

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 12770/2021

in

S.C.No. 185/2017

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

in

R.2, Kodambakkam PS, Crime No.143/2017

Sasi @ Sasitharan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R.2, Kodambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.7.2021 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 307, 302, 506(ii) IPC r/w. 34 of IPC in S.C.No.185/2017 in Crime No.143/2017 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. According to the petitioner's counsel, due to his non appearance before the trial court on 26.3.2021, NBW was issued against him and the same was executed on 20.7.2021. The petitioner was absent for only one hearing. Hereafter he undertakes to appear before the court, regularly. Hence, prays for granting bail.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner jumped bail. NBW was issued on 26.3.2021 and the same was executed only on 20.7.2021. Due to the absence of the petitioner, the case could not be proceeded further. If the petitioner is released on bail, again he will abscond. He objects the grant of bail.
5. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 26.3.2021 and he was arrested on 20.7.2021. It is alleged by the counsel for the petitioner that due to lock-down the

petitioner is not able to surrender and 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 XVIII 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 12770/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13430/2021

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 1778/2021

Vinoth

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. B. Shankar, Mohammed Aasif, V. Venkatesan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 5.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a) & 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No. 1778/2021 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. This petitioner is only an auto driver. He is in custody from 5.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during patrol duty, the respondent police caught an auto bearing registration No.TN 05 BK 7852 which was driven by this petitioner and on the instruction of one Manimegalai, he transported 19 bottles of illicit arrack in his auto for selling the same at higher price before opening the TASMALAC shop. He further submits that arrest of the petitioner is very recent one and thus objects the grant of bail.

5. As per the FIR, having knowledge about the spurious nature of brandy bottles, this petitioner transported the same in his auto with intention to sell the same for higher price. Auto and bottles were seized from this petitioner. The petitioner was arrested only on 5.8.2021. Considering the nature 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13432/2021

in

E-4 Abiramapuram P.S. Crime No. 710/2021

Jamal @ Jamaludeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-4 Abiramapuram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 710/2021 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 this petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 11.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused broke open the defacto complainant's Car glass and looted laptop and cash Rs.2,53,000/- when it was parked in the defacto complainant's friend's house. He further submits that investigation is completed and Charge sheet also filed in this case. This petitioner is also having one previous case of similar nature.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having one previous case of similar nature. For which also, the petitioner moved bail application today. The petitioner was arrested on 11.7.2021 under PT Warrant. Occurrence had taken place on 16.1.2021. Investigation is completed and Charge Sheet also filed in this case. Earlier bail application was dismissed only on 4.8.2021. Considering the nature of offence and no change in circumstances was reported before this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application, 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**

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13433/2021

in

E-4 Abiramapuram P.S. Crime No. 17/2021

Jamal @ Jamaludeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-4 Abiramapuram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 12.7.2021 under PT Warrant for the offences punishable under Section 379 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 this petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. Originally, he was arrested on 11.7.2021 in Crime No. 710/2021. Thereafter, he has been implicated in this case and remanded to judicial custody under PT Warrant on 12.7.2021. This petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. In this case occurrence took place on 16.1.2021. The respondent police wantonly implicated him in this case with an ulterior motive. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 12.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused broke open the defacto complainant's Car glass and looted laptop and other valuable goods when it was parked in the defacto complainant's apartment. He further

submits that investigation is completed and Charge sheet also filed in this case. This petitioner is also having one previous case of similar nature.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having one previous case of similar nature. For which also, the petitioner is moving bail application today. The petitioner was arrested on 12.7.2021. Investigation is completed and Charge Sheet also filed in this case. Earlier bail petition of this petitioner was dismissed on 4.8.2021 by this court. Considering the nature of offence and no change in circumstance was reported before this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application, 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**

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13434/2021

in

K-2 Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No. 309/2021

Akash @ Akashraj @ Gundu Raj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Jaisankar, D. Manoj Kumar, D. Karthick, R. Ram Kumar, S. Pavithra, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.6.2021 under PT Warrant for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 309/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Originally, he was arrested on 5.6.2021 in two crime nos. 573/2021 and 540/2021 on the file of P2 Otteri Police Station, wherein he was granted bail by the Court below. While so, the petitioner was remanded in this case on 30.6.2021 under P.T. Warrant only to close the pending FIRs. The petitioner is in custody from 30.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's two wheeler, which was parked in front of his house. He seriously objects the granting of bail stating that the bike was recovered from this petitioner and he is having 3 previous cases.

5. It is reported that the property involved in this case has been recovered. It is alleged by the counsel for the petitioner that this petitioner was granted bail in the main case and in this case he was formally arrested under PT Warrant. He is in custody for more than one month. According to CPP the petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

CrI.M.P.No. 13434/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13435/2021

in

K-2 Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No. 302/2021

Akash @ Akashraj @ Gundu Raj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Jaisankar, D. Manoj Kumar, D. Karthick, R. Ram Kumar, S. Pavithra, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.6.2021 under PT Warrant for the offence punishable under Section 392 r/w 511 of IPC in Crime No. 302/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Originally, he was arrested on 5.6.2021 in two crime nos. 573/2021 and 540/2021 on the file of P2 Otteri Police Station, wherein he was granted bail by the Court below. While so, the petitioner was remanded in this case on 30.6.2021 under P.T. Warrant only to close the pending FIRs. The petitioner is in custody from 30.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money. On his refusal, the accused assaulted him with sharp edged weapon and escaped from the place of occurrence. He seriously objects the granting of bail stating that the petitioner is having 3 previous cases and stolen bike in other crime number was recovered from this petitioner.

5. It is reported that the property involved in another crime number case has been recovered. It is alleged by the counsel for the petitioner that this petitioner was granted bail in the main case and in this case he was formally arrested under PT Warrant. He is in custody for more than one month. According to CPP the petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

Cri.M.P.No. 13435/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 12th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 13437/2021

in

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

Karthick

.. 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 petitioner submits that the petitioner is 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**

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13438/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 673/2021

1. Santhosh @ Thavakalai Santhosh
2. Manikandan @ Brown Mani
3. Prakash @ Stephen

.. 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. G. Vinothprabu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 12.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 307 of IPC in Cr.No. 673/2021 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 and the defacto complainant are friends. There was a quarrel over consuming liquor. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 12.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that when the defacto complainant's son/Balu demanded his friends, the petitioners herein to give him Beer, over which there was a quarrel and the accused attacked the victim using beer bottle and caused injuries on his head, face and chest. The victim was treated as in-patient for 5 days. He further

submits that the 1st petitioner is having one previous cases. Other petitioners have no previous cases.

5. No previous case is reported as against 2nd and 3rd petitioners. According to CPP, 1st petitioner is having one previous case. Petitioners were arrested on 12.7.2021. It is a case of 307 IPC. Victim was treated as in-patient for 5 days and thereafter discharged. The petitioners are in custody for the past one 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 petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13438/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13442/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 998/2021

Devaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Senthil Kumar, R. Prabhakaran, 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 under P.T. Warrant for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 998/2021 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 of the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Originally, this petitioner was arrested in Crime No. 716/2021 in P3 Vyasarpadi Police Station on 17.7.2021. In this case, he was formally arrested under PT Warrant on 26.7.2021 for the offence u/s.379 IPC. This petitioner 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 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of motor bike bearing registration No. TN 06 J 7509 Duke 200 of the defacto complainant when it was parked in front of his house. He further submits that this petitioner is having one more previous case of similar nature. This petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021 in this case. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021. It is alleged that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's Duke 200 motor cycle when it was parked in front of his house. Considering the allegation made against 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**

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 13443/2021

in

J-6 Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No. 667/2021

1. Deena @ Kuthirai Deena
2. Anwar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-6 Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 19.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 397, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 667/2021 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 innocent. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 19.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.650/- from him at knife point. He submits that the 1st petitioner Deena was detained under Act 14/1982. The 2nd petitioner is having one previous case.

5. Since, the 1st petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 and he is in custody as per the detention order, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the 1st petitioner. As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, he is having one previous case. However, he is in custody for the past three weeks. Considering the duration of custody of the 2nd petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner alone subject to 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 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13443/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021**

CrI.M.P.No. 13445/2021

in

J.6, Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Cr.No.654/2021

1. Dheena @ Kuthirai Dheena
2. Anwar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J.6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 19.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379, 417 @ 395 of IPC in Cr.No.654/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Property recovered. The petitioners are in custody from 19.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused who came in an Auto, under the guise of giving away free clothes and bedsheets, took the defacto complainant in the Auto and robbed her gold ornaments weighing 1 ½ sovereigns. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 4 previous cases and he was detained under Act 14/1982. The 2nd petitioner is having 1 previous case.

5. Since, the 1st petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 and he is in custody as per the detention order, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the 1st petitioner. As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, he is having one previous case. However, he is in custody for the past three weeks. Considering the duration of custody of the 2nd petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner alone subject to 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 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13445/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13444/2021

in

H-1 Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 1923/2021

Ramalingam @ Ramu @ Elumba

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A. Jayamohan, R. Ilayaaja, K. Ajith, 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 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 307 IPC in Crime No. 1923/2021 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 petty quarrel between the petitioners' and the defacto complainant's group under the influence of alcohol. The petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. It is a case and counter case. Though there was a quarrel between two groups, no serious injury has been inflicted. Victim was discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 5.7.2021 in CrI.M.P.No. 10990/2021. The petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, case and counter case was registered at the same occurrence in Cr.Nos.1923 and 1922/2021. When questioning the taking of alcohol in that area by the complainant therein, the accused in this crime number assaulted the defacto complainant and others and caused injuries.

5. It is a case and counter case. Victim was discharged from the hospital. It is alleged that the weapon used in this crime is wooden log. It is reported by the CPP that injuries inflicted on the victim is simple in nature. There are chances of including Sec.307 IPC deliberately in order to make the offence grave one. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 5.7.2021. No previous case is reported as against this petitioner. Considering all 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13444/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 12th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13350/2021

in

N.1, Royapuram P.S. Cr.No.1083/2021

1. Kamal @ Amala Doss
2. M.Diliban Raj
3. Prabha @ Arun Prabhakaran
4. Venkat @ E.Vankatesan
5. Hemanth Kumar
6. R.Maruthu Pandian

.. Petitioners/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.Mohammd Rafi, R.Joe Anand, J.Kanikkai Nathan and S.Aishwarya, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s.147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 341, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1083/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner are football players. There was a wordy altercation between the petitioners and defacto complainant side in the play-ground. Case and counter case have been registered. Both side compromised. Counter parties were granted anticipatory bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.12697/2021 on 5.8.2021. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners picked up quarrel with the defacto complainant in the playground and assaulted him with hands and cricket stump.

5. Quarrel in football ground. Case and counter-case have been registered. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Counter parties were granted anticipatory bail. Considering all those circumstances, 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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, N.1, Royapuram Police Station, Chennai.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.13350/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.**

Cr.L.M.P.No.13351/2021

in

W-21, A.W. P.S. Crime No.Not known/2017

R.Ragavendra

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-21, All Women Police Station, Guindy,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 498A of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2017 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. According to CPP, F.I.R. has been registered in Cr.No.4/2018.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the petition. Hence, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file fresh petition with crime number.

Delivered by me today.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.13352/2021

in

F-3, Nungambakkam P.S. Crime No.571/2021

A.Elayaraja

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-3, Nungambakkam 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.E.Venkatesan and M.Premkumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 341, 294(b), 323, 427 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.571/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that already a complaint was lodged against the petitioner for quarreling in the Union. Since the defacto complainant gave evidence in the court, the petitioner damaged his auto, for which a complaint was given. On the occurrence day, the petitioner and others threatened the defacto complainant to withdraw the complaint and assaulted him with hands.

5. No deadly weapon was used. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

SS

CrI.M.P.No.13352/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.13356/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11544/2021

in

Crime No.396/2021

Girija

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R-6, Kumaran Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.Thirumaran and K.Purushothaman and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11544/2021, dt: 15.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11544/2021, dated 15.7.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition till 10.8.2021.

5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 14 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.13355/2021

in

R-1, Mambalam P.S. Crime No.10/2021

1. B.Jayakumar
2. Vanaja

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-1, Mambalam 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.E.Dharmaraj and A.Arighandran 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 294(b) and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.10/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are Samanthis. In respect of a matrimonial dispute between their children, there were previous complaints. The present complaint is the offshoot of the previous dispute. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The offence u/s 294(b) IPC is bailable. Even as per the complaint, no deadly weapon was used so as to made out a case for criminal intimidation and prays for anticipatory bail.

4. On perusal of the complaint, it appears there was previous complaints in the year 2019 over matrimonial dispute between the petitioners' daughter Syamala and defacto complainant's son Vishnuram. There are chances for exaggeration of the present complaint. Arresting the petitioners appears to be unnecessary. It may aggravate the situation. Hence, 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 XVII 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R-1, Mambalam Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.13355/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 12th day of August, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.13354/2021

in

R-1, Mambalam P.S. Crime No.11/2021

1. B.Jayakumar
2. Vanaja

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-1, Mambalam 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.E.Dharmaraj and A.Arichandran 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 294(b) and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.11/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are Samanthis. In respect of a matrimonial dispute between their children, there were previous complaints. The present complaint is the offshoot of the previous dispute. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The offence u/s 294(b) IPC is bailable. Even as per the complaint, no deadly weapon was used so as to made out a case for criminal intimidation and prays for anticipatory bail.

4. On perusal of the complaint, it appears there was previous complaints in the year 2019 over matrimonial dispute between the petitioners' daughter Syamala and defacto complainant's son Vishnuram. There are chances for exaggeration of the present complaint. Arresting the petitioners appears to be unnecessary. It may aggravate the situation. Hence, 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 XVII 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R-1, Mambalam Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.13354/2021