

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.10898/2021**

in

**H.3, Tondiarpet P.S. Cr.No.1071/2021**

Ajith@ Oonai Ajith

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H.3, Tondiarpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above 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 was arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.1071/2021 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 for statistical purpose. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 19.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on their refusal, the accused assaulted him and at knife point robbed cash Rs.150/- and a cellphone from him. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 1 previous case.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days. Considering the duration of custody and the fact that the petitioner is having only one previous case, 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 XV 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.

(c) the petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

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

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

(f) 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]**.

(g) 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.10898/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11010/2021**

in

**V.4, Rajamangalam P.S. Cr.No.617/2021**

Sam Prakash

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 395, 458, 511 IPC in Cr.No.617/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. During enquiry, learned counsel for the petitioner has chosen to withdraw the petition. Considering his submission, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

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 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11018/2021**

in

**P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.394/2021**

Prabhu

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police(L&O),

P.4, Basin Bridge Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above 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 of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 427, 336, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.394/2021 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 for statistical purpose. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 20.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused went to the defacto complainant's roadside tiffin shop and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused assaulted him and at knife point robbed cash Rs.1,200/- from the cash box. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 16 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, 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.

(c) the petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

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

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

(f) 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]**.

(g) 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11018/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11060/2021**

in

**H.5, New Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.1053/2021**

Iyya @ Dinesh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H.5, New Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 397, 506(ii) IPC and sec. 3 of TNPPDL Act in Crime No.1053/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10748 and 10909 of 2021. The petitioner is in custody from 19.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 6 accused involved in this case. This petitioner along with other accused armed with deadly weapon threatened the public as if they are the area rowdies and damaged the vehicles parked in the road and at knife point robbed Rs.230/ from the defacto complainant. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having one previous case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days. Considering the duration of custody, the fact that the petitioner is having only one previous case and co-accused were already granted 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 XV 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.

(c) the petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

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

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

(f) 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]**.

(g) 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11060/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11064/2021**

in

**P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.414/2021**

Doss

.. 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. M. Kabilan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 4(1)(a) r/w. 4(1-A) of TNP Act and Sec.328 of IPC in Cr.No.414/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 25.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with another accused was found in possession of 19 bottles of brandy bottles and 1 Kg Maava without valid licence. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having one previous case.
5. The petitioner has been in custody for the past 11 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having one previous case. However, as far as this case is concerned, Property has been recovered and no one was hospitalized due to the consumption of



contraband. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on 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 Investigating Officer as and when required.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

1. The learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11064/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11067/2021**

in

**P.R.C.No.58/2021**

(on the file of X Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai)

in

**P.4, Basin Bridge P.S., Cr.No.777/2020**

Suresh @ Sulchi Suresh

.. 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. S. Ajith, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was remanded on 25.3.2021 for the offence punishable under Sections 395 r/w. 34 IPC in PRC.No.58/2021 on the file of X Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Chennai, 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 was arrested on 25.3.2021 and remanded to judicial custody. The case is pending before the X Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Chennai in PRC.No.58/2021. The petitioner is in custody for more than 3 months. He undertakes to appear before the Committal Court without fail. Hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is the accused in a murder case in Cr.No.940/2020, wherein he was originally arrested on 9.11.2020. In this case he was produced under P.T. warrant on 25.3.2021 and remanded to judicial custody

and the case is pending at the stage of committal. He further submits that petitioner is having 8 previous cases and thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. The alleged occurrence is dated 22.9.2020. Originally, the petitioner was arrested in another Cr.No.945/2020 in the year 2020 itself. In this case, he was produced on 25.3.2021 under P.T. warrant. The petitioner has been in custody for more than 3 months. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 8 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody and the stage of the case, 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

(b) 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.

(c) the petitioner shall appear before the said court at 10.30 a.m. on all hearing dates without fail.

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

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

(f) 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]**.

(g) 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate Chennai.
  2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai
- nmk Crl.M.P.No.11067/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11207/2021**

in

**D.3, Ice House P.S. Cr.No.218/2021**

Prakash

.. 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. P. Thinesh, T. Sundar Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 307 IPC @ 341, 452, 302 r/w. 34 IPC in Cr.No.218/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. On suspicion, the petitioner has been implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 27.4.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner/A3 along with other attacked the deceased with knife on the neck, chest, stomach and upper part of the hip and caused grievous injuries. The victim was admitted into the hospital and later he succumbed to injuries. Initially, the case was registered

u/s.307 IPC and subsequently, on the death of the victim the case has been altered into Sec.302 IPC. He seriously objects granting bail stating that earlier petition was dismissed only on 7.6.2021 and there is no change of circumstance.

5. Initially, the case was registered u/s.307. Due to the brutal attack made on the deceased, he succumbed to death. Subsequently, the case was altered into Sec.302 IPC. A valuable life has been lost. Petitioner is a named accused. Considering the gravity of offence and no change of circumstance after dismissal of earlier petition, 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 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11130/2021**

in

**CCB, Cr.No.11/2021**

Madan Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCB, Cyber Crime Cell,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Jayaprakash, G. Sathish, R.S. Maitreya, J. Dhanalakshmi, R. Santhosh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 509 IPC r/w. Sec.67, 67A of IT Act and Sec.4 of Indecent Representation of Women Act, 1986 in Cr.No.11/2021 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 played PUBG game of Korea, which has not been banned in India and uploading the same in his YouTube Channel. There were some subscribers in his Channel. According to the prosecution, while playing the game, the petitioner used vulgar language representing the women in a vulgar manner outraging the modesty of women and thereby he attracted subscribers including minor boys and girls. For which, a case has been registered u/s. 294(b), 509 IPC and Sec.67, 67A of IT Act and Sec.4 of IRW Act. Except Sec.67(A) of the IT Act, other offences are bailable. In fact, the offence u/s.67(A) is not attracted. Because as per Sec.67(A) of the Act, if any obscene material with sexually explicit act is published, Sec.67(A) is attracted. Even as per the prosecution case, no sexually explicit act had been uploaded by the petitioner. So, the offence under Sec.67(A) of the IT Act is

not prima facie attracted. He further submits that investigation is almost over. He is in custody for the past 17 days. Co-accused/his wife was released on bail. Police custody was also taken. Custodial interrogation is over. Hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that by using vulgar language representing the women in a vulgar manner, the petitioner attracted young adolescent subscribers and thereby lured them to part with their money. Out of such indecent activities, the petitioner amassed wealth more than a Crore. In fact, the case is likely to be altered into Sec.420 IPC also and thus he seriously objects granting bail.

5. Learned CPP also filed written objections containing the vulgar words used by the petitioner. However, this court don't want to mention the words used by the petitioner in this order to meet the decorum of the Court.

6. No doubt, the offence u/s. 294(b), 509 IPC and Sec.67 of IT Act and Sec.4 of IRW Act are bailable. Sec.67(A) of IT Act is a non bailable offence. Whether the contents uploaded by the petitioner in his YouTube channel are to the effect of sexually explicit act or not is a matter for investigation. The case is a highly sensitive one, in which, the petitioner moved before the Hon'ble High Court for anticipatory bail and the same has been dismissed.

7. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears, the petitioner aged about 29 amassed wealth more than a Crore. He was in possession of two Audi Cars out of the proceeds of uploading Video game with obscene materials may be oral. According to the Prosecutor, several complaints are blowing up for cheating the subscribers. The case records would go to show nearly 77,000 subscribers for the petitioner's YouTube Channel. So, the investigation necessarily take much time. Under such circumstances, considering the initial stage of investigation and the money involved, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

8. 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**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.10990 and 11098 of 2021**

in

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

1. Haribabu
2. Antony
3. Dinesh @ Kava Dinesh
4. Rajesh
5. Saleem @ Vignesh

.. Petitioners/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.10990/2021

Shanmugam @ Sathish

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.11098/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

For Petitioners : M/s. M.Illiyas and A. Venkateswara Babu,  
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.10990/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. N. Naresh, A. Jaganathan  
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11098/2021

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor in both the petitions.

Both the petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the above said Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 IPC in Cr.No.1923/2021 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 appearing for the petitioners submits that petty quarrel between the petitioners' and the defacto complainant's group under the influence of alcohol. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners are in custody from 17.6.2021.



Though there was a quarrel between two groups, no serious injury has been inflicted and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On perusal of the Case Diary relating to Cr.Nos.1923 and 1922/2021, it appears the case and counter case was registered at the same occurrence time. As per FIR in Cr.No.1923/2021, no specific previous motive alleged. When questioning the taking of alcohol in that area by the complainant therein, the accused in this crime number (petitioners herein) assaulted the defacto complainant and others. In respect of the same occurrence, another complaint in Cr.No.1922/2021 has been given. On perusal of the Case Diary and available AR copies would go to show there are simple injuries. There are chances of including Sec.307 IPC deliberately in order to make the offence grave one. According to learned CPP, the petitioners are having previous cases. However, considering the counter case and the injuries on either side 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/- each (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XV 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 Investigating Officer as and when required.

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.10990 and 11098 of 2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11038/2021**

in

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

Viji @ Chetta Viji

.. 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. Nithiyavel, R. Mukesh Kannah, 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. Though there was a quarrel between two groups, no serious injury has been inflicted 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. On perusal of the Case Diary relating to Cr.Nos.1923 and 1922/2021, it appears that the case and counter case was registered at the same occurrence time. As per FIR in

Cr.No.1923/2021, no specific previous motive alleged. When questioning the taking of alcohol in that area by the complainant therein, the accused in this crime number (petitioners herein) assaulted the defacto complainant and others. In respect of the same occurrence, another complaint in Cr.No.1922/2021 has been given. On perusal of the Case Diary and available AR copies would go to show there are simple injuries. There are chances of including Sec.307 IPC deliberately in order to make the offence grave one. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having previous cases. However, considering the fact that victim sustained only simple injury and the arrested co-accused were granted bail by this court today, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to following conditions.

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 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 Investigating Officer as and when required.

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

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

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the 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

**Crl.M.P.No.11038/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.11124, 11125, 11126, 11127 of 2021**

in

**H.1, Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.1922/2021**

M. Sathish Kumar	.. Petitioner/Accused in Crl.M.P.No.11124/2021
Manikandan	.. Petitioner/Accused in Crl.M.P.No.11125/2021
V. Mohan	.. Petitioner/Accused in Crl.M.P.No.11126/2021
Gajalakshmi	.. Petitioner/Accused in Crl.M.P.No.11127/2021
Vs.	
State Rep. by The Inspector of Police, H.1, Washermenpet Police Station, Chennai.	..Respondent/Complainant in all the petitions.

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Thulasi Manikandan, R. Rajadurai, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 307 IPC in Cr.No.1922/2021 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 petty quarrel between the petitioners' and the defacto complainant's group under the influence of alcohol. No serious injury has been inflicted. An exaggerated complaint has been given. It is a case and counter case. The petitioners are in custody from 17.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that there was a clash between two groups. Case and counter case(Cr.No.1923/2021). He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioners are having previous cases.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary relating to Cr.Nos.1922 and 1923/2021, it appears the case and counter case was registered at the same occurrence time. There is no specific previous motive. On perusal of the Case Diary and available AR copies would go to show there are simple injuries. There are chances of including Sec.307 IPC deliberately in order to make the offence grave one. According to learned CPP, the petitioners are having previous cases. However, considering the counter case and the injuries on either side 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/- each (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XV 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 Investigating Officer as and when required.

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.11124, 11125, 11126, 11127 of 2021**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11159/2021**

in

**F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Cr.No.75/2019**

R. Venkatesan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F.5, Choolaimedu Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Percivul Pericles, P. Thalopathy, S.M. Raghuram, D. Anantha Padmanabhan, 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 offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 307, 506(ii) IPC r/w. Sec.4 of TNPHW Act in Cr.No.75/2019 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. The alleged occurrence is of the year 2019. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. Originally, the petitioner was arrested in another Cr.No.556/2021 and he has been implicated in this old case. Co-accused was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.4422/2019. The petitioner is in custody from 23.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 23 accused involved in this case. Due to previous enmity in connection with the murder of the defacto complainant's

relative, this petitioner/A1 along with others attempted to murder the defacto complainant with knife and abused her in vulgar words. The petitioner is the main accused. He was absconding for more than 2 years. The police after much effort arrested him recently. He seriously objects granting bail stating that petitioner is a murder case accused having 8 previous case and in this case charge sheet has been filed and it is yet to be numbered.

5. The alleged occurrence is of the year 2019. There is a specific motive for the occurrence. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is the main accused and he is having 8 previous cases. He managed to escape for more than 2 years and arrested only on 23.6.2021. Though investigation is over, considering the motive for the occurrence, bad antecedents and short duration of custody, 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 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11208/2021**

**in**

**D-3, Ice House P.S. Crime No.305/2021**

Dinesh @ Vendakai Dinesh

.. 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.P.Thinesh, T.Sundarbabu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 325, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.305/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offence. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 10.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to dispute in supplying drugs, the petitioner and others attacked the defacto complainant and caused severe bleeding injury on his nose. Due to the said assault his teeth was broken. He further submits that the petitioner is having 7 previous cases. Earlier petition was dismissed on 29.6.2021 and objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is having seven previous cases. Earlier petition was dismissed on 29.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Considering the nature of case and antecedents, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11209/2021**

**in**

**K-2, Aynavaram P.S. Crime No.345/2021**

Nivas @ Solo Nivas

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.S.K.Masthan, K.Sujan Kumar and G.Siva Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.345/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this case has been foisted against the petitioner. There was a quarrel between the petitioner's brother-in-law and some other persons. Anticipating something from the petitioner, he has been called for by the respondent police for executing bond u/s 110 Cr.P.C. Since he has failed to appear, this false case has been foisted against him and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is having four previous cases and objects granting bail.
5. Considering the duration of custody and nature of offence for which this case has been registered, 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 photograph and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to :

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No. 11209/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11210/2021**

in

**P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.724/2021**

Sathish @ Sanda Koli Sathish

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The 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. K. Sujan Kumar, S.K. Masthan, T. Ramesh Kumar, G. Siva Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.724/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 4.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is a vegetable vendor selling vegetables in a pushcart. This petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused threatened him and robbed Rs.750/- from him. The petitioner is a history sheeter having 12 previous cases. Earlier petition was dismissed on 25.6.2021 and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is having 12 previous cases. Earlier petition was dismissed only on 25.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Considering the nature of offence and antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

ss



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11211/2021**

**in**

**K-3, Aminjikarai P.S. Crime No.72/2021**

Anthony @ Sori Anthony

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-3, Aminjikarai Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.G.Sivakumar, S.K.Masthan and B.M.Santharam, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.3.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 120(B), 380, 511, 307, 302 of IPC altered to 120(B), 392, 453, 455, 459, 393 r/w 397, 394, 302 r/w 34 of IPC and 454, 392 r/w 109 of IPC in Crime No.72/2021 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 for more than three months. Charge sheet was filed and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of murder for gain. The accused is already a convicted accused, liable to enhance the punishment. Earlier petition was dismissed on 24.6.2021 and seriously objects granting bail.

5. Earlier petition was dismissed on 24.6.2021 on the ground that the murder was taken place in an attempt to commit robbery, a woman was seriously injured and another woman was done to death and the petitioner is having bad antecedents. No change of circumstances. Considering the same, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

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

SS

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI  
**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**  
**Crl.M.P.No.11212/2021**  
**in**  
**G-5, Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No.146/2021**

Ajay @ Ajaykumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-5, Secretariat Colony Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.R.Muthukumar, R.Lingakumar and D.Jaisankar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324 and 307 of IPC in Crime No.146/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 22.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to enmity over the murder of one Madan, the petitioner along with other accused assaulted the defacto complainant with knife and caused injuries on his leg and head. The injured was admitted in the hospital and still he is taking treatment as inpatient and thus, strongly opposed the petition.
5. It is a case of 307 IPC. The injured sustained grievous injuries and he is taking treatment as inpatient. Considering the same, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

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

SS

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11213/2021**

**in**

**H-6, R.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No.943/2021**

Santhosh Kumar @ Santho

.. 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.R.Hemanthkumar, N.Ravi and B.Nandhakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.943/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point, he robbed the cellphone. The petitioner is habitual offender, having 25 previous cases, thus, strongly opposed the petition.

5. The petitioner is having 25 previous cases. He was arrested in this case on 17.6.2021. Considering the nature of offence, duration of custody and antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

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

SS

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.11196/2021**

in

**K-8, Arumbakkam P.S. Crime No.573/2021**

1. Mathiyalagan
2. Shyamala
3. Aribal

.. Petitioners/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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.Muthukumar, A.Saravanakumar, D.Pavithra and S.V.Shyamkumar 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 341, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC and Sec.4 of TN Harassment of Women Act, 2003 in Crime No.573/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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. The petitioners have lodged a complaint against the defacto complainant and others and a case was registered in Cr.No.616/2021. The defacto complainant and another was granted anticipatory bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.10780/20201, on 23.6.2021. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to dispute between neighbours, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and wooden log and also assaulted a pregnant lady.

5. Dispute between neighbours. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Defacto complainant and others were granted anticipatory bail by this court in the counter case. Considering the above aspects, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 V 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 as and when required.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to:

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K-8, Arumbakkam Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11196/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrL.M.P.No.11198/2021**

in

**P-6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No.981/2021**

1. Samathanam
2. Balaji
3. Raja Raja Chozhan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P-6, Kodungaiyur 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.R.Muthukumar, R.Lingakumar and D.Jaisankar 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 147, 148, 294(b) and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.981/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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. There was family dispute between A1 and defacto complainant. Already A1 lodged a complaint. No one injured in this incident. The petitioners' name have not been mentioned in the F.I.R. They are no way connected with the offence. They apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners along with main accused went to the house of the defacto complainant with deadly weapons and tried to assault them.

5. As evidenced from the complaint and other facts, it appears there was a complaint against one Sathish, Sub-Inspector of Police under the POCSO Act as if he has sexually abused the defacto complainant's daughter with the aid of his wife and wife's sister. Now, the present occurrence took place in furtherance of the S.I. of Police by the present

petitioners. They are no way connected with the defacto complainant's family. It is alleged that at the instance of the S.I. of Police, the present petitioners assembled and tried to assault the defacto complainant's family. Considering the nature of incident and background of the case, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.10974/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.11751/2021**

**(On the file of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)**

**in**

**Cr.No.484/2021**

Ajayan

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Venkatesan and R.Devendiran and CPP for respondent, this court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks modification of the condition imposed by the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in the bail order passed in Crl.M.P.No.11751/2021, dt: 8.6.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.11751/2021 on 8.6.2021 with condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties (one shall be a blood relation of the petitioner) each for a likesum. This application has been filed to modify some other persons, instead of blood surety, stating that he is not having any blood relatives.

4. However, according to CPP, as per the confession statement, the petitioner's parents are in Kerala. Hence, this court is not inclined to modify the condition.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/-R.Selvakumar**

ss

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.11133/2021**

in

**P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.800/2021**

Prasanth Kumar @ Kumar

.. 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.N.Naresh and A.Jaganathan 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), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC and Sec.4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.800/2021 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 and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The defacto complainant's Aunty selling prohibited things, which was objected the petitioner's family, in which both of them assaulted each other. Arrested accused was released on bail by the Magistrate in CrI.M.P.No.423/2021 on 25.6.2021. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous dispute, the petitioner along with other accused assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and stones and also torn her nighty.

5. Arrested accused released on bail. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of case, 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 Metropolitan Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, 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 as and when required.

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

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

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the 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 Metropolitan Magistrate, Addl. Mahila Court, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-1, Pulianthope Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11133/2021