

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
**FAC of Principal Sessions Court**  
**Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.15727/2021**

in

**C.2, Elephant Gate P.S. Crime No.1235/2021**

Iqbal

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
C.2, Elephant Gate Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 7(3) of Lottery Act and Sec.353 of IPC in Crime No.1235/2021 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. Based on the confession of co-accused, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was enlarged on bail by the court below in Crl.M.P.No.7692/2021 dated 14.9.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 3.9.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner/A1 along with other accused were indulged in sale of banned lottery tickets. They found in selling 1 number lottery tickets of Kerala State and from the accused, cash Rs.400/-, note books and slips

containing 1, 2 and 3 digits numbers etc., were seized. However, he submits that the petitioner has no previous case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 15 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has no previous case. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail by the Court below. 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 VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

1. Learned VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Thiruvallur District.

nmk CrI.M.P.No.15727/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
**FAC of Principal Sessions Court**  
**Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.15843/2021**

in

**F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No.688/2021**

Palani Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F.5, Choolaimedu Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 420, 406, 306 of IPC in Crime No.688/2021 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 did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner is doing real estate business and for the business purpose, he borrowed Rs.15 lakh from Balakrishnan as hand loan and had repaid Rs.13 lakh to him through bank transaction and he has to return the balance amount of Rs.2 lakh alone. While so, false case has been foisted as if the petitioner received Rs.23 lakh from Balakrishnan for securing a government job and cheated him. The petitioner is noway connected with the self-immolation of Balakrishnan. He is not the reason for the said act. The petitioner is aged 60 years and he is affected

with Cardiac problem as well as diabetes. The petitioner is in custody from 10.9.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner under the guise of securing government job received Rs.23 lakh from the victim/Balakrishnan and neither secured the job nor returned the money and committed cheating. When the victim demanded return of money, the petitioner abused him and refused to pay money. Due to which, the victim poured kerosene and set fire on him and he died due to the burnt injuries. He further submits that it is a recent occurrence and investigation is pending and the police is taking steps for custody and thus objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner was arrested only on 10.9.2021. Investigation is pending. Period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Considering the nature of offence, short duration of custody and the objection raised by learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.15968/2021**

**in**

**J-2, Adyar Traffic P.S. Crime No.334/2021**

R.Sudhakar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J-2, Adyar Traffic Police Station(Investigation),  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 2.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 308 of IPC and Sec.184 and 185 of M.V.Act in Cr.No.334/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. On the particular date, the petitioner was proceeding to hospital for emergency. The victim, who is aged 75 years, crossed the road suddenly without noticing the vehicle. The petitioner is in custody from 2.9.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner, under the influence of alcohol, drove the car in a rash and negligent manner and ran over the platform and dashed against the victim. The victim sustained grievous injury on his leg and admitted in the Government Royapettah Hospital. He objects granting bail stating that the victim is still taking treatment as in-patient.

5. It is a case of drunken-driving. According to the petitioner's counsel, no offence u/s.308 IPC is attracted. According to prosecution, the petitioner, deliberately, after consuming alcohol, drove the vehicle, which resulted in the accident. However, it is to be decided during trial. The petitioner is in custody for the past 16 days. 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 like sum to the satisfaction of the learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

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

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.15968/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge**

**FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.Nos.15970 and 16113 of 2021**

**in**

**J.3, Guindy Traffic P.S. Crime No.406/2021**

Duddukuri Karthik Chowdary

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
CrI.M.P.No.15970/2021

Ramachandran

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
CrI.M.P.No.16113/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant  
in both the petitions.

For Petitioner : M/s. S. Marshall, Advocate in CrI.M.P.No.15970/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. R. Prem Anandhan, Thangamani, S. Magesh, R. Sekar,  
J. Logesh, Advocates in CrI.M.P.No.16113/2021

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor in both the petitions.

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing Counsel for the petitioners and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 12.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 279, 337, 308 IPC @ 279, 337, 308 of IPC and Sec.185, 190(2), 122, 177 of MV Act in Cr.No.406/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.15970/21 submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. He is hailing

from Hyderabad and he came to Chennai to meet his friend. On the date of occurrence, when he was coming in his car, A1 who was coming from the opposite side in the two wheeler hit the car driven by this petitioner, due to which, there was a wordy altercation between them. While so, one Auto driver lodged this complaint. Initially, the case has been registered u/s. 279, 337, 308 IPC. Subsequently, it has been altered into Sec.279, 337, 308 IPC and Sec.185, 190(2), 122, 177 of MV since both A1 and A2 were under the influence of alcohol. No offence u/s.308 IPC is attracted. The petitioner herein has been arrayed as A2. There was no injury. Only vehicles got damaged. The petitioner is in custody from 12.9.2021 and prays for bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.16113/2021 submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. It is only an accident. When he was returning to home in the two wheeler after attending a function, A2 who was coming from the opposite side in a Car hit the two wheeler driven by this petitioner. This petitioner alone sustained injury. No offence u/s.308 IPC attract. The petitioner has been arrayed as A1. He is in custody from 12.9.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

5. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that both the petitioners/A1 and A2, under the influence of alcohol, drove their vehicles in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against each other, due to which, A1 got bleeding injury on his nose and both the vehicles got damaged. Both of them were under the influence of alcohol and they shouted on each other and created nuisance. The complaint was lodged by one Auto Driver and both of them were arrayed as A1 and A2. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioners were arrested only on 12.9.2021.

6. It is a case of drunken-driving. On perusal of FIR as well as Alteration Report, it appears both A1 and A2 drove their vehicles under the influence of alcohol and dashed against each other. Both vehicles got damaged. According to the petitioners' counsel, no offence u/s.308 IPC is attracted. According to prosecution, the petitioners, deliberately, after consuming alcohol, drove the vehicle, which resulted in the accident. However, it is to be decided during trial. As of now, the petitioners are in custody for the past 6 days. No serious injury. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

1. Learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Madhuranthagam.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.Nos.15970 and 16113 of 2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.15975/2021**

**in**

**K.2, Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No.446/2021**

Hemanathan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 427, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.446/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. Since the petitioner is having previous cases, he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 4.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.800/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender, having 11 previous cases and he cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who have no bad antecedent. He seriously

objects granting bail stating that earlier petition was dismissed on 1.9.2021 and there is no change of circumstance.

5. Earlier petition was dismissed on 1.9.2021. No change of circumstance was brought to the knowledge of this court after dismissal of earlier petition. Under such circumstances, considering the nature of offence and antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.16243/2021**

in

**W.22, AWPS Crime No.12/2021**

Dinesh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W.22, All Women Police Station,  
Mylapore,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R.N.Kasivishwanathan, R. Jothi Raj, Sriram V, Counsel for the petitioner and of learned CPP, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 354(A), 376(2)(k), 506(i) IPC in Crime No.12/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. Both the petitioner and the defacto complainant are residing in Housing Board. He is living with his family and children. There is no possibility of such occurrence. Due to prevailing enmity in respect of parking of two wheeler, the defacto complainant lodged this false complaint. The petitioner is in custody from 15.8.2021 and prayed for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner sexually abused the defacto complainant's daughter, a mentally retarded person and threatened her with dire

consequences. Investigation is pending. He seriously objects granting bail stating that earlier petition was dismissed on 13.9.2021 and there is no change of circumstance.

5. It is a case of 376 IPC. Petitioner had sexually exploited the mentally ill person. Earlier petition was dismissed and there is no change of circumstance. Under such circumstances, considering the gravity of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
**FAC of Principal Sessions Court**  
**Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.16246/2021**

**in**

**P-3, Vyasarpadi P.S. Crime No.781/2021**

Arun @ Arunkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P-3, Vyasarpadi Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.M.Ramesh Babu, K.Senthil Kumar and K.Dinesh Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 397, 427 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.781/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 24.8.2021. Co-accused was enlarged on bail by this court on 7.9.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.450/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner has 4 previous cases.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 25 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has 4 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody and the fact that co-accused was already enlarged on bail, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily twice at 10.30 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.16246/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
**FAC of Principal Sessions Court**  
**Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.16250/2021**

in

**AVS I P.S. Crime No.3/2021**

Troydon Christopher Netto

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Anti Vice Squad I,  
Chintadripet,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a of ITP Act @ 3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a, 5(d) of ITP Act and Sec.370-A(2) of IPC in Crime No.3/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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. The petitioner is a musician. He has been diagnosed with low back ache and has been under medical treatment. He bona fidely went to the occurrence place for physio-therapy and massage service. He is not aware of running of prostitution in the massage centre. He has been implicated in this case. He is only a customer to the center. He is in custody from 13.9.2021 ad prays for bail.

5. Learned CPP also submits that the petitioner is only a customer and he has not raised any serious objection.



6. On perusal of the FIR and other connected records, it appears A1/Karthick, owner of the Massage Centre and A2/Loganathan indulged in the business of prostitution using women under the guise of running a Massage Centre. As per the prosecution record/Remand Report, the petitioner/Gopikrishnan has been categorized as customer. He is in custody for the past 5 days. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail to 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 IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.16251/2021**

in

**P.R.C. No.54/2021**

**(on the file of XVI Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Chennai)**

in

**N.4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Crime No.15/2021**

1. Ellappan  
2. Saravanan @ Attu Saravanan .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
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. M. Nithiyavel and R. Mukesh Kannah, counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 30.1.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 302 r/w. 34, 120-B of IPC in Crime No.15/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.9494/2021 on 20.5.2021. The petitioners are in custody from 30.1.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant's son one

Narayanan with knife and caused grievous injury on the head and face, due to which the victim died. He further submits that the petitioners 1 and 2 have been detained under Act 14 of 1982 vide order dated 25.3.2021 in BCDFGISSSV No.88 and 89 of 2021, respectively and the same have not yet been revoked and thus seriously objects grant of bail.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioners are detained under Act 14 of 1982 and the objection of learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
**FAC of Principal Sessions Court**  
**Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.16253/2021**

in

**PRC No.107/2021**

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

in

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

Lachu @ Lakshmanan

.. 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. S. Thiyagarajan, V. Manimaran, A. Tamilselvan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.4.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 302, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.199/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. This petitioner is not a named accused. Based on the confession statement of co-accused, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were already granted bail. Investigation is completed. Charge sheet also filed. The petitioner is in custody from 18.4.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there was dispute between two rival groups. On the occurrence day, this petitioner and his associates went to the house of the victim and assaulted him with deadly weapons. Due to which, the victim

died on the spot. He objects granting bail stating that this petitioner is having 13 previous cases.

5. On perusal of records, this petitioner is not a named accused. He has been implicated in this case based on the confession statement of other accused. Co-accused were already granted bail. Investigation is completed. Charge sheet is filed. The petitioner is in custody for about 5 months. Co-accused were also enlarged bail. 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 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 said Court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./- T. Chandrasekaran,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge,  
FAC : Principal Sessions Court.  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.15421 and 15653 / 2021**

in

**CBCID Cr.No.4/2021**

T.Joseph

.. Petitioner in

Crl.M.P.No.15421/2021 / Accused

A.Jeyakumar

.. Petitioner in

Crl.M.P.No.15653/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Crime Branch C.I.D. Metro Wing,  
Egmore,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.  
in all the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.S.Sivakumar, P.Venkatraman and K.Mayurapriyan 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 147, 323, 347, 384 and 420 of IPC in Cr.No.4/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are police personnel. They were deputed to work in the Special Team attached with the Assistant Commissioner, Thirumangalam Range during the year 2019. The petitioners have acted upon the direction / instruction of the higher officials and they are not aware of the alleged incident of the defacto complainant. The defacto complainant lodged the complaint alleging that some police personnel obtained sale deed under threat. As far as these petitioners are concerned, there is no specific allegation in the F.I.R. The petitioner Joseph is suffering from neuro problem and he is taking treatment. Main accused were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.12546/2021, dated 30.7.2021. One more

accused / A4 was released on bail. The petitioners have nothing to do with the alleged occurrence. They apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is the owner of the property. He borrowed a considerable amount from one of the accused. The said amount was not repaid, for which, the accused persons joined together and obtained three sale deeds under threat and coercion.

5. Co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. According to the petitioners, there is no specific allegations against the petitioners in the F.I.R. The petitioner Joseph is suffering from neuro problem. Considering the nature of case, health condition of the petitioner Joseph and the fact that co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with stringent conditions.

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 CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners 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 petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**

**(FAC)**

Copies to:

1. The CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, Crime Branch C.I.D.  
Metro Wing, Egmore, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.15421 and 15653/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge,  
FAC : Principal Sessions Court.  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.16155/2021**

in

**W-26, A.W. P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021**

V.Srinivasan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
AWPS – W-26 Police Station,  
Ashok Nagar,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.T.Nixon and N.Marimuthu 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 498-A of IPC in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, petition enquiry conducted and closed.
4. Considering the representation of CPP, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran  
I Additional Sessions Judge,  
Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
FAC of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.16156/2021**

in

**F-2, Egmore P.S. Crime No.608/2021**

Praveen Kumar @ Praveen @ Praveena

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F-2, Egmore Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.Vivek Ram and N.Naresh 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 147, 294(b), 427 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.608/2021 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 A6 in this case. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Arrested accused were released on bail. The petitioner is innocent and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is aged 18. He apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and others were consuming alcohol and making nuisance to the public, which was questioned by the defacto complainant, for which, the petitioner and others damaged the car of the defacto complainant and threatened him.

5. No previous case is reported. The petitioner is a boy, aged 18. No one sustained injury. Considering the nature of case and age of the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail with stringent 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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner

shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
**FAC of Principal Sessions Court**

Copies to:

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.16156/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. T. Chandrasekaran, M.L.,  
I Additional Sessions Judge,  
Incharge : Principal Sessions Court.  
Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.16158/2021**

in

**CCB Crime No.170/2021**

1. K.M.Musthafa
2. A.Sarabeevi
3. M.Abdul Salam

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch Team-1,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406, 420, 34 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.170/2021 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 had lodged the complaint alleging that the 1<sup>st</sup> accused borrowed a sum of Rs.2 crore to get canteen contract in railway and the same was given by him. However, the 1<sup>st</sup> accused has not returned the amount and when the defacto complainant approached the 1<sup>st</sup> accused, all the accused abused and threatened him, hence, he lodged the complaint. In fact, the police have not registered the case and the case was registered only on the direction of the Magistrate. The learned counsel further submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> accused is running a railway canteen contract. When he was in need of money, he obtained a loan of Rs.1,74,05,000/- from the defacto complainant through bank transaction. He has periodically repaid

Rs.7,50,000/- When the defacto complainant pressurised for repayment, the 1<sup>st</sup> accused repaid the entire amount by way of cash on 27.9.2019 and both the parties have entered into an agreement recording the settlement on 27.9.2019. After two years, the defacto complainant lodged complaint with false allegations. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners are wife and son of 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner. They have nothing to do with the said transaction. It is a loan transaction and civil dispute. Though the entire amount has been settled, the defacto complainant lodged the present complaint for the reasons best known to him. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submitted a detailed counter and submitted that the accused demanded Rs.2 crores for transferring their IRCTC canteen contract to the defacto complainant and also lured that the said contract would fetch huge profit. Believing their words, the defacto complainant paid Rs.56,80,000/- through his company bank account. Thereafter, on different dates he paid Rs.35 lakhs, Rs.82 lakhs through bank account and Rs.25 lakhs and Rs.21,20,000/- as cash. The total amount paid by him is Rs.2.20 crores. However, after receiving the said amount, the accused have neither transferred the contract right nor repaid the amount. Thereafter, an agreement was entered between the defacto complainant, 1<sup>st</sup> accused and one Stalin George and as per the said agreement, the said Stalin George has to run the canteen at Rameshwaram, Nagapattinam, Tirupathy, Egmore and Mambalam Railway Stations and he has to give Rs.1,65,00,000/-, being the half of the income, to the defacto complainant. However, the said contract for six stalls were closed already. Hence, in order to recover the amount, the defacto complainant has lodged the complaint and the case was registered as per the direction of the Magistrate.

5. It is the case of the defacto complainant that the 1<sup>st</sup> accused has received Rs.2.20 crores for transferring the IRCTC canteen contract in the name of defacto complainant and later he failed to do so and also not returned the amount. On the other hand, the petitioners contended that they have returned the amount by way of cash. However, according to the prosecution, the defacto complainant, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner and one Stalin George have entered into a agreement for running the canteens, however, the contract period of the said canteens were over and thus, the accused has cheated the defacto complainant. The amount involved

in more than Rs.2 crores. Considering the gravity of offence and the amount involved, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

ss

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge (FAC)**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: **Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**

**I Additional Sessions Judge,**

**FAC : Principal Sessions Court.**

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.16141/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.12587/2021**

in

**Crime No.561/2021**

Mujip Rahman

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

F-3, Nungambakkam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.R.Ganesh Kumar, S.Shrenik Raj, R.Rajasekaran and C.Jayavel 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.12587/2021, dt: 10.8.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12587/2021, dated 10.8.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 13.8.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for more than a month. 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.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,

I Additional Sessions Judge,

FAC : Principal Sessions Court.

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.16143/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.12393/2021

in

Crime No.263/2021

Damo @ Damodaran

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Jagan, B.L.Sankar and A.Vinoth Kumar 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.12393/2021, dt: 30.7.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12393/2021, dated 30.7.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 14.8.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for more than a month. 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.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,

I Additional Sessions Judge,

FAC : Principal Sessions Court.

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.16144/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.14018/2021

in

Crime No.553/2021

Vel Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

F-2, Egmore Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.T.V.Somasundaram and U.Yuvaraj 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.14018/2021, dt: 26.8.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.14018/2021, dated 26.8.2021 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 for 16 days and prays for modification of the condition.

5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 16 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows:

“The petitioner shall appear before the respondent police once in a week, on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.”

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**

**I Additional Sessions Judge,**

**FAC : Principal Sessions Court.**

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.16145/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.12826/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.4812/2021**

**(On the file of the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)**

in

**Crime No.29/2021**

Ravishankar @ Kalvettu Ravi @ Ravi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-5, New Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Kaveri Selvam 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.12826/2021, dt: 6.8.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.4812/2021, dated 5.5.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 15 days. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.12826/2021, dated 6.8.2021, the above condition was modified and the petitioner was directed to appear before the respondent police, once in a week, on every Sunday at 10 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for six weeks.

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

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,

I Additional Sessions Judge,

FAC : Principal Sessions Court.

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.16146/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.12825/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.4589/2021

(On the file of the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)

in

Crime No.2322/2020

Ravishankar @ Kalvettu Ravi @ Ravi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Kaveri Selvam 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.12825/2021, dt: 6.8.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by the XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.4589/2021, dated 17.4.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of two weeks. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.12825/2021, dated 6.8.2021, the above condition was modified and the petitioner was directed to appear before the Inspector of Police, H-5, New Washermenpet Police Station, once in a week, on every Sunday at 10 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for six weeks.

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

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,

I Additional Sessions Judge,

FAC : Principal Sessions Court.

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.16147/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.12827/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.4811/2021

(On the file of the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)

in

Crime No.718/2018

Ravishankar @ Kalvettu Ravi @ Ravi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-5, New Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Kaveri Selvam 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.12827/2021, dt: 6.8.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.4811/2021, dated 5.5.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 15 days. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.12827/2021, dated 6.8.2021, the above condition was modified and the petitioner was directed to appear before the respondent police, once in a week, on every Sunday at 10 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for six weeks.

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

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**

**I Additional Sessions Judge,**

**FAC : Principal Sessions Court.**

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.16148/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.12828/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.4340/2021**

**(On the file of the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)**

in

**Crime No.4415/2020**

Ravishankar @ Kalvettu Ravi @ Ravi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-5, New Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Kaveri Selvam 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.12828/2021, dt: 6.8.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.4340/2021, dated 9.4.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 15 days. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.12828/2021, dated 6.8.2021, the above condition was modified and the petitioner was directed to appear before the respondent police, once in a week, on every Sunday at 10 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for six weeks.



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

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**

**I Additional Sessions Judge,**

**FAC : Principal Sessions Court.**

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

**CrI.M.P.No.16149/2021**

in

**CrI.M.P.No.12937/2021**

in

**Crime No.136/2021**

R.Sanoj Kumar

.. 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.D.Lakshmipathy, T.Gopinathan and K.Vanangamudi and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in CrI.M.P.No.12937/2021, dt: 9.8.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.12937/2021, dated 9.8.2021 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 for 14.8.2021 and prays for modification of the condition.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition from 14.8.2021. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows:

“The petitioner shall appear before the respondent police once in a week, on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.”

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**

**I Additional Sessions Judge,**

**FAC : Principal Sessions Court.**

Friday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.16152/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.13056/2021**

in

**Crime No.67/2020**

P.Sridhar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Central Crime Branch, Team-VII, Vepery,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Govindaraju, T.Vidyasagar, M.K.Gauthaman and SMA Mohammed Faiz Mohideen 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.13056/2021, dt: 10.8.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13056/2021, dated 10.8.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 11.8.2021 and charge sheet has been filed.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for more than a month. 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.

**Sd/- T.Chandrasekaran**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge(FAC)**