakhs as chit amount and did not repay the same even after its maturity date. When the defacto complainant demanded A1 to return the money paid by him, she executed a receipt dt.20.3.2019 promising to repay the amount within 20.4.2019 . But, thereafter also the accused did not come forward to settle the money to the victims. Except the present complaint, 14 complaints are pending as against the petitioner and other accused. The accused have cheated the innocent persons and the amount cheated is more than Rs.27 lakhs. Hence, he objects the grant of bail stating that petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed on 19.7.2021 and there is no change of circumstance.

5. The accused have conducted unregistered Chit. The present complaint is in respect of chit amount Rs.1,21,675/- paid by the defacto complainant. There are 14 more complaints are pending against the accused and more than Rs.27 lakhs was cheated by them. Petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed by this court on 19.7.2021. Under such circumstances, considering the gravity of offence, the quantum of amount involved in this case and no change of circumstance, 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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.12588/2021

in

K.2, Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No.412/2021

K. Bala

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K.2, Ayanavaram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. Thangavadhana Balakrishnan, S Valarmathi, K. Santhosh, counsel for the petitioner and the CPP, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 174(3) Cr.P.C. @ 306 of IPC in Crime No.412/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He married his wife(now deceased) on 16.11.2017 and they lived in a joint family. They had 3 years old male child. Often, she quarreled with him to set up a separate home and threatened him that she will commit suicide. Though the petitioner managed to convince her and was searching for a separate house, on the fateful day, she had committed suicide. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has to take care of his child. Co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. He is in custody from 20.7.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased. He along with his family members tortured the victim mentally and physically,

due to which the victim committed suicide. Investigation is pending. He further submits that it is a recent occurrence, the petitioner was arrested only 20.7.2021 and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. The marriage of the petitioner with the victim took place in the year 2017. It is a case of unnatural death of a woman took place within 7 years of marriage at the in-laws house. Initial presumption is against the husband. He was arrested only 20.7.2021. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in-laws of the deceased were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. However, this petitioner is the husband of the deceased. Investigation is at the budding stage. Considering the above facts, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, 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
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12000/2021

in

J.3, Guindy P.S. Cr.No.654/2021

C. Vigneswaran @ Viki

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J.3, Guindy Police Station(L&O)
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Ganesh Babu, T. Murugan, 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. 341, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.654/2021 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. Defacto complainant had illegal affair with the wife of A2/Co-brother of this petitioner. The family members advised him not to continue the relationship. Enraged over that, this false and exaggerated complaint has been given. This petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused assaulted the defacto complainant with wooden log and bottle. The victim sustained injury on the head and ear, for which sutures were done. He objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The petitioner and other accused alleged to have attacked the victim, who had tried to elope with a married woman/sister-in-law of the petitioner. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC other offences are bailable. Injured has been discharged. Arrested accused were also enlarged on bail by the Court below. 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 IX 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 IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, J.3, Guindy Police Station(L&O), Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12000/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.12002/2021

in

H-1, Washermenpet P.S. Crime No.1922/2021

Munirathinam

.. 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. R.Thulasi Manikandan and R.Rajadurai, Counsel for the petitioner and of 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 147, 148, 341, 294(b) and 307 of IPC in Crime No.1922/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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 has not committed any offence as alleged. An exaggerated complaint has been given. It is a case and counter case. In the counter-case in Cr.No.1923/2021, accused were granted bail and anticipatory bail by this court. In the present case, co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by this court. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that when the defacto complainant and others were coming near Bojarajanagar, the petitioner and others picked up quarrel with them and assaulted them with knife and caused injuries to them. He objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case and counter case. Accused in counter-case in Cr.No.1923/2021 were granted bail and anticipatory bail by this court. The co-accused in the present case were

already granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to following 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 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 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H-1, Washermenpet Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12002/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12495/2021

in

P.5, M.K.B. Nagar P.S. Cr.No.927/2021

Sathish Kumar @ Pura Sathish

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P.5, M.K.B. 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. 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.927/2021 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. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsley implicated in this case. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and wooden log. He objects granting anticipatory bail.
5. Petty quarrel over passing of urine in a public place. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences areailable. No serious injury was reported. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail by the Court below. 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 X 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P.5, MKB Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12495/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021**

Cr.L.M.P.No.12496/2021

in

D-1, Triplicane P.S. Crime No.883/2020

P.Parameshwari

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-1, Triplicane Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K. Amulraj, 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 406 of IPC in Crime No.883/2020 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 has not committed any offence as alleged. He has been falsely implicated in this case. A1 was granted bail by the Court below. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the 1st accused/Sundararajan joined as a Cook in the defacto complainant's house and he along with the present petitioner joined together and convinced the defacto complainant to part with Rs.25 lakhs under the pretext of getting more income and cheated him. He seriously objects granting bail.
5. This is the 2nd petition. Without disclosing the dismissal of the earlier petition, this petition has been filed. During the course of arguments, the petitioner's counsel admitted the dismissal of the earlier petition. This Court remembered the dismissal of the

earlier application in CrI.M.P.No.6381/2021 on 28.4.2021. There is no change of circumstance. Considering the above facts, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12497/2021

in

P-3, Vyasarpadi P.S. Crime No.410/2021

Renuka @ Renuka Eswari

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P.3, Vyasarpadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Lingesan, N. Naresh, S.Y. Syed Parvez, 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), 353, 332, 506(ii) IPC r/w. Sec.3(1) of TNPPDL Act @ sec.147, 148, 341, 294(b), 353, 332, 427, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.410/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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. Being the mother of one Jegadeeswaran, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. She was standing outside the station. She has not committed any offence as alleged. Co-accused were enlarged on bail. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that on suspicion, A1 to A3 in this case were called for enquiry by the respondent police and during the enquiry, the present petitioner, mother of Jegadeeswaran/A3 along with one Pavithra, wife of A2 and others came to the police station and on the wrong notion that the respondent police are going to remand A1 to A3 in other case, started quarrelling with the defacto complainant/Sub-

Inspector. Even after explaining the facts, they broke open the gate of the Police Station and abused the police officials who are on duty and assaulted them and taking advantage of the same, A1 to A3 escaped from the station. In the said incident, two police officials got injured. According to learned CPP, petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed on 14.7.2021 and the 2nd anticipatory bail petition is not maintainable and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that she broke open the gate of the police station to facilitate the other accused to escape and prevented the police officials to discharge their duty. Earlier petition was dismissed on 14.7.2021. This is the 2nd anticipatory bail petition. There is no change of circumstance. Considering the above facts, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. 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

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12491/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11239/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.204/2021

1. K. Kagil

2. M. Jayavarma Pandi

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. V. Manimaran, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent , this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11239/2021, dt:6.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11239/2021 on 6.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition from 11.7.2021 to 1.8.2021. Considering the period of compliance, 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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12492/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11240/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.543/2021

1. K. Kagil

2. M. Jayavarma Pandi

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. V. Manimaran, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent , this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11240/2021, dt:6.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11240/2021 on 6.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition from 11.7.2021 to 1.8.2021. Considering the period of compliance, 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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12494/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.10882/2021

in

V.6, Kolathur P.S. Cr.No.422/2021

M. Tamizhselvan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

V.6, Kolathur Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. Maran, V. Sathish, B.L. Sankar, 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.10882/2021, dt:28.6.2021.

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.10882/2021 on 28.6.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the Inspector of Police, Tiruvallur Town Police Station, daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 3.7.2021 to 1.8.2021. Considering the period of compliance, 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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12493/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11350/2021

in

P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Cr.No.753/2021

Ajay

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,(L&O)

P.1, Pulianthope Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Muralidaran, U. Yuvaraj, M. Elayakumar, 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.11350/2021, dt:8.7.2021.

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.11350/2021 on 8.7.2021 for the offence u/s.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) 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 12.7.2021 till 30.7.2021 except from 19.7.2021 to 29.7.2021. Since the petitioner had fallen from the stair case, he sustained injury on the back and he was admitted in the hospital for treatment. Due to which he was unable to comply the condition during the intervening days. Further, in view of the above condition, the petitioner is unable to take further treatment. Hence, prays for relaxation.

5. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition only for 6 days and from 20.7.2021, he has not complied the condition and thus objects the petition. Considering the period of compliance and the objection made by learned CPP, 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

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.12581/2021

in

F-1, Chintadripet P.S. Cr.No.84/2021

Pradeep

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

F-1, Chintadripet 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 and B.Jayakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.5.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 448, 294(b), 307 of IPC in Crime No.84/2021 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 in custody from 9.5.2021. He was detained under Goondas Act and the detention has been revoked by the Advisory Board in G.O.Rt.No.3300, dated 26.7.2021. Hence, seeks for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused went to the shop of the defacto complainant and assaulted his manger for not giving mamool amount.

5. The petitioner is in custody from 9.5.2021. His detention under Goondas has been revoked by the Advisory Board. Considering the nature of offence 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 XIV 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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.12581/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.12590/2021

in

F-1, Chintadripet P.S. Cr.No.75/2021

Pradeep

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

F-1, Chintadripet Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.5.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 353, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.75/2021 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 in custody from 9.5.2021. He was detained under Goondas Act and the detention has been revoked by the Advisory Board in G.O.Rt.No.3300, dated 26.7.2021. Hence, seeks for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and tried to assault him with knife.

5. The petitioner is in custody from 9.5.2021. His detention under Goondas has been revoked by the Advisory Board. Considering the nature of offence 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 XIV 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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.12590/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12397/2021

and

Crl.M.P.No.12605/2021

(Intervene Petition)

in

K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 648/2021

Pandiaraj

.. 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. Mohamed Ansar, A.M.M. Umar Mukthar, R. Raj Prabhu, B.M. Santharam, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and M/s.K.S.Raju and A.Saranraj, Counsel for the intervener, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 364A, 384 and 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 648/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the intervener and the CPP were heard through video conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a driver. It appears there was some dispute between one Sudhakar and the other accused A1 and A2 in connection with purchasing of plot. The defacto complainant is the agent of Sudhakar. In order to get back the money, which was paid as advance through the defacto complainant to the Sudhakar, there was some quarrel with the aid of one Karthick. The present petitioner is only a driver of the car, in which the victim was alleged to have been kidnapped. He is innocent. He is in custody for the past 20 days and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the intervener submits that the accused are having another case of similar nature at Pazhavanthangal Police limit. It is a grave case of kidnapping for ransom and prays to dismiss the petition.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the defacto complainant Vedanayagam acted as agent for purchasing a plot at Urapakkam by one Tamim Ansari. There was some default in executing the sale deed of the plot, over which the aggrieved parties kidnapped the agent Vedanayagam and took him in a car in order to get back their money, for which the accused Karthick, a rowdy element assisted them. As per the prosecution, the petitioner drove the car alone. He is no way connected with the offence knowingly. Even as per the confession statement, the petitioner is the owner of the car, a Taxi. Having engaged the Taxi, the customer used the same for unlawful purpose, which culminated to the arrest of the petitioner. Except the car has been used, no other incriminating piece of evidence is available to connect the petitioner in the crime. He is in custody for three weeks. His car was also seized. Considering all those circumstances, 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 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 learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.12397/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 3rd day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.4675/2021

in

J-1, Saidapet P.S. Crime No.108/2021

S.Kushpu @ Rekha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J-1, Saidapet 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.M.K.Parandhaman 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 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.108/2021 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 it is a case of 406 and 420 of IPC. After moving anticipatory bail, this court referred the matter to the Mediation. So far, they have not received any communication from the Mediation Center and prays for an adjournment.

4. On the other hand, the reference made to the Mediation Center has been returned to the court as if the petitioner not turned up for mediation. When the same was confronted, the learned counsel, who is appearing from Ambur through Video Conference, submits that he has not received any communication from the Mediation Center. The matter has been referred to Mediation in March 2021. Having got the order for referring the matter for Mediation, the petitioner and his counsel not even approached the Mediation Center to know the status of the reference. On the other hand, the Mediation Center gave a report as if the petitioner did not appear before the Center. So, on the guise of mediation, the petitioner wants to prolong the matter. The usual practice is to issue notice or intimation to parties alone from the Mediation Center. So, this court finds valid notice to the petitioner

and his counsel. Even otherwise, the duty of the petitioner, who is at threat of arrest, to contact the Mediation Center for redressal. He has not chosen to do so. Considering all those circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail or adjournment and thus, finds the petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss