

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No. 12464/2021

in

E-2 Royapettah P.S. Crime No. 333/2021

Aravind @ Aravindan

.. Petitioner/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 M/s. U. Yuvaraj, D. Gopi Krishnan, A.Vinothkumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 307, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 333/2021 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. No one was hospitalized. The petitioner is in custody from 13.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.500/- from him and also tried to assault him with knife. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 9 previous cases and thus objects the grant of bail.

5. It is reported that no one sustained injury. The petitioner is in custody for more than three weeks. According to CPP the petitioner is having 9 previous cases. However,

considering the duration of custody and the fact that no one sustained injury, 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12464/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No. 12484/2021

in

E-2 Royapettah P.S. Crime No. 366/2021

P. Sundarrajan

.. Petitioner/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 M/s. B. Shyam, AGD Bala Kumar, M. Meganathan, S. Obath, A. Prabhakaran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 24(1) of COTP Act 2003 r/w sec. 328, 353, 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 366/2021 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. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 10.8.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 27.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during regular vehicle check by the police, this petitioner along with other accused were found in possession of prohibited tobacco products such as Hans 750 packets, Cool Lips 300 packets, Vimal 150 packets, V! Jarda 120 packets for sale.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. No one is reported as hospitalized after the consumption of alleged contraband. Co-accused was already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12484/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos. 12674 & 13183/2021

in

N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Crime No. 641/2021

Santhosh

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.12674/2021

Niresh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No. 13183/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-2 Kasimedu Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Nithiyavel, Counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 12.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392,397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 641/2021 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 in both the petitions submits that these petitioners have nothing to do with the alleged offence. They are innocent. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 12.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 4 accused involved in this case. The petitioners herein are A2 and A3. The defacto complainant's father was murdered by the accused earlier. On the date of occurrence, the accused waylaid the

defacto complainant who is the son of the deceased and demanded money from him for conducting the murder case. On his refusal, at knife point, they robbed Rs.3000/- from him. He further submits that the petitioner Santhosh is having 2 previous cases. Whereas, the petitioner Nireshkumar has no bad antecedents.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner Niresh Kumar. The petitioners are in custody for more than three weeks. 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 both 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 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12765/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 726/2021

Rajiv @ Rajubai @ Raj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The 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. V. Karthick, S. Raj, 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 under PT Warrant for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 726/2021 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. Originally, he was arrested on 27.6.2021 in the main case in Crime No.666/2021 on the file of P3 Vyasarpadi Police station and he was granted bail in the main case by this court in CrI.M.P.No.12477/2021 dated 3.8.2021. In this case, this petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody under P.T. Warrant on 3.8.2021. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court on 29.6.2021 and 1.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody for more than 1 ½ months and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with 5 other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and his friend at knife point and snatched their motor bikes(2 nos) and also attacked them with knife and thereafter escaped from the spot. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 7 previous cases and thus seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. The petitioner was arrested only on 3.8.2021 in this case under PT Warrant. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 7 previous cases. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioner 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 12766/2021

in

C-4 Rajiv Gandhi Hospital P.S. Crime No. 48/2021

Rathidevi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C-4 Rajiv Gandhi Hospital Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 174 Cr.P.C. altered into sec. 302 IPC in Crime No. 48/2021 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. Only based on suspicious, this petitioner was implicated in this case. She was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. She is no way connected with the alleged offence. She is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of murder for gain. Initially, the case was registered under sec. 174 Cr.P.C. During investigation, it came to light that this petitioner murdered the deceased Sunitha, when she was admitted in Rajiv Gandhi Government hospital for Corona treatment. CCTV footage is also available to connect the petitioner with the alleged crime. Investigation is at crucial stage. If the petitioner is released on bail, certainly, she will abscond. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a grave case of murder for gain. The allegation against the petitioner is that when the victim was admitted in Government Hospital for Corona treatment, this petitioner, working as a scavenger on contract basis, had taken the victim to the top floor of the hospital and taken away cash and cell phone from her handbag and murdered her. After 10 days, the body was noticed by the hospital authorities in a decomposed stage and the body was identified by the defacto complainant based on her handbag which was found in mortuary. According to CPP, during investigation it came to light, this petitioner committed the murder and it was brought to light based on the CCTV footage. Investigation is at crucial stage. Releasing the petitioner at this stage is not conducive for investigation. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12767/2021

in

F-4 Thousand Light P.S. Crime No. 281/2021

1. Abdul Barek
2. Jitendra Biswal

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-4 Thousand light Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A. Anandaraman, M.V. Sathish, P. Surendran, G. Pandian, 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 269, 328, 353 and 506(i) IPC r/w 24(1) of COTPA Act in Crime No. 281/2021 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. A1 is the main accused. These petitioners are no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioners are in custody from 25.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on information, when the respondent police came to search New Apollo Lodge, the present petitioners who tried to escape from the place, were apprehended and gave statement that these petitioners along with A1 indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products, which were brought by A1 from other States. These petitioners are arrayed as A2 and A3 in this case. The banned tobacco products such as Hans 176 packets, Swagat Gold Tobacco 115 packets, Missile Super Strong 16 packets, Sardar Zafrani Zarda – 4 packets, Chandtara Special Kahini 6 packets,

Rajnigandha flavoured Pan Masala 29 packets, Signature Finest Panmasala -189 packets, Signature Panmasala Orange 1200 packets, V-1 Tobacco Orange 1140, V-1 Tobacco Red-880 packets, Vimal Pan Masala 26 packets, Sardar Deluxe Chewing Tobacco-287 packets, Vimal Pan Masala -89 packets, Cool Lip 404 packets, V1 Tobacco-89 packets, V1 tobacco 51 and Sardar Deluxe Chewing tobacco 4 packets were seized. He further submits that Jitendra Biswal is the native of Odisha and Abdul Barek is from Assam. The petitioners are wholesalers. Prime accused is not yet arrested. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioners, who came from other States indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products. Huge quantity of banned tobacco products were seized from the petitioners. According to learned CPP, the accused are wholesalers. Nowadays, these type of offences are on the rise in the City. Prime accused is not yet arrested. Since the petitioners hail from other States, chances for absconding is more. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No. 13182/2021

in

G-3 Kilpauk P.S. Crime No. 296/2021

Abinash

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-3 Kilpauk Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Arun Prasad, N. Naresh, Vijay R. Shukla, 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 341, 294(b), 392, 336, 397, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 296/2021 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 aged 21 years. 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 28.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused had tiffin from the defacto complainant's tiffin centre and refused to pay money. On demand, they threatened the complainant and also robbed Rs.1800/- from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is also having 3 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Considering the above facts, age of the petitioner 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13182/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 13324 & 13325/2021

in

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

Chandrasekar

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.13324/2021

Karamani @ Vinothkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.
in Crl.M.P.No. 13325/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. N. Selvarajan, M. Jaikumar, L. Vinothkumar, P. Kamaraj, T. Lavanya, S.H. Vazhavankarthikeyan, P.S.Mercy Gnanammal, Counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13324/2021, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13325/2021 was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 302 IPC in Crime No. 211/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent of offence. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. These petitioners being the friend of prime accused, they have been falsely implicated in this case.

The deceased was a notorious rowdy element. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioners are in custody for more than one month and prays for granting bail.

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

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

6. Hence, both the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 13327/2021

in

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

Hidayathullah

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-9 Thiru Vi Ka Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Mohamed Ansar, A.M.M. Umar Mukthar, R. Raj Prabhu, B.M. Santharam, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

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

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through video conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are no way connected with the alleged offence. The allegation against the petitioner is that due to money transaction dispute in selling land, he along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant in their car and brutally attacked him and they had taken money from his bank account through ATM Card and grabbed his mobile phone. No such occurrence had happened as narrated in the FIR. Occurrence took place on 10.7.2021. But, the complaint was lodged after two days which itself go to show the falsity of the case. There is no specific overt act as against the petitioner. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 13.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant and the petitioner are land brokers. The defacto complainant is agent for one Sudhakar. This petitioner is agent for one Thamim Ansari. The defacto complainant received Rs.11,50,000/- from the petitioner to sell a land from Sudhakar to Thamim Ansari. But, he failed to sell the land and wantonly made delay to return the money. Therefore, wordy

quarrel arose between the Vendor Sudhakar and purchaser Thamim Ansari. In continuation of that, on 10.7.2021, this petitioner along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant in their Car and brutally attacked him and they had taken money from his bank account through ATM card, grabbed his mobile phone and also gave life threat to him.

5. It is alleged that there was some financial transaction between the defacto complainant and the petitioner. Victim was rescued. It is reported by the CPP that some of the Co-accused were released on bail by this court. This petitioner is in custody for about a month. 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No. 13328/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 1000/2021

1. Ajith Kumar @ Sharma Nagar Ajith

2. Kallarai John @ Anandan

.. Petitioners/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. B.M. Santharam, M. Elumalai, A. Umar Farook Ali, S. Vijayakumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 IPC @ 120-B, 392 r/w 34 IPC in Crime No. 1000/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They 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 have no bad antecedents. They are in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners came in a motorbike and snatched the cell phone of the defacto complainant and escaped from the spot.

5. It is a case of mobile snatching. Nowadays, this type of offence rise in the City. The petitioners were arrested only on 26.7.2021. Considering the modus operandi adopted by the petitioners to commit the offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13330/2021

in

Crime No. 9/2020

Rajvel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Bank Fraud Prevention Wing,
Central Crime Branch-Team XXXI,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 120-B r/w 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC and sec. 66C, 66D r/w 43 of Information Technology Act in Crime No. 9/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent and he had nothing to do with the alleged offence. The allegation against this petitioner is that he had bought the account numbers of innocent persons over phone and handed over the same to A1 and A2 to facilitate them to commit the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner is in custody from 19.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner had bought the bank account numbers of innocent persons and handed over the same to A1 and A2 for cheating the innocent persons under the guise of arranging loan at lower rate of interest and received

commission of Rs.50,000/- for the same and facilitated other accused to commit the offence. Several complaints have been received. Investigation is not yet completed. This petitioner is residing at Delhi. If he is released on bail, he will abscond and thus objects the granting of bail.

5. It is a on-line fraud. On perusal of the FIR, it would go to show that A1 and A2 are husband and wife. They contacted some unknown persons in and around Chennai City over phone posing themselves that they are the dealers for leading bank and financial institutions and induced them that they would arrange loan at lower rate of interest, collected their bank account and card details,OTP number and transferred money from their accounts and thereafter failed to arrange loan. The investigation revealed that during 2017-2019, this petitioner had cheated several public and also obtained SIM cards and bank accounts from several persons and sold the SIM cards and bank accounts to A1 and A2 after receiving commission from them. This petitioner is residing at Delhi. The involvement of other accused and the role played by this petitioner is to be unearthed. Investigation is yet to get shape. According to prosecution, total cheated amount runs to Rs.13 lakhs and above. Since, this petitioner is resident of Delhi, chances for absconding is more. The petitioner was arrested only on 19.7.2021. Considering the gravity of offence and that investigation is underway, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13331/2021

in

Crime No. 08/2020

Mohammed Jasim @ Sukku

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
RPF Chennai Central Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(a) RP (UP) Amended Act 2012 in Crime No. 08/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He was not held any railway property. He is in custody from 29.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner was found in possession of 352 Kg of railway parcel goods property parcel contains cloths worth about Rs.1,45,000/- without valid licence. He further submits that the petitioner is a North Indian hails from Rajasthan. Investigation is at an early stage. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent. This petitioner is having previous cases in Rajasthan. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was found in possession of 352 Kg of railway parcel goods, property worth about Rs.1,45,000/- without valid licence. He was arrested only on 29.7.2021. This petitioner hails from North India. If he is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Considering the nature of offence, objection raised by the CPP 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13334/2021

in

P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 1101/2021

Suresh Singh

.. 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. G. Naveen, Counsel for the petitioner and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 328, 273 IPC and sec. 24(1) of COTP Act in Crime No. 1101/2021 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 of the offence. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner is in custody from 6.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that based on a secret information, the police conducted search at petitioner's place and seized 1 Kg of banned tobacco products. He further submits that this petitioner is having 3 previous cases. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Investigation is at an early stage. Hence, he objects the granting of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, short duration of custody and that investigation is at budding stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13335/2021

in

J-3 Guindy P.S. Crime No. 666/2021

1. Saharkumar
2. Nivash Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

.. Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. H. Arif Ali, K. Hassan Ali, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 24.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 328 IPC and Sec.20(2) of COTP Act in Cr.No.666/2021 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 only employees under one Ramesh and he is a prime accused. These petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged. They have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are in custody from 24.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners are manufacturers of banned tobacco products. When the police party was on a routine checkup, the petitioners were found in possession of banned tobacco products in gunny bags. The police arrested the accused and seized the contraband, namely, HANS about 2 kg. packets,

COOLLIP, 2 kg. packets, MDM 1 kg. packets, SWAGAT 1 kg. packets, Remo 1 kg packets, Maava betelnuts 1 kg. along with two wheeler and cash Rs.14,200 under mahazar. The accused took the police to the place of their owner, where, the police have recovered HANS 3 kg. packets, COOL LIP 2 kg packets, MDM 1 kg. packets, SWAGAT, Remo 1 kg packets and Maava betel-nuts about 3 kg. The police have also recovered one Grinder used for preparing the tobacco products along with other ingredients. He further submits that petitioners hails from Bihar. If they are released on bail, they will abscond and objects granting bail.

5. According to counsel for the petitioner, these petitioners are only employee under prime accused Ramesh. According to CPP, the petitioners and other accused are manufacturers of banned tobacco products and these petitioners hails from Bihar. No previous case is reported as against the petitioners. They are in custody from 24.7.2021. Considering the duration of custody and the fact that nobody was hospitalized due to consumption of the alleged contraband, 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13335/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13213/2021

And

CrI.M.P.No.13337/2021

(intervene petition)

in

C.C.No.5308/2020

(on the file of Special Court for CCB and CBCID, Egmore, Chennai)

in

CCB, Crime No.472/2011

Sambasivan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C. Balaji Venkateswaran, R. Ravichandran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and of M/s. Tri Law Office Ramadevi, Vijayakumar, S. Mohan Raj, Counsel for the intervener, 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. 420, 465, 468, 471, 474 r/w. 34 of IPC in C.C.No.5308/2020 in Crime No.472/2011 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Charge Sheet has already been filed during 2020 and the case is pending in C.C.No.5308/2020 on the file Special Court exclusively for Land Grabbing Cases-II, Chennai. Only after receipt of summons, the

petitioner came that charge sheet has been filed against this petitioner. The petitioner is innocent and he is noway connected with the alleged offence. A1 was arrested and released during 2011 itself. The petitioner undertakes to appear before the Court regularly and ready to co-operate with the trial. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the intervener and learned CPP submits already charge sheet has been filed by showing the accused in the absconding column and is pending in C.C.No.5308/2020 on the file of Special Court exclusively for Land Grabbing Cases-II, Chennai. In the earlier occasion, the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this court on 2.3.2021 as well as by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.No.8350/2021 dated 14.6.2021 with specific direction. Even thereafter, instead of approaching the trial court, he moved this court with the present petition, which is not maintainable and thus, objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the order copy in CrI.O.P.No.8350/2021, dated 14.6.2021, the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, dismissed the petitioner by holding that "*the case has been taken up for the Court below for trial in CC.No.5038/2020, which is confirmed by the learned Government Advocate. In such circumstances, anticipatory bail sought for is wholly misconceived and liberty is granted to the petitioner to work out his remedy before the Court below*". In view of the said observation of our Hon'ble High Court, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge.

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13216/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.10590/2021

in

K.4, Anna Nagar P.S. Cr.No.90/2021

Irudhayam @ Irudhayaraj @ Anand

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

K.4, Anna Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Sivakumar, K. Sujan Kumar, S.K. Masthan, B.M. Shantharam, 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.10590/2021, dt:4.6.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10590/2021 on 4.6.2021 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 18.6.2021 to 9.8.2021. 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13218/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.10459/2021

in

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

1. Settu @ Abdul Rahim
2. Abib @ Mohamed Abib
3. Ibrahim @ Mohamed Ibrahim

... 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.10459/2021, dt:26.5.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10459/2021 on 26.5.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the X Metropolitan Magistrate Court daily at 10.30 a.m.
4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition from for the past 13 days till 9.8.2021. 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13219/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11596/2021

in

K.7, ICF P.S. Cr.No.127/2021

1. M. Praveen
2. D. Maaravarman

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. B.M. Santharam, M. Elumlai, A. Umar Farook Ali, S. Vijay Kumar, 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.11596/2021, dt:16.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11596/2021 on 16.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition from 20.7.2021 to 9.8.2021. 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13220/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11180/2021

in

S.C.No.226/2021

(on the file of XXIII Additional Sessions Court, Chennai)

in

E.2, Royapettah P.S. Cr.No.11/2014

Ravi @ Ravishankar @ Kalvettu Ravi

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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 M/s. K.G. Senthilkumar, S. Vinothkumar, 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.11180/2021, dt:3.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11180/2021 on 3.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the trial court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in this case, the petitioner has been complying the condition from 19.7.2021 to till date. Further, the petitioner has also been complying the condition imposed in 4 other cases before the Inspector of Police, H5, New Washermenpet Police Station as well as before the Sessions Court, Chengalpattu in respect of Kelambakkam PS Cr.No.148/2003 and thus prays for relaxation of the condition.

5. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 19.7.2021 to 9.8.2021. He further submits that it is a case of 302 IPC. However, considering the representation made by the counsel for the petitioner and the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13221/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.12673/2021

in

B.1, North Beach P.S. Cr.No.243/2019

Shahul Hameed @ Muttai Shahul

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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 M/s. M. Zainul Abideen, M. Mujibur Rahman, D. Gopi Krishnan, U. Yuvaraj, A.Vinothkumar, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks modification of the condition imposed by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.12673/2021, dt:5.8.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.12673/2021 on 5.8.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on 2.8.2021 the petitioner was also granted bail by this court in two other cases with condition to appear before the Inspector of Police, C1, Flower Bazaar Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Therefore, the petitioner finds it difficult to appear before two different police station at the same time.

Hence, prays for modification to appear before the C1 Flower Bazaar Police Station instead of respondent police.

5. Considering the representation made by the counsel for the petitioner, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows:

“The petitioner shall appear before the Inspector of Police, C.1, Flower Bazaar Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 11th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13332/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.1304/2021

1. Nantha Kumar
2. Meena

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P.4, Basin Bridge Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 5.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.1304/2021 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 there was a quarrel between two groups. Counter case has been registered in Cr.No.1313/2021 on the file of respondent police. The petitioners are in custody from 5.8.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a grave case of 307 IPC. Period of incarceration is only 6 days and objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that there exists previous motive between two groups. Due to that previous enmity, victim/Vasanthakumar was assaulted with deadly weapon. As per the complaint, the assault is by the 1st petitioner/Nantha Kumar. The 2nd petitioner herein is a woman, mother of the 1st petitioner. As per FIR, she and others thrown stones on the victim. So, prima facie, there is no specific overt act by the 2nd petitioner to attract offence u/s.307 IPC. There is a counter case also. Considering all these

circumstances and nature of injury inflicted on the head of the victim by the 1st petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the 1st petitioner. However, considering the gender and the overt act of the 2nd petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner alone subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the 2nd 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 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 2nd petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 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.

7. As far as the 1st petitioner is concerned, petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13332/2021