

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12201/2021

in

D-1 Triplicane P.S. Crime No. 552/2021

1. Nareshkumar Dube
2. Uma Sankar Dube

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing Mr. D. Dhanasekaran, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 25.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 328, 353, 506(i) IPC and sec. 6 and 24(1) of COTPA Act in Crime No. 552/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 25.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners were found in possession of 5 Kg of banned tobacco products at the time of search made by the police. He further submits that the petitioners are having 2 previous cases of similar nature.

5. No one is reported as hospitalized after consuming the contraband. According to CPP, the properties involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioners are in

custody for more than two weeks. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12201/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 12672/2021

in

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

T. Sainath

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147,148 and 302 IPC in Crime No. 211/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of brutal murder due to previous enmity. Investigation is not yet completed. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for abscondence is more. Hence,he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the gravity of offence and that investigation is at crucial stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 12768/2021

in

D.5, Marina P.S. Cr.No.575/2021

Vishal

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D.5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.575/2021 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. Since the petitioner is having previous cases, he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. He is in custody for more than one month and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.150/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender having 9 previous cases and objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Co-accused was already granted bail. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time.

Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Cenral Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12768/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12769/2021

in

S.C.No. 90/2021

(on the file of XX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

N-1 Royapuram P.S. Crime No. 425/2019

Praveenraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-1 Royapuram Police Station,
Chennai

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 28.7.2021 on execution on NBW for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No.90/2021 on the file of XX Additional Sessions Judge in Crime No. 425/2019 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 28.7.2021. NBW was issued against him due to his non-appearance before the trial court. He was regular in attending the court prior to issuance of NBW. He was absent for only one hearing. Hereafter he will be regular in attending the court. He is in custody from 28.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW is pending from 26.2.2021. NBW was executed on 28.7.2021. He was also arrested in another crime number 44/2021 on the same day. If he is

released on bail, again there is every possibility of his abscondence and the case could not be proceeded further and thus objects the grant of bail.

5. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 26.2.2021 and he was arrested on 28.7.2021. According to counsel for the petitioner, due to pandemic situation, the petitioner is not able to recall the warrant. Considering the reason stated by the petitioner for his absence, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to following 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 XX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the said Court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond during trial.

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

1. The XX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Cri.M.P.No. 12769/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 12936/2021

in

N-1 Royapuram P.S. Crime No. 44/2021

Praveenraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-1 Royapuram Police Station,
Chennai

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 28.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 399, 402 IPC in Crime No. 44/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 28.7.2021. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 28.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, this petitioner along with other accused planned to commit dacoity. He is also involved in another case for an offence u/s.307 IPC in which he is facing trial.

5. Occurrence took place on 10.2.2021. Today in another crime number 425/2019 this petitioner moved bail petition and he was granted bail. The petitioner was arrested on 28.7.2021. Considering the nature of offence and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVI 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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12936/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 12937/2021

in

K-6 T.P. Chatram P.S. Crime No. 136/2021

R. Sanoj Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-6 T.P. Chatram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Lakshmipathy, T. Gopinathan, K. Vanangamudi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 7(1) r/w 20(2) of COTP Act 2003 and sec. 294(b), 353, 328 and 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 136/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 16.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that when the police party was on routine check-up, the petitioner was found in possession of banned tobacco products in a plastic gunny bag. When the police enquired him, he abused the officials and prevented them from performing their duty. He was arrested and from him Maava-50pockets(each 14 grams) were recovered under mahazar. The accused took the police to the place, where he manufactured the contraband and the police have recovered Maava-600 pockets(each 14 grams) ; white colour plastic bag containing 6.200 grams of Maava ; White colour plastic bag containing betel-nuts -17.300 grams, red colour gunny bag containing rice flour -16.800 grams, slaked lime – 4 boxes, colour powder-1

box were seized. The police also recovered weighing machine-1, heating machine-1, red colour Grinder-2 and cash Rs.54,470/- and also the two wheeler used for selling the contraband. He further submits that petitioner is from North India. The arrest is very recent. Huge quantity of banned tobacco products were recovered and thus, strongly opposed the petition.

5. No one is reported as hospitalized after consuming the contraband. According to CPP, the properties involved in this case has been recovered. Though the petitioner is the native of Bihar, he is having local address. He is in custody for about 25 days. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 12940/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.690/2021

1. Dinesh @ Manda Dinesh
2. Akash

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. N. Selvarajan, M. Jaikumar, L. Vinothkumar, P. Kamaraj, T. Lavanya, Sh. Vazhavan Karthikeyan, S. Bharathiraja, P.S. Mercy Gnanammal and S. Vincent, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 336, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.690/2021 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 15.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with another 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 further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 8 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 2 previous cases and thus objects granting bail.

5. Considering the antecedents of the 1st petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present. As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, this court is inclined to grant bail considering previous case and his duration of custody, subject to following condition.

6. Accordingly, the 2nd petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 2nd petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

(g) As far as the 1st petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

Cri.M.P.No. 12940/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 12945/2021

in

N-1 Royapuram P.S. Crime No. 67/2021

Sirajudeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-1 Royapuram 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 was arrested on 23.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 380 IPC in Crime No. 67/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is a relative of the defacto complainant. The real fact is all the gold ornaments were pledged in the name of Sumaiya and signed by defacto complainant and all the transaction made in the Santosh Giri Pawn broker shop located at Royapuram. Due to some misunderstanding between the defacto complainant and the petitioner, the defacto complainant lodged the complaint before the Washermenpet range police on 3.2.2021 and the same has been forwarded to the respondent police and 4.3.2021 and FIR was registered on the same day. This petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He is in custody from 23.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner and his wife has committed theft of 56 sovereigns of gold ornaments from the defacto complainant's house and objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the available records, it would go to show that there are some documents were recovered from the petitioner for pledging gold ornaments in his wife's

name. According to CPP 56 sovereigns of gold ornaments were recovered from the petitioner. The arrest of the petitioner is very recent. Investigation is at budding stage. In the said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12946/2021
in
W-18 AWPS Crime No. 17/2021

Navin Daniel Ashok Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-18 All Women Police Station,
MKB Nagar,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 376 r/w 417 IPC in Crime No. 17/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Since this case appears to be the Consensual sex, prima facie Sec.376 IPC not attracted. The petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant was given employment in the Glenn Garry Marketing at Nungambakkam, Chennai on 7.9.2020. This petitioner is the Human Resource Manager of the above said company. He was already a married man. He proposed his love proposal to the defacto complainant by suppressing his earlier marriage and after some period, he compelled her to have physical contact with him. Though the complainant refused, this petitioner sexually abused her under the pretext of marry her and several times he had physical relationship with her. Thereafter, the complainant came to know about his previous marriage and when she

asked about his previous marriage, he threatened her that he will will make out their affair in public. Investigation is at an earlier stage. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he sexually abused the defacto complainant under the pretext of marrying her. Suppressing his earlier marriage, he had physical contact with the defacto complainant. When the complainant came to know about his previous marriage, he promised to marry her. Later, refused and threatened her. According to prosecution, the petitioner's wife delivered a baby just last month. The act of the petitioner would go to show his cheating intention. The petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021. Investigation is at budding stage. Considering the gravity of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13047/2021

in

PRC No. 107/2021

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

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.199/2021

Samuvel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.4.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 302, 341, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 199/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. This petitioner is not a named accused. Since he is having some previous cases, he has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were already granted bail. Investigation is completed. Charge sheet also filed. The petitioner is in custody from 13.4.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner is having 7 previous cases.

5. On perusal of records, this petitioner is not a named accused. He has been implicated in this case based on the confession statement of other accused. Co-accused were already granted bail. Investigation is completed. Charge sheet is filed. The petitioner

is in custody for more than three months. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13047/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13051/2021

in

K-7 ICF P.S. Crime No. 91/2021

Vijay

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 5.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 454 and 380 IPC in Crime No. 91/2021 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 has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Only based on the confession statement, he has been implicated in this case. Nothing has been recovered from this petitioner. Co-accused was released on bail by this court on 15.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A2 along with three other accused break open the defacto complainant's house and stolen away 6 sovereigns of gold jewels, 1 Laptop, one LED TV and cash Rs.55,000/-. According to him only 6 grams of gold and one Laptop only recovered. Remaining portion of property not yet recovered and objects the granting of bail.
5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. He is in custody for more than a month. Properties partly recovered. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on

15.7.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13051/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13058/2021

in

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

Anthony @ Sori Anthony

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-3, Aminjikai 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 5.7.2021 and seriously objects granting bail.

5. Earlier petition was dismissed on 5.7.20121 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. The petitioner is having one previous case. According to CPP, investigation is completed and charge sheet was filed. The petitioner is in custody for more than three months. Considering the duration of custody, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13058/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 9th day of August , 2021
Crl.M.P.No. 13143/2021
in
R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 734/2021

Sivaraman

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 307 IPC in Crime No.734/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. Due to previous enmity, wordy quarrel arose between the petitioner and the victim, both of them attacked each other. There is no grievous injuries. The petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 22.7.2021, when the defacto complainant's son talking with his friends, this petitioner/A1 along with other accused came there in bike. Victim Ajithraj enquired A1 and told he seen him after a long time. Without giving any answer he left the place. Thereafter, on the same day at about 7.30 p.m. A1 Sivaraman (the petitioner herein) and his friends Sivabalan and one Sivanesan came on their bike and attacked the victim using deadly weapons and caused multiple cut injuries on his head and right hand and escaped from the spot in their bike. Victim was admitted to hospital for treatment. He also produced A.R. copy for perusal.

5. On perusal of the A.R. copy it would go to show that the victim sustained deep lacerated cut injury over the head on

1. left temporal region measuring 6cm x 4cm x 0.5cm sutured
2. right forehead (a) measuring 4cm x 3 cm x 0.5 cm sutured (b) 4.5 cm x 3 cm x 0.5 cm - sutured
3. High parietal region 6 cm x 1 cm x 0.5 cm – sutured
4. Occipital region skull exposed 8 cm x 1cm x 0.5 cm – not sutured
5. Frontal region 7 cm x 1 cm x 0.5 cm not sutured
6. Deep laceration on right hand – tender cut injury measuring 8 cmx.5cm x 0.5cm -not sutured

The above said injuries would go to show the murderous assault made on the victim. The victim sustained grievous nature of injuries. Initially, he was admitted to a private hospital and later referred to Rajiv Gandhi General Hospital for further treatment. The petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021. Investigation is at budding stage. Considering the nature of injuries inflicted, short duration of custody and stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13145/2021

in

H-3, Tondiarpet P.S. Crime No. 1190/2021

Manikandan @ Kulla Mani

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 452, 341, 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1190/2021 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 had only friendship with the Transgender. However, a false complaint has been given as if he has assaulted the grandmother of the Transgender. Injured discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 4.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is having 10 previous cases, including a murder case and thus, he strongly opposed the petition. However, according to him injured was discharged from the hospital after one day inpatient treatment.

5. It is reported by the CPP that injured was discharged from the hospital. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the fact that injured was discharged and duration of custody of the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to him 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.

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13145/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 9th day of August , 2021
Crl.M.P.No. 13146/2021
in
J-3 Guindy Traffic Investigation Crime No. 311/2021

Pandiyan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-3 Guindy Traffic Investigation,
Guindy Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 279, 304(ii), 337 IPC and Sec.185 of MV Act in Cr.No.311/2021 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 did not drive the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner. It is a case of road accident. The petitioner belongs to Vilupuram District. He is having 4 years old child. The petitioner is in custody from 11.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of drunken driving. This petitioner drove the Eicher Lorry(four wheeler) in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and dashed against the two wheeler driven by the defacto complainant, due to which, the pillion rider/mother-in-law of the defacto complainant died on the spot and the defacto complainant also sustained injury and objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it appears the vehicle ran over the deceased. There are possibilities of negligent driving of the rider of the motor cycle also. The petitioner is in custody for about a month. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13146/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12691/2021

in

D.5, Marina P.S. Cr.No.600/2021

J. Rasol Basha

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
D.5, Marina Police Station
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 323, 324, 427, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.600/2021 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 both the petitioner and the defacto complainant are relatives. There was a wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Victim was discharged. A1 was granted bail by the Court below. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that petitioner along with two others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and assaulted him with knife and abused his sisters and assaulted them with hands. The defacto complainant sustained injury on the left thumb and 8 sutures were made. The accused have also damaged the household articles, window glasses and a two wheeler and the damage has been assessed at Rs.50,000/-. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Arrested accused was already granted bail by the learned Magistrate. Dispute between relatives, in which, the petitioner and others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and assaulted him and the family members as well as caused damage to the properties. There are chances for exaggeration. However, considering the damage caused, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition to deposit Rs.15,000/- into Court concerned.

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 deposit a sum of Rs.15,000/- to the credit of the crime No.600/2021 before the said court and the final order in respect of the amount will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court.

[c] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[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 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**

Copies to:

1. Learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Sub-Inspector of Police, D5, Marina Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12691/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13068/2021

in

J.4, Kotturpuram P.S. Crime No.515/2021

Nagaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J.4, Kotturpuram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing learned CPP and no representation having been made on the side of the petitioner and his counsel M/s. R. Parthiban, M. Nagoor Moideen, 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, 397, 323, 336, 427, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.515/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. Learned CPP was heard through Video Conference. No representation for the petitioner.

3. As per petition averments, the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A1 along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.700/- from him at knife point. The petitioner is a habitual offender having 6 previous cases. According to learned CPP, petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed on 12.7.2021 and the 2nd anticipatory bail petition is not maintainable and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of robbery. Petitioner is a named accused. He is having 6 previous cases. Earlier petition was dismissed on 12.7.2021. This is the 2nd anticipatory bail petition. There is no change of circumstance. Considering the above facts, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13074/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.10496/2021

in

P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.543/2021

1. V. Murugan

2. Rajesh @ Rajeshkumar

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, J. Sakthivel, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10496/2021, dt:26.5.2021.

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

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10496/2021 on 26.5.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the X Metropolitan Magistrate daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition from 26.7.2021 to 7.8.2021. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13075/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11442/2021

in

F.2, Egmore P.S. Cr.No.522/2021

Sivabalan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

F.2, Egmore Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11442/2021, dt:13.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court for the alleged offence u/s.147 and 364 of IPC in Crl.M.P.No.11442/2021 on 13.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the period of 21 days till 6.8.2021. However, considering the nature of offence, the petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation and condition is relaxed to that extent. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

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 9th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13076/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11573/2021

in

F.2, Egmore P.S. Cr.No.522/2021

Ramamoorthi

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

F.2, Egmore Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11573/2021, dt:15.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court for the alleged offence u/s.147 and 364 of IPC in Crl.M.P.No.11573/2021 on 15.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 20.7.2021 to 6.8.2021. However, considering the nature of offence, the petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation and condition is relaxed to that extent. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

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 9th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13077/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11523/2021

in

F.2, Egmore P.S. Cr.No.522/2021

Alex

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

F.2, Egmore Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11523/2021, dt:14.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court for the alleged offence u/s.147 and 364 of IPC in Crl.M.P.No.11523/2021 on 14.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the period of 21 days till 6.8.2021. However, considering the nature of offence, the petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation and condition is relaxed to that extent. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

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 9th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.12592/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.12560/2021

(on the file of learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.602/2021

A. Parthiban

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State 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. S. Vedavalli, A. Arul Alex, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner was granted bail by the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate in CrI.M.P.No.12560/2021 on 19.7.2021 for the offence u/s.147, 148, 427 of IPC and Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act on executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum each and also to deposit Rs.10,000/- in the said court and to report and sign before the respondent police daily at 10 a.m. until further orders.

2. Now the petitioner has come forward with this petition to modify the order in respect of deposit of Rs.10,000/- as condition for bail.

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

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is ailing from poor family. His mother is working as a Sweeper and doing house maid works and earning only Rs.4,500/- p.m. Therefore, the petitioner finds it difficult to deposit Rs.10,000/-. Though the petitioner was granted bail on 19.7.2021, he is still inside the prison. Hence, prays for modification.

5. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that considering the nature of case, the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate has imposed necessary condition and there is no necessity to interfere the same. Hence, he opposes this petition.

6. On perusal of the order, the allegation against the petitioner is that he damaged the two wheeler(Royal Enfield) and Honda City Car belonged to the defacto complainant as well as the Auto belonged to the neighbour of the defacto complainant. The damage has been assessed at Rs.20,000/-. Considering the damage caused, the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate imposed the condition to deposit Rs.10,000/-, which appears to be reasonable and hence, this court is not inclined to interfere with the said order and 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 9th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12591/2021

in

R.R.No.16/2021

in

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

Mohammed Rasik Farith

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

The Senior Intelligence Officer,
Directorate of Revenue Intelligence,
T.Nagar, Chennai-600017.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.B.Dhanasekaran and V.Shanmugam, 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 10.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 135 of Customs Act, 1962 in R.R.No.16/2021 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 even as per the allegations of the Department, there was only preparation to export Red Sanders under the guise of declared goods. It is punishable u/s 135A of Customs Act, which is bailable one. In fact, the petitioner is no way connected with the alleged incident. He has been falsely implicated and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the Department in his counter contended that under the guise of declared goods, there was an attempt to stuff Red Sanders in the container. The worth of the Red Sanders about to be illegally exported runs to crores. It is not a preparation. It is an attempt, which is punishable u/s 135 Customs Act. He is the prime accused and seriously objects granting bail.
5. On perusal of the records, it appears when it is attempted to stuff the container with Red Sanders, pretending the same as some other permissible goods, the other accused

were caught red-handed. The arrested accused gave a confession statement, which is an admissible piece of evidence, clearly stating the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. On perusal of the statement recorded in this case and the remand report and other records, it appears in a private godown premises of one M/s.Mahalakshmi Bright Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd., Burma Nagar Main Road, Sadayankuppam, Chennai, there were goods about to be replaced in the declared shipping bill meant for export. On information, the said premises was raided and the authorities found Red Sanders stuffed inside a truck container bearing Registration No.TN-18/K-1119 and seized nearly 12 MT., worth about Rs.5.4 crores. The person present was immediately arrested and other persons were arrested during the course of investigation. As per the prosecution case, the present petitioner is the prime accused / A1, who had made arrangements for stuffing Red Sanders in the container.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was no preparation of Bill of Lading with declared goods, under such circumstances, the alleged theory of the prosecution that there was an attempt to replace the declared goods, is false etc. However, as per Sec.135, sub-clause (c) of the Customs Act, “*attempts to export any goods which he knows or has reason to believe are liable to confiscation under section 113, is punishable u/s 135 of Customs Act.*” Admittedly, the goods seized are Banned Red Sanders. Everybody, including the petitioner could have had knowledge about the possibility of confiscation of such banned goods. Under such circumstances, the objection raised by the prosecution appears to be sound. There was an attempt to stuff the Red Sanders in the container meant for export. The value of the goods is Rs.5.4 crores. It is a serious offence, affecting the Nation’s economy. The petitioner is the main accused arrested only on 10.7.2021, in custody for short duration. Considering all those circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.12459/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.62/2021

against

LIR No.156/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021

in

H-5, New Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.49/2021 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C.

Anthony

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent

/

Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner,
Washermenpet, Chennai.

2. The State represented by
Inspector of Police,(Law & Order),
H-5, New Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..

Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/

Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the revision petition.

2. The counsel for the petitioner was heard through Video Conference.

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in LIR No.156/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021 in H-5, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.49/2021 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 11 months and 8 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 21.7.2021.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has fair chance of success in the revision. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

5. This Court has also perused the revision petition and the submission made by the petitioner's counsel. The revision has been preferred without any delay.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 11 months and 8 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

7. Hence, the order passed by the 1st respondent / Executive Magistrate is hereby stayed till the disposal of the revision and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

8. The Revision is made over to III Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

9. The Revision is posted on 9.9.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.12221/2021

in

E-2, Royapettah P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

1. Sasikala

2. Sekar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

E-2, Royapettah 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.Balaguruswamy, K.Balaji, T.Kumar and R.Srithar 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 420 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. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was some money transaction between the defacto complainant and the petitioners. They had executed valid documents for the borrowal. The dispute is purely civil in nature. Under the guise of complaint, the prosecution is harassing the petitioners and thus, he prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On perusal of the C.S.R. copy produced by the CPP, so far, no case has been registered. The complaint would go to show borrowal of amount from the defacto complainant by the petitioners by executing a valid document. So, prima facie, the dispute appears to be civil in nature. Harassing the petitioners under the guise of enquiry appears to be improper. Thus, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees Ten Thousand only)

with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

SS

CrI.M.P.No.12221/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 9th day of August, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13052/2021

in

Guindy Traffic Investigation Wing Cr.No.327/S2/2021

Jafer Sathic

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Traffic Investigation Wing, Guindy,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.J.William Shakesphere, V.Ravi, A.Gurumoorthy and T.Srikanth, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 279, 338, 308 of IPC and Sec.185 of Motor Vehicle Act altered to Sec.279, 304(ii) IPC r/w 185 of Motor Vehicle Act in Crime No.327/S2/2021 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. It is purely a case of road accident. In fact, he alone took the victim to the hospital. Only on the next day, the deceased succumbed to injuries and prays for bail. He further submits that the petitioner is prepared to deposit interim compensation to the victim's family.

4. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the driver of the vehicle, the petitioner was under the influence of alcohol as evidenced from breather analysis test as well as drunkenness certificate. The petitioner was arrested only on 25.7.2021. Considering the

short duration of custody and the fact that a valuable life has been lost due to the drunken driving of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. 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 9th day of August, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.13069/2021

in

F-1, Chintadripet P.S. Crime No.490/2019

1. Mohan

2. Venkatesh

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

F-1, Chintadripet Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Raja and A.Rajagopalan 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, 341 and 307 of IPC in Crime No.490/2019 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 no way connected with the offence. Since they are having bad antecedents, they have been falsely implicated in this case. They were not at all present at the place of occurrence. They have been arrayed as A12 and A13. The occurrence took place in the year 2019 and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP objects granting bail stating that it is a case of 307 IPC.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears investigation was completed and charge sheet was also made ready and available in the C.D. So, far, the prosecution not chosen to arrest the petitioners. The petitioners' name does not find place in the F.I.R. Considering the date of occurrence and possibility of implicating the petitioners in the crime due to bad antecedents, 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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, F-1, Chintadripet Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.13069/2021