

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13326/2021

in

K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 103/2021

Lawrance

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-11 CMBT Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 103/2021 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. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. He is in custody from 8.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused came in a motor bike and snatched the mobile phone from the defacto complainant at knife point.

5. According to CPP, the petitioner is a habitual offender and having 5 previous cases.

6. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. It is represented that this petitioner is on bail in the other cases pending against him and co-accused was granted bail by this court. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

7. 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. 13326/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.13440/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No.734/2021

Sivabalan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was surrendered on 26.7.2021 before the XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, and 307 IPC in Crime No. 734/2021 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 has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is innocent of the offence. He has no bad antecedents. Co-accused/A3 was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.13154/2021 dated 6.8.2021. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 22.7.2021, when the defacto complainant's son talking with his friends, one of the accused Sivaraman/A1 came there in his bike. Victim Ajithraj enquired him and told he seen him after a long time. Without giving any answer he left the place. Thereafter, on the same day at about 7.30 p.m. A1 Sivaraman and his friends viz., Sivabalan (the petitioner herein) and one Sivanesan came

on their bike and attacked the victim using deadly weapons and caused multiple cut injuries on his head and right hand and escaped from the spot in their bike. Thereafter, victim was admitted to hospital for treatment.

5. According to CPP, victim was discharged from the hospital. It is reported by the learned counsel for the petitioner that Co-accused/A3 was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court . No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the past 3 weeks. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on 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 XXIII 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13555/2021

in

K-4 Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No. 359/2021

M. Murugan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. 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. D.Jai Sankar, D. Manoj Kumar, D. Karthick, R. Ram Kumar, R. Stephen Shadhurak, S. Pavithra, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 392 IPC in Crime No. 359/2021 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 has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is innocent of the offence. Charge sheet not yet filed. This petitioner is in custody for the past 75 days. Investigation is almost completed and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant under the guise of asking route to go to ICF and snatched part of her Thali chain and escaped from the spot.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 4 previous cases. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of crime and objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 75 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. So far charge sheet is not filed. 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

Crl.M.P.No. 13555/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13556/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 177/2021

Renuka @ Renuka Devi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 302 IPC in Crime No. 177/2021 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 has nothing to do with the alleged offence. She is innocent of the offence. There was dispute between the deceased and her husband/Ruban, Over which, a false complaint has been lodged against Ruban and his family members. The petitioner is not at all present in the scene of occurrence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. Some of the accused were detained under Act 14/1982 and some of the accused were granted bail. The petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that one Supriya was done to death by the petitioner and others. It is a preplanned murder due to vengeance over suspicious

relationship of deceased with rival of her husband Ruban. However, according to CPP, some of the accused were granted bail by this court.

5. It is reported that some of the accused were granted bail and some of the prime accused were detained under Act 14/1982. As far as this petitioner is concerned, she is in custody for about two months. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. This petitioner is a woman. Considering the duration of custody and gender of the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison (for Women), Puzhal, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13571/2021

in

N-4 Fishing Harbour P.S. Crime No. 843/2021

Johnson

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-4 Fishing Harbour Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 323, 307 IPC in Crime No. 843/2021 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 has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is innocent of the offence. Injured sustained simple injuries and discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 1.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the complainant using deadly weapon and caused multiple cut injuries to him.
5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a rowdy element and having 4 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the antecedents of the petitioner and nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

7. 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**

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13574/2021

in

N-4 Fishing Harbour P.S. Crime No. 843/2021

1. Vinoth

2. Akash

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-4 Fishing Harbour Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 1.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 323, 307 IPC in Crime No. 843/2021 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 have nothing to do with the alleged offence. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. Injured sustained simple injuries and discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 1.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant using deadly weapon and caused multiple cut injuries to him.

5. According to CPP, the 2nd petitioner is having 2 previous cases and objects the grant of bail. However, injured was discharged from the hospital.

6. Since the 2nd petitioner is having previous cases, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present. As far the 1st petitioner is concerned, no previous case is reported as against him. According to CPP, victim was discharged from the hospital. The 1st petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 1st petitioner alone subject to condition.

7. Accordingly, the 1st petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 1st petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the 1st petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 1st 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 1st petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 1st 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 1st petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

(g) As far as the 2nd petitioner Akash is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13574/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 13659/2021

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 1725/2021

Kishore

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 273, 328, IPC and sec. 24(1) of COTPA Act 2003 in Crime No. 1725/2021 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. False case has been foisted on the petitioner only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 3.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of search made by the police, this petitioner was found in possession of 140 Kg of banned tobacco products for sale and the same was seized from him.

5. According to CPP, huge quantity of banned tobacco products were seized from the petitioner. However, he submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedents.

6. No one is reported as hospitalized due to consumption of alleged tobacco products. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody from 3.8.2021. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13659/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 13668/2021

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 1725/2021

Marimuthu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C.V. Kumar, N. Thandayudhabani, S.J. Sasikala, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 273, 328, IPC and sec. 24(1) of COTPA Act 2003 in Crime No. 1725/2021 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. False case has been foisted on the petitioner only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 3.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of search made by the police, this petitioner was found in possession of 140 Kg of banned tobacco products for sale and the same was seized from him.

5. According to CPP, huge quantity of banned tobacco products were seized from the petitioner. However, he submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedents.

6. No one is reported as hospitalized due to consumption of alleged tobacco products. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody from 3.8.2021. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13668/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 13662/2021

in

K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 679/2021

Ramachandran

.. 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.M. Harikrishna, N. Naresh, M. Muthamizha Selvam, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 174(iii) Cr.P.C. altered into sec. 498(A) and 306 IPC in Crime No. 679/2021 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 and deceased loved each other and eloped. Thereafter they got married against the family member wishes. The family members of the deceased are not interested to get marry with the petitioner and they did not speak with her. Due to the mental stress, she committed suicide. This petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is not responsible for the death of the deceased. The petitioner is in custody from 19.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with his parents and other family members tortured and demanded dowry from the deceased. Unable to bear the torture, the deceased committed suicide on 16.7.2021 by consuming poison and suicide committed at matrimonial home.

5. According to CPP, RDO report is awaited. It is alleged that the victim committed suicide due to dowry harassment. The case requires thorough investigation. Investigation is at an early stage. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. It is a unnatural death. Death occurred within 7 years from the date of marriage. RDO Report is awaited. Defacto complainant made allegation as against this petitioner and his family members stating that due to dowry harassment, her sister (deceased) committed suicide. Investigation is at an early stage. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. 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**

Monday, the 16th day of August , 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 13663/2021

in

R-2 Kodambakkam P.S. Crime No. 60/2021

Suresh @ Ramapuram Suresh

.. 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, upon hearing M/s. P. Murugesan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.6.2021 under PT Warrant for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.60/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way connected with the offence. Co-accused were already granted bail. This petitioner is in custody for the past 50 days and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that there was a dispute over non payment of money for Briyani taken by one Kumaresan and Guna from the defacto complainant's shop. There was a quarrel over which one month back. At that time one Prasath intervened. Being aggrieved at, the said Kumaresan and Guna along with other accused including these petitioners, on 18.3.2021 came to the shop of the defacto complainant and assaulted the defacto complainant and proceeded to the house of the Prasath and there, they have assaulted the Prasath also.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner was engaged as a hooligan for committing the offence. He further submits that this petitioner was remanded under PT Warrant on 29.6.2021. Occurrence took place on 18.3.2021. With great difficulty, he has been secured. He is a notorious rowdy element and having 23 previous cases and objects the granting of bail. However, he submits that injured was discharged from the hospital and some of the co-accused were released on bail.

6. Though the petitioner is having several previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past 50 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

7. 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 XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Cuddalore.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13663/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13664/2021

in

S.C.No. 109/2017

in

H-6 R.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No. 288/2015

Suresh @ Thakkali Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-6 R.K. Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Karthick, A. Vinoth Kumar, C. Jagan, P. Praveen Kumar, 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 10.8.2021 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 120(B), 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 IPC in S.C.No.109/2017 on the file of this court in Crime No. 288/2015 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 ill-health of the petitioner he could not appear before the trial court. Further due to pandemic situation, he is not aware of the hearing date. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereafter he undertakes to appear before the court regularly. He is in custody from 10.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner jumped bail. NBW was issued on 25.3.20121 and the same was executed only on 10.8.2021. 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 further submits that this petitioner is having 6 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. In the previous hearing date, the petitioner was present in the Court. However, the NBW was not recalled and pending. Thereafter, he was arrested and remanded to judicial custody. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 25.3.2021 and he was arrested on 10.8.2021. It is alleged by the counsel for the petitioner that due to lock-down the petitioner is not aware about the hearing date and so he could not appear before this court. Considering the ignorance of the petitioner about the pendency of NBW against him and the reason stated 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 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 this 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Chengalpet.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13664/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 13666/2021

in

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

T. Saikrishna

.. 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. A. Arul Alex, 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 offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392,336, 397 and 427 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 is innocent of offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody for more than two weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused picked up quarrel with the defacto complainant and suddenly taken away Rs.1800/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 4 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

6. 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.

7. 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

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13667/2021

in

C.3, Seven Wells P.S. Crime No.119/2019

D. Suriya

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C.3, Seven Wells Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. AGD Bala Kumar, D. Yuvaraj, A. Prabhakaran, D. Nagaraj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 28.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Crime No.119/2019 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been working as a Forklift Driver in TVS company at Sunguvarchathiram for the past two years. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody from 28.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of two wheeler belonged to the defacto complainant and the property was recovered from the petitioner. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having one previous case.
5. It is a case of 379 IPC. Stolen property has been recovered from the petitioner. Considering the nature of offence and bad antecedent, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13669/2021

in

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

Appu @ Arun Murugan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 302 of IPC in Crime No.211/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused murdered the deceased using deadly weapon. Investigation is pending. He seriously objects granting bail stating that petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed only on 22.7.2021 and there is no change of circumstance.

5. It is a brutal case of murder. The deceased was assaulted by number of persons. This petitioner is a named accused. Considering the nature of offence, the overt act against the petitioner and no change of circumstance was brought to the knowledge of this court

after the dismissal of earlier petition, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13672/2021

in

V.6, Kolathur P.S. Crime No.563/2021

Karthick

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V.6, Kolathur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 5.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 174 @ 306 of IPC in Crime No.563/2021 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 there exists matrimonial dispute between the petitioner and his wife, due to which, she went to her parent's house. Even after repeated requests, petitioner's wife refused to return. On the date of occurrence, sister of the petitioner's wife came to the petitioner's house to take her sister's belongings and she hanged herself. The petitioner has no knowledge about the suicide. There was no external injury. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner's mother alone gave a complaint. Petitioner is in custody from 5.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 306 IPC and investigation is pending. He seriously objects granting bail.

5. Deceased committed suicide in the house of the petitioner. The deceased is the sister of the wife of the petitioner. There are prima facie doubtful circumstances. Investigation is at the budding stage. A valuable life has been lost. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. The petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

nmk

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13673/2021

in

G.3, Kilpauk P.S. Cr.No.281/2021

Dass @ Adhi bagavan

.. 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. V. Karthick, S. Raj, A.G. Abdul Kareem, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 392 of IPC in Cr.No.281/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is a differently abled person. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. His name does not find a place in the FIR. The petitioner is in custody from 13.7.2021. Hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused, who came in a two wheeler, stopped near the defacto complainant and under the guise of enquiring about the address, snatched the defacto complainant's mobile phone. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 2 previous cases including one murder case.
5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 2 previous cases including one case u/s.302 IPC. However,

considering the duration of custody and the fact that the petitioner is a differently abled person, 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 learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13673/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13675/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.839/2021

Veera Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Cr.No.839/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. His name does not find a place in the FIR. The petitioner is in custody from 18.7.2021. Hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's mobile phone and thus objects granting bail. However, he submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedent.
5. The petitioner is in custody for about a month. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has no bad antecedent. Considering the above fact 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 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 learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13675/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13211/2021

in

J.3, Guindy P.S. Cr.No.655/2021

G.V.R. Nanda Kishore

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police(crime),

J.3, Guindy Police Station

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Ramkumar, A. Bharath Kumar, V. Gurumoorthy, B. Ebenezer, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 408 of IPC and Sec.66 of I.T. Act in Crime No.655/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. As per the complaint, the petitioner is the employee of the defacto complainant's company. After resigning the post, he had joined some other company in the same period. That was the allegation against the petitioner.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the dispute is civil in nature. There is no question of 408 IPC. It is only a violation of agreement and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
5. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 408 IPC. Whatever it may be, prima facie, the allegation appears to be civil dispute. The remedy is before the Civil Court and not by way of criminal proceedings. Under such circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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 IX 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. Learned IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police(crime), J.3, Guindy Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13211/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13451/2021

in

PEW Anna Nagar Crime No.221/2021

S. Sharvanth

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.4(1-A), 4(1)(aaa) of TNP Act r/w. Sec.188 and 269 of IPC in Crime No.221/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a Civil Engineering Contractor. He was falsely arrayed as an accused in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Arrested accused were already granted bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that without having any valid licence, the petitioner is indulged in the sale of liquor, which were brought from the State of Karnataka. The liquor bottles, totalling 3432 bottles of Brandy were seized along with the vehicles. This petitioner is the main accused and he is having 2 previous cases. He further submits that petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed only on 29.7.2021 and there is no

change of circumstance. Thus, he seriously objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who have been granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration.

5. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedent and no change of circumstance, 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

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13452/2021

in

PEW Anna Nagar Crime No.289/2021

S. Sharvanth

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.4(1-A), 4(1)(aaa), 4(1)(i) of TNP Act in Crime No.289/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a Civil Engineering Contractor. He was falsely arrayed as an accused in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Arrested accused were already granted bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that without having any valid licence, the petitioner is indulged in the sale of liquor. He stocked the liquors in his house in huge quantity in order to sell the same in black market. During inspection, the other accused, who is a worker was arrested and the police seized 33 boxes, each containing 24 bottles of Old Tavern Whisky ; 6 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Bagpiper Whisky ; 24 boxes,

each containing 12 bottles of 8 PM Whisky ; 12 boxes, each containing 9 bottles of Bejois Vsop Brandy ; 4 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Mcdowells Brandy ; 6 boxes, each containing 9 bottles of Old Admiral Vsop Brandy ; 3 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Old Munk XXX rum along with cash Rs.25,300/-. According to learned CPP, initially the case was registered in Cr.No.263/2021 on the file of V.5 Thirumangalam Police Station for the offence u/s.4(1)(aaa) and 4(1)(i) of TNP Act and subsequently the case was transferred to PEW, Anna Nagar and registered in Cr.No.289/2021 for the offences u/s.4(1-A), 4(1)(aaa), 4(1)(i) of TNP Act. Petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed and there is no change of circumstance. Learned CPP further submits that the petitioner is the main accused and he is having 2 previous cases. He objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who have been granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration.

5. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedent and no change of circumstance, 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

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13596/2021

in

K.6, T.P. Chathiram P.S. Cr.No.7/2021

1. S. Ranjith Kumar

2. R. Vignesh

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K.6, T.P. Chathiram Police Station

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Rajkumar Pandian, S. Gokulakannan, 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 offence u/s.294(b), 323, 325, 506(i) of IPC and Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Women Harassment Act in Crime No.7/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was some land dispute between A1 and the defacto complainant's son, due to which wordy altercation exists. The alleged occurrence is during January 2021. Arrested accused were already enlarged on bail. Though the defacto complainant filed an affidavit in the quash petition filed by the petitioners before the Hon'ble High Court expressing her no objection, the respondent police are taking steps to arrest the petitioners. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. There was some land dispute between A1 and the defacto complainant's son. According to learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petitioners were falsely implicated in this case. The occurrence took place on 11.1.2021. So far, the prosecution

has not chosen to arrest the petitioners. Except Sec.506(i) IPC and Sec.4 of TNPHW Act, other offences are bailable. Arrested accused was already enlarged on bail. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the Metropolitan Magistrate, Addl. Mahila Court, 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. Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K.6, T.P. Chathiram Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.13596/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13600/2021

in

P5, M.K.B.Nagar P.S. Crime No.937/2021

Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P5, M.K.B.Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 328 of IPC in Crime No.937/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

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

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with A1 indulged in the sale of banned tobacco produced. While A1 was arrested, this petitioner escaped from the scene of occurrence. Totally 740 grams of banned tobacco products and cash Rs.600/ were recovered from the accused. He further submits that petitioner's earlier

petition was dismissed only on 7.8.2021 and there is no change of circumstance and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of selling banned tobacco products. Nowadays, these type of cases are on the rise of the City. Co-accused was granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Under such circumstances, considering the nature of offence and no change of circumstance after dismissal of earlier petition, 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**

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13602/2021

in

G.5, Chetpet P.S. Crime No.not known of 2021

R. Ajay

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K. Gajendiran, D. Arul Kamaraj, Counsel for the petitioner and of 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.147, 148, 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.not known of 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 defacto complainant is the uncle of the petitioner. There exists civil dispute between them. Due to which wordy quarrel arise. The petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for anticipatory bail.

4. According to learned CPP, the case has been registered in Cr.No.267/2021 on the file of the respondent police. Hence, this petition is dismissed with liberty to file fresh petition with crime number.

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

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13160/2021

in

CrI.R.C.No.65/2021

against

M.P.No.31/2021

in

Rc.No.58/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021

in

N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Sl. No.2/2021 u/s.110 of Cr.P.C.,

Ramesh @ Attu Ramesh

... Petitioner/Appellant/Respondent/
Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner
of Police, Washermenpet Range,
Chennai.

2. State Represented by
The Inspector of Police, (Law & Order)
N.2, Kasimedu Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/
Complainant

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

ORDER

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

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

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.31/2021 in Rc.No.58/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021 on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 234 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 19.7.2021.

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

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 234 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

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

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

9. The Revision is posted on 16.9.2021.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13732/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.68/2021

against

M.P.No.37/2021

in

LIR.No.228/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021

in

H.1, Washermenpet P.S. Sl. No.5/2021 u/s.110 of Cr.P.C.,

Karthick @ Dio Karthick

... Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

2. State Represented by
The Inspector of Police, (L&O)
H.1, Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai - 21.

.. Respondents/Complainants

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Mukesh Kannah, Y. Selvaraj, M. Nithiyavel, Counsel for the petitioner and upon perusing the records, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

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

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

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.37/2021 in LIR.No.228/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021 on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 351 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 2.8.2021.

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

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 351 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

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

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

9. The Revision is posted on 16.9.2021.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.13603/2021

in

E-4, Abiramapuram P.S. Crime No.728/2021

Jothi

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.Saranraj and P.Thamaraiselvam and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 325 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.728/2021 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. Arrested accused were released on bail by the learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in CrI.M.P.No.6361/2021 and 6061/2021. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and others, who are the relatives of the defacto complainant's mother, assaulted her demanding their share in the jewels and money.

5. Arrested accused were released on bail. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XXIII 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, E-4, Abiramapuram Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.13603/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.13217/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11361/2021

in

Crime No.131/2021

1. B.Prabhavathy
2. B.Vani

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch (CCB-1), Vepery,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.Durai Kannan, R.Vijayalakshmi, B.M.Goshinraj, E.Sadasivam and M.Senthil Kumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11361/2021, dt: 12.7.2021.
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.11361/2021, dated 12.7.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition till 12.8.2021 for 22 days.
5. The petitioners have complied the condition for 22 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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.13357/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11439/2021

in

Crime No.199/2021

Raagu @ Ragavendran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the CPP and no representation by the counsel for the petitioner namely, M/s.R.Sasikumar, S.Thiyagarajan, V.Manimaran and A.Tamilselvan, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11439/2021, dt: 12.7.2021.
2. The CPP was heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11439/2021, dated 12.7.2021 with condition to appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Chengalpattu daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 19.7.2021, however, in between, he has not complied the condition for 17 days.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for the past one month, however, he has not complied the condition for 17 days in between the days. He is irregular in complying the condition. Hence, this court is not inclined to relax the condition.
6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.13454/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11400/2021

in

Crime No.130/2021

Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-6, T.P.Chathiram Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.R.Mukesh Kannah, S.Hari Kumar and M.Nithiyavel 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.11400/2021, dt: 12.7.2021.
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.11400/2021, dated 12.7.2021 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 11.8.2021 for 28 days.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 28 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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.13455/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11350/2021

in

Crime No.753/2021

1. Sanjay

2. Saranraj @ Chinnapaiyan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P-1, Pulianthope Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Muralidaran, U.Yuvaraj and M.Elayakumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11350/2021, dt: 8.7.2021.
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.11350/2021, dated 8.7.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition for 28 days.
5. The petitioners have complied the condition for 28 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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.Nos.13446, 13447, 13448, 13449 and 13450/2021

in

R-4, Soundarapandiyanar Angadi P.S. Crime No.17/2021

T.Sathish Babu .. Petitioner in
CrI.M.P.No.13446/2021 / Accused

T.Naresh .. Petitioner in
CrI.M.P.No.13447/2021 / Accused

N.Manikandan .. Petitioner in
CrI.M.P.No.13448/2021 / Accused

E.Janarthanan .. Petitioner in
CrI.M.P.No.13449/2021 / Accused

K.Vijayakumar .. Petitioner in
CrI.M.P.No.13450/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-4, Soundarapandiyanar Angadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.B.Narayanan, B.Srikrishnan, G.Ramachandiran and AKalimuthu and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406 and 420 in Crime No.17/2021 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 defacto complainant entered into a commodity market by opening a trading account with M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. No doubt, he has deposited nearly Rs.25 lakhs into the account. By trading in future metal, he had sustained some loss. The investment has been made only as

per the instructions of the defacto complainant. M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. only acted as broker for such investment, by receiving brokerage. M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. is an approved agent for dealing with commodity trading by SEBI. Since the defacto complainant sustained some loss, the false complaint has been given against the present petitioners, who were ex-employers of the M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. The defacto complainant deliberately taking the risk of investing in metals and sustained loss. There are proper accounts for the investments made and the purchase and selling of metals in the Exchange market. Previously, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before Thiruvallur Police. That has been enquired and closed. Thereafter, another complaint was given before the Flower Bazaar police and another complaint before the Pondy Bazaar police station. After enquiry, the Investigating Officers, having realised that the investments made by the defacto complainant in the MCX and NCDEX, refused to proceed further. That being so, he deliberately filed another complaint before the Saidapet Metropolitan Magistrate and got to forward to the respondent police. Now, the respondent police registered the present case and the petitioners apprehending arrest at the hands of the Investigating Officer. Further, he submits that there are valid documents to show that the investment made through broker on the approval of the defacto complainant. There are SMS and E-mail confirmation as well as telephonic conversation with the defacto complainant. Due to the market risk, it appears the defacto complainant had sustained some loss, for which, the petitioners are no way responsible. Even if there is any grievance with the M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd., as per the agreement, it has to be resolved only through Arbitration and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant was made to suffer a loss more than Rs.25 lakhs. The defacto complainant is an agriculturist, having no exposure in the share market or Online trading in the market. He has been lured by the petitioners and he was made to invest Rs.25 lakhs into the account of M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. As per the instructions and advices of the M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd., some investments has been made. He is ignorant of the risk. He has been cheated and the entire amount has been swindled by the petitioners and objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the typed-set produced by the petitioners, the defacto complainant Gopi opened a commodity account with M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. He also made investments in the future gold and future silver. Investing in future marked is with higher risk. Whether he had known the risk or not, we cannot infer anything. However, the statements produced by the petitioner would go to show several transactions of investments in gold as well as silver by the defacto complainant. According to the petitioners, there was proper account maintained by the M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. In case of any deficiency in service, it is for the defacto complainant to approach the SEBI. The petitioners are mere employees. From the statements filed by the petitioners, it appears though the defacto complainant invested nearly Rs.25 lakhs, he had traded in MCX and NCDEX to the tune of Rs.9,16,00,514.99. Having parted with the money of nearly Rs.25 lakhs, traded to the tune of Rs.9 crores, in the net result, it appears he sustained loss in the Online metal trading. Prima facie, the petitioners cannot be held responsible for the same. As already stated, it is the 4th complaint. Everything is borne out by records. The petitioners also produced the C.D. containing the conversation between the defacto complainant and the employees of the M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. to show the concurrence and confirmation given by the defacto complainant for making investments. Under such circumstances, arresting the petitioners may lead to miscarriage of justice. The defacto complainant ventured upon unknown field of Online trading of metal, that too, in future market, which resulted in loss. It is always open to the defacto complainant to approach the SEBI to redress his grievance if any. Moreover, the petitioners are ex-employees, no more in service for M/s.Kotak Commodities Services Pvt. Ltd. Under such circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the 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-4, Soundarapandiyanar Angadi Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.Nos.13446, 13447, 13448, 13449 and 13450/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13670/2021

in

W-18 A.W. P.S. Crime No.12/2021

Seenivasan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

W-18, A.W.P.S., M.K.B.Nagar,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 376 r/w 417 of IPC in Crime No.12/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the defacto complainant and the petitioner were about to marry through family arrangements. Meanwhile, it came to light that the defacto complainant had several contacts and hence, the petitioner dropped the marriage. Being aggrieved at, the present complaint has been given. He had no sexual intercourse with the defacto complainant as alleged in the complaint. He is ready for a D.N.A. Test and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP objects granting bail stating that it is a grave case of rape. Under the guise of marriage, the petitioner had sexual relationship with the defacto complainant on several occasions, due to which the defacto complainant was conceived. Now, the petitioner gone to the extent of suspecting her chastity and seriously objects granting bail.

5. Though the petitioner is in custody from 23.6.2021, the nature of offence appears to be serious in nature. The life of the defacto complainant itself was put into peril. Investigation is not yet completed. No D.N.A. report is available in the C.D. Further, the samples were sent to lab. Results are awaited. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

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
Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021**

Crl.M.P.Nos.13333 and 13665/2021

in

G-5, Secretariat Colony P.S. Cr.No.198/2021

Sivanesh .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13333 / 2021
/ Accused.

1. Sriram
2. Ajith Kumar @ Vellai Ajith .. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13665 / 2021
/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petitions coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.S.Prabudoss, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13333/2021 and M/s.C.Jagan, P.Senthil Kumar and R.Sarath Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13665/2021 and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13333/2021, who was arrested on 4.8.2021 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.13665/2021, who were arrested on 3.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 336, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.198/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsels for the petitioners submits the petitioners are in custody for the past 12 days. An exaggerated complaint has been given due to previous enmity and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. It is a revenge attack on the defacto complainant. The petitioners are rowdy elements and objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the complaint, it appears due to previous enmity, the assault was made by the petitioners and others. The A.R. copy of the victim Madhavan would go to show cut injuries on the shoulder, forearm and multiple fresh cut injury on the foot etc. The nature of injury itself would go to show the assault made by several persons with deadly weapon on the victim. Considering the nature of offence and duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petitions are dismissed.

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

Monday, the 16th day of August, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13701/2021

in

G-5, Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No.198/2021

S.Mukesh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.K.Ganesh, G.S.Sudharsan, E.Arulprakash and S.Rajkumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 336, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.198/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a juvenile and his date of birth is 17.11.2003. Without conducting enquiry, he has been arrested. He is in custody for the past 12 days and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. It is a revenge attack on the defacto complainant. The petitioner is a rowdy element and objects granting bail.
5. On perusal of the records, it appears it is an assault due to previous enmity. The bail applications for the co-accused was dismissed in Crl.M.P.No.13333/2021 and 13665/2021 today. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner produced the birth certificate and adhar I.D. of the petitioner Mukesh Kumar. It would go to show the date of birth as 17.11.2003. So far, he has not completed 18 years of age. So, he has to be considered as a Juvenile. Without proper fixation of age, it appears he had been remanded

by the learned Magistrate. Considering the age of the petitioner as evidenced from the birth certificate and adhar card, this court is inclined to grant bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.13701/2021