

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.12089 and 12207 of 2021**

in

**P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.1460/2021**

Muthu @ Muthuvel

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12089/2021

Joseph

.. Petitioners/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12207/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

For Petitioner : M/s. A. Saranraj, K.S.A. Syed Jaffer,  
Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.12089/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. B.R. Shankaralingam, N.Ravi, M. Babu,  
Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.12207/2021

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 petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12089/21, who was arrested on 23.7.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12207/21, who was arrested on 24.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 269, 273, 328 and Sec. 24(i) of COTP Act in Cr.No.1460/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They are in custody for more than two weeks and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on information, when the respondent police came to search the shop run by the accused Muthu @ Muthuvel, it was found that he indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products, which was purchased from another accused/Joseph, who is a wholesaler. Muthu was arrested and 152 Kg of banned tobacco products were seized. Based on the statement given by Muthu, other accused Joseph was arrested. Learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioners are having 3 previous cases.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than two weeks. According to learned CPP, the petitioners are having 3 previous cases. 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 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 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet.

nmk

CrI.M.P.Nos.12089 and 12207 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12091/2021**

**in**

**G.5, Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No.175/2021**

Raju @ Kattu Raju @ Kalidas

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
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. K.V. Kalaivanan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 427, 397, 336, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.175/2021 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 alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody from 20.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's tea shop and after having tea and bun refused to pay money, that on demand, he assaulted the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.110/- from his pocket and also damaged the glass tumblers. He seriously objects granting bails stating that the petitioner is having 5 previous cases.

5. Considering the nature of offence and bad antecedent, 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**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12218/2021**

in

**R.R.No.13/2021**

in

**F.No.DRI/CZU/VIII/48/ENQ-01/INT-04/2021**

S.Ganesh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

Directorate of Revenue Intelligence,  
Chennai Zonal Unit,  
Rep. by Senior Intelligence Officer,  
No.27, G.N.Chetty Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai-600017.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 104, 135 of Customs Act, 1962 in R.R.No.13/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned SPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is only a Supervisor of a Godown, in which, according to the prosecution, somebody tried to export red sanders under the guise of declared goods by stuffing red sanders in the container. Since, the petitioner was present at the premises, he has been arrested. He is no way connected with the offence. He is in custody from 9.6.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor submits that the petitioner is in custody of the goods about to be exported by stuffing the same in the

container. Since he is having control over the banned goods, he has been arrested. He has given a voluntary confession statement implicating himself and others in the crime. The prime accused Vijay Sarathi @ Viji is yet to be arrested. The value of red sanders about to be exported without valid permission is running to Crores and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for about 60 days. According to learned CPP, prime accused is still at large. However, considering the duration of custody and the role played by the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, E.O.I, 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 Investigating Agency 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**

Copies to :

1. The Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, E.O.I, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12218/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.12485 and 12575 of 2021**

in

**J.1, Saidapet P.S. Cr.No.640/2021**

1. Isakkimuthu  
2. Balamurugan

.. Petitioners/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12485/2021

Manoharan

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12575/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J.1, Saidapet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

For Petitioners : M/s. M. Prabakar and D. Raja,  
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.12485/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. D. Dhanasekaran, Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.12575/2021

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 petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 22.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 328 of IPC r/w. 20(1) COTP Act in Cr.No.640/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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



3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They are in custody from 22.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during vehicle check-up, on information, when the respondent police intercepted the petitioners' vehicle(Tata Ace), they found huge quantity of banned tobacco products. The petitioners herein were arrested and from them 345 Kg of banned tobacco products and cash Rs.94,000/- were seized. He objects granting bail considering the nature of offence. However, he submits that the petitioners have no bad antecedent.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 17 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have no bad antecedent. Further, the property involved in this case 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 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 IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned

Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.Nos.12485 and 12575 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13046/2021**

in

**PEW – Anna Nagar P.S. Cr.No.289/2021**

Rosini

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
PEW – Anna Nagar,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 4(1-A), 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1)(i) of TNP Act in Crime No.289/2021 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. She is noway connected with the alleged offence. Neither the petitioner is the owner nor she leased out the premises, from where the contraband was seized. She is the native of Trichy District. She came to Chennai and working under 2<sup>nd</sup> accused. She is a Divorcee and she is having a male child aged 9 years. She is unable to take care of her child due to incarceration. She is in custody from 21.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused indulged in the sale of illicit liquor, which has been brought from the State of Karnataka by co-accused Shrvanth. The police have searched the premises of the accused and arrested one Dhanush/A1 and seized 33 boxes, each containing 24 bottles of Old Tavern Whisky, 6 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Bagpiper Whisky, 24 boxes, each

containing 12 bottles of 8 PM Whisky, 12 boxes, each containing 9 bottles of Bejois Vsop Brandy, 4 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Mcdowells Brandy, 6 boxes, each containing 9 bottles of Old Admiral Vsop Brandy, 3 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Old Munk XXX rum along with cash Rs.25,300/- He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having one previous case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 18 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having one previous case. However, the property involved in this case has been recovered. Considering the above facts, gender 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 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.

**nmk**

**CrI.M.P.No.13046/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12486/2021**

**in**

**PEW Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No.221/2021**

Rosini

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
Inspector of Police,  
PEW Anna Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. John Samuvel, S. Dinesh Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1-A), 4(1)(aaa), of TNP Act and Sec.188 and 269 of IPC in Crime No.221/2021 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. She is noway connected with the alleged offence. Neither the petitioner is the owner nor she leased out the vehicle, from which the contraband was seized. She is the native of Trichy District. She came to Chennai and working under 2<sup>nd</sup> accused. She is a Divorcee and she is having a male child aged 9 years. She is unable to take care of her child due to incarceration. She is in custody from 21.7.2021. Co-accused were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court as well as by this court and the Court below also and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused indulged in the sale of illicit liquor, which were brought from the State of Karnataka. The liquor bottles, totalling 3432 bottles of Brandy transported through four vehicles were seized along with the vehicles and the accused were arrested and based on

their statement, this petitioner has been implicated in this case. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is also involved in yet another case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 18 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having one previous case. However, the property involved in this case has been recovered. One of the co-accused was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court and others were granted bail by this court as well as by the court below. Considering the above facts, gender 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 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 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**

Copies to :

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

nmk CrI.M.P.No.12486/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12578/2021**

**in**

**P.5, MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No.134/2021**

Sikkandar Basha

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A. Elumalai, S. Shanmugam, B. Dineshkumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 324, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.134/2021 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 alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Petitioner is in custody from 13.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant with knife and caused injuries on the hand, stomach and head. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner was arrested after much effort and he is having one previous case.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 26 days. The alleged occurred is in the month of March 2021. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having one previous cases. However, it is reported that injured has been discharged from the hospital. Under



such circumstances, 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 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, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12578/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12938/2021**

in

**P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.1106/2021**

1. Jeeva @ Jeevanantham

2. Sasi @ Sasikumar

.. 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 M/s. C. Jagan, E. Vignesh, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 8.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 506(ii) r/w. 397 IPC in Cr.No.1106/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are in custody from 8.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused, at knife point robbed Rs.800/- from him. He further submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 9 previous cases and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 4 previous cases and thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. Petitioners are in custody for the past one month. According to learned CPP, both the petitioners are having previous cases. However, considering the fact that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/Jeeva is having 9 previous cases, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him.

As far as the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner/Sasi is concerned, as he is having only 4 previous cases, this court is inclined to grant bail to him subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner alone 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is concerned, petition is dismissed.

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

CrI.M.P.No.12938/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12939/2021**

**in**

**K.11, CMBT P.S. Crime No.103/2021**

Lawrance

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

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, Sh.Vazhavan Karthikeyan, P.S. Mercy Gnanammal, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Crime No.103/2021 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 alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody from 8.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused came in a two wheeler and snatched the defacto complainant's mobile phone. He seriously objects granting bails stating that the petitioner is having 5 previous cases.
5. It is a case of mobile snatching. Considering the nature of offence and bad antecedent, 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**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13048/2021**

**in**

**K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.690/2021**

Mada Vikki @ Vignesh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
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. N. Ganesh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 336, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.690/2021 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 alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody from 15.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, they assaulted him and at knife point robbed Rs.800/- from him. He seriously objects granting bails stating that the petitioner is having 10 previous cases.

5. Considering the nature of offence and bad antecedent, 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**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13049/2021**

**in**

**K.1, Sembium P.S. Crime No.1000/2021**

Ajith Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC @ Sec.120(B), 392 r/w. 34 of IPC in Crime No.1000/2021 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 alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused, who came in a two wheeler, snatched the defacto complainant's mobile phone. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner was arrested recently and is also involved in yet another case.
5. It is a case of mobile snatching. The petitioner was arrested on 26.7.2021 and the period for custodial interrogation is not yet over. Considering the nature of offence,

bad antecedent 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  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.13050/2021**

in

**P.2, Otteri P.S. Cr.No.865/2020**

Immanuval

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P.2, Otteri 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 3.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.865/2020 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. Originally, the petitioner was arrested in K.7 P.S. Cr.No.120/2021 on 26.6.2021, wherein he was granted bail by this court on 3.8.2021. In this case, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in order to close pending FIR, which is of the year 2020. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. The petitioner is in custody from 3.7.2021. Hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused, who came in a two wheeler stopped the vehicle near the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, they assaulted him and at knife point robbed cash Rs.2,350/- from him. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 8 previous cases.



5. The petitioner is aged about 20. He is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 8 previous cases. The petitioner was originally arrested in K.7 P.S.Cr.No.120/2021, wherein he was granted bail by this court. In this case formal arrest was shown. Considering the above facts, duration of custody and the age of the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on 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 learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.13050/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.13053/2021**

in

**P-6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.1725/2021**

Kishore

.. 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.M.Iliyas and A.Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 273, 328 of IPC and u/s 24(1) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act, 2003 in Crime No.1725/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody for the past five days and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the arrest was very recent and seriously objects granting bail.

5. As per the F.I.R., the police have recovered 140 kg. of HANS, 6 kg. of COOL LIP, 1 kg. of REMO, 2 kg. of Maava along with TATA Ace vehicle from the accused. The petitioner was arrested only on 3.8.2021. Considering the quantity of banned tobacco

products seized from the accused, duration of custody and the fact that rising of this nature of cases, 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**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13054/2021**

in

**P-6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.1725/2021**

Marimuthu

.. 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.C.V.Kumar, N.Thandayuthabani and S.J.Sasikala, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 273, 328 of IPC and u/s 24(1) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act, 2003 in Crime No.1725/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody for the past five days and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the arrest was very recent and seriously objects granting bail.

5. As per the F.I.R., the police have recovered 140 kg. of HANS, 6 kg. of COOL LIP, 1 kg. of REMO, 2 kg. of Maava along with TATA Ace vehicle from the accused. The petitioner was arrested only on 3.8.2021. Considering the quantity of banned tobacco

products seized from the accused, duration of custody and the fact that rising of this nature of cases, 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  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13055/2021**

in

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

Mohamed Sheriff @ Sheriff

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 28.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.923/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was a clash between two groups of Muslims. In fact, the petitioner side is the affected parties. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.13176/2021 on 29.7.2021 and by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12482/2021, on 2.8.2021. The petitioner is in custody for the past 11 days and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there is a counter case in Cr.No.922/2021. Apart from that, one more case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered at the instance of police officials. Injured has been discharged from the hospital.
5. Co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court and by this court. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody for the past 11 days. 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 VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 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 VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Maduranthagam.

ss

Cri.M.P.No.13055/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.12952/2021**

in

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

1. Mohammed Meeran
2. Syed Niyamathullah
3. Imrankhan
4. Thameem Ansari @ Ansar Ali
5. Jai Ramesh @ Ramesh
6. Syed Anwar Jamal
7. Ayubkhan
8. Abdul Khader
9. Sowbar Sadiq

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
B-1, North Beach 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.Mohamed Riyas, M.Manimaran and K.Kaviyarasu 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), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.923/2021 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 there was a clash between two groups of Muslims. In fact, the petitioners are the affected parties. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court and by this court. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there is a counter case in Cr.No.922/2021. Apart from that, one more case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered at the instance of police officials. The petitioners and counter parties are creating law and order



problems and attacked each other, which affected the public peace. Earlier petition was dismissed on 26.7.2021 and no change of circumstances.

5. On perusal of the C.D. and trial court's order, it appears two groups of Muslim clashed each other over claiming political right over the Tamil Nadu Muslim Munnetra Kazhagam office, in which, it appears the general public has been affected. As submitted by the learned CPP, another case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered against all the parties concerned. Co-accused were granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Further, no change of circumstances. Considering all those circumstances, 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  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.13057 and 13059/2021**

in

**P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Cr.No.744/2021**

Suresh @ Karkka Suresh  
2021

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13057 /

/ Accused.

Rajathi @ Ilamparuthi  
2021

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13059 /

/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petitions coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.C.Johnson Samuel and M.B.Prabhu, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 16.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 394, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.744/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13057/2021 is suffering from kidney ailment. He needs treatment for his illness. The petitioners are in custody from 16.7.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand the learned CPP submits that the petitioners along with four others waylaid the defacto complainant on 14.6.2021 and robbed Rs.2,000/- from him at knife point. The accused have also assaulted the defacto complainant with knife on his back

and caused injuries to him. The petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.13057/2021 is having 15 previous cases and the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.13059/2021 is having 44 previous cases, thus, he seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners' name found place in the F.I.R. The petitioner Suresh is having 15 previous cases and the petitioner Rajathi @ Ilamparuthi is having 44 previous cases. Considering the nature of offence and bad antecedents of the petitioners, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petitions are 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**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.13060/2021**

in

**P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Cr.No.1037/2021**

Sathish @ Lottai Sathish

.. 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.E.Muralidharan, C.Vadivel and P.Ramu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1037/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted bail in the previous case in Cr.No.465/2019 on 25.7.2019. A day prior to the present occurrence, the respondent police intercepted the petitioner and since he is having previous case, they have falsely implicated in this case also and remanded him to custody. The petitioner is not involved in the present occurrence and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with four other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1,500/- from him at knife point. He is having four previous cases and objects granting bail.

5. However, as far as this case is concerned, the petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days. According to the petitioner's counsel, since the petitioner is having previous

case, the present case has been foisted against him. Considering the nature of case 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 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 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, Saidapet, Chennai.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.13060/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrL.M.P.No.11360/2021**

in

**A.W. P.S. Tondiarpet Crime No.Not known/2021**

1. Ilahiparveen
2. Nageebunnisa

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station,  
Todiarpot,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.J.Nissar Ahmed 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 506(ii) and 498 of IPC in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, petition enquiry conducted and closed.
4. Considering the representation of CPP, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

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  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**Cr.L.M.P.No.12133/2021**

in

**W-21, Guindy A.W.P.S. Crime No.6/2021**

Anbarasan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W-21, Guindy All Women 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.D.Padmanabhan, G.Varun Gandhi and D.Saravan Kumar 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 417 and 376 of IPC in Crime No.6/2021 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 case was registered as per the order passed by the learned Magistrate u/s 156(3) Cr.P.C. The defacto complainant is one Bhgyasri. In the year 2017, the petitioner and defacto complainant had love affair and also had consensual relationship. Later she started to separate from the petitioner. Now, in order to extract money from the petitioner, she has lodged the false complaint. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that during 2017, the petitioner and defacto complainant loved each other and believing his words, both had sexual relationship. The defacto complainant got pregnant and subsequently they aborted it. For the sake of marriage, the petitioner received Rs.10 lakhs and 25 sovereign gold jewels. Thereafter, the petitioner went to his home town and joined in police department. When the defacto complainant approached him, he refused to marry him and also attempted to murder her twice.

5. It is a case of 376 IPC. The petitioner admits the relationship with the defacto complainant. But, according to him, it is a consensual relationship. On the other hand, according to the defacto complainant, on the guise of marriage, the petitioner had sexual relationship with her and thereafter, he refused to marry her. It is further alleged that the petitioner received cash Rs.10 lakhs and 25 sovereigns gold jewels. It is also alleged that the petitioner tried to eliminate her. Though the case was registered in the month of April, 2021, the petitioner is absconding. Considering the gravity of offence, 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  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.12429/2021**

in

**G-7, Chetpet P.S. Crime No.252/2021**

Tamizh Selvan @ Thamizha

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.K.Nagarajan and C.R.Ezhil Kumar 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), 392 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.252/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no offence u/s 392 IPC is attracted. Since the petitioner was present at the scene of occurrence, he has been implicated in this case. An exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there was previous dispute between the accused and defacto complainant. On the occurrence day, the accused, including the present petitioner, waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted him and threatened him.

5. As per the allegation in the F.I.R., during the clash, portion of the chain was missing. So, prima facie, the offence u/s 392 IPC is not attracted. There are chances for deliberately including Sec.392 IPC in the F.I.R. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences areailable. Considering the facts and circumstances of the 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 II 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, G-7, Chetpet Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.12429/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrL.M.P.No.12949/2021**

in

**E-1, Mylapore P.S. Crime No.920/2021**

V.Kumaresan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Ganesh Pandian, A.Shabanal, M.Nanda Gopal, M.Mohamed Yusuff, C.Prabakar, K.N.Paridhi Arasu and U.Mohamed Siddiquedeen 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 24(1) of the Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act, 2003 r/w Sec.328 of IPC in Crime No.920/2021 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 co-accused has been granting bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrL.O.P.No.13493/2021 on 4.8.2021. The petitioner has been implicated based on the confession of A2. He has not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. He has no previous case and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the police searched the shop of the petitioner and seized banned tobacco products and arrested the employee of the petitioner. The petitioner is absconding and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. As per the F.I.R., 10 pockets of REMO, 10 pockets of RMD Panmasala, 10 pockets of Rasiklal Manichand, 60 pockets of HANS, 40 pockets of COOL LIP were seized from the petitioner's shop. Co-accused has been released on bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Considering the quantity of banned tobacco products seized from the accused, 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  
Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.12951/2021**

in

**P-5, M.K.B.Nagar P.S. Crime No.937/2021**

Kumar

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Gopi and S.Kumaresan 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 328 of IPC in Crime No.937/2021 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 has been implicated on the basis of the confession statement given by A1. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.12289/2021 on 4.8.2021. He is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of selling banned tobacco products and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Totally 740 grams of banned tobacco products and cash Rs.600/- were recovered from the accused. Co-accused has been granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Considering the fact that cases of this nature is on the rise, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

ss