

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 13767/2021

in

J-6 Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No. 279/2021

Kadher Basha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 279/2021 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 the offence. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Prime accused was granted bail by this court on 10.8.2021 in CrI.M.P.No. 13186/2021. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. This petitioner along with other accused came to the defacto complainant's house and asked about his brother. When he came out from the house, all the accused joined together and assaulted his brother using knife and sustained injuries. Occurrence took place in the month of April 2021. But, the police is able to arrest him only on 26.7.2021. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Occurrence took place in the month of April 2021. The petitioner was arrested on 26.7.2021. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 10.8.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to following condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13767/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13768/2021

in

K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 418/2021

Selvi

.. 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. 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 25.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 418/2021 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 the offence. She has nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on her with an ulterior motive. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. She is in custody from 25.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that when the complainant family were stayed in the waiting hall in Koyambedu bus stand, this petitioner stolen away the hand bag which contains two chargers, cash Rs.3000/- and 6 grams of gold Mangal Sutra. He further submits that this petitioners antecedents are yet to be ascertained. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The nature of offence committed itself would go to show that the petitioner might be a professional offender. According to CPP, during investigation, it came to light that this petitioner committed the offence and her antecedents are yet to be ascertained. She was arrested only on 25.7.2021. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13778/2021

in

R-8 Vadapalani P.S. Crime No. 648/2021

1. Karthikeyan @ Dan Karthik
2. Michaelraj @ Ramapuram Aji
3. Rajesh
4. Sasi @ Siva @ Singam Sasi @ Sasikumar
5. Vinoth @ Vinothkumar
6. Karthik @ Mala Karthik

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-8 Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The 1st, 2nd and 6th petitioners, who were arrested on 26.7.2021, 3rd petitioner was arrested on 31.7.2021, 4th petitioner was arrested on 2.8.2021 and 5th petitioner was arrested on 5.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147,148, 341, 294(b) and 307 IPC in Crime No. 648/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent of the offence. In fact, there was money dispute between the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant. When the 1st petitioner requested the complainant to return back the money, he refused to do so. After heated arguments, it ended in assault. Injured discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody for the past two weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. Victim sustained grievous injuries and he was treated as inpatient for 21 days. He was discharged only recently. Investigation is not yet completed. Arrest of the petitioners is very recent one. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it would go to show that murderous assault was made on the victim and due to which, he sustained multiple cut injuries. According to CPP, the victim had taken 21 days inpatient treatment. Considering the period of treatment taken by the victim, nature of injuries inflicted and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.**

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13878/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 1313/2021

1. Vasanth kumar
2. Poonkodi

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 5.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1313/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent of the offence. It is a case and counter case. In counter case, co-accused was granted bail by this court. At the time of occurrence, these petitioners are not at all present at the scene of occurrence. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 5.8.2021 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 victim using knife and caused injuries to him.

5. According to CPP, it is a case of 307 IPC. The 1st petitioner attacked the victim using knife and the 2nd petitioner and others thrown stones on him. However, he submits that injured was discharged from the hospital.

6. No previous case is reported as against the petitioners. In counter case crime no. 1304/2021, one of the co-accused was granted bail by this court on 11.8.2021. Injured was

discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody for the past two weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to following condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13878/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13599/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 1313/2021

S. Dhavamani

.. 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. J. Janarthanan, P. Archana, S.P. Chellammal, J. Elanchezhien, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1313/2021 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 of the offence. It is a case and counter case. In counter case, co-accused was granted bail by this court. At the time of occurrence, this petitioner was present at the scene of occurrence. Except that he has no connection with the alleged offence. He has not participated in the alleged assault. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. Victim was discharged from the hospital. Hence, he prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the victim using knife and caused injuries to him.

5. According to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital.

6. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. Co-accused were granted bail today in this crime number. Victim was discharged from the hospital. According to counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner has not participated in the alleged assault. No offence u/s.307 IPC prima facie, made out as against the petitioner. Considering the

above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to following 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 X 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 report 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-4 Basin Bridge Police Station, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13599/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13879/2021

in

P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 1065/2021

Loganathan @ Velu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-1 Pulianthope Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1065/2021 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 the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 30.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.800/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. He objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases .

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than two weeks. Considering the duration of custody, 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 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. 13879/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13881/2021

in

C-3 Seven Wells P.S. Crime No. 655/2021

Murali Ayyar

.. 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. C. Raja, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 419, 420 IPC in Crime No. 655/2021 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 the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The defacto complainant lodged a complaint against one Sankaran, not against this petitioner. He has been wrongly implicated in this case. He is in custody from 6.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner approached the defacto complainant under the guise that he will give change for old currency notes and coins. Believing his words, the defacto complainant given a sum of Rs.43,000/- through his employee Ramesh. After receiving the said amount, this petitioner escaped from the spot.

5. According to CPP, during investigation it came to light the person who introduced himself as Sankaran to the defacto complainant is this petitioner. He cheated the defacto complainant under the guise of giving new currency notes to old notes and coins. After receiving the old currency worth about Rs.43,000/- he escaped from the spot. The petitioner belongs to Andhra Pradesh State. If he is released on bail, certainly, he will abscond. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

6. It is a case of cheating. The petitioner is native of Andhra Pradesh. If he is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. This petitioner was arrested only on 5.8.2021. Investigation is at budding stage. Considering the above facts 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**

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13882/2021

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 918/2021

Vinoth Kumar @ Vellai Mani

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 397 IPC in Crime No. 918/2021 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 the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 24.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner waylaid the defaco complainant and demanded money from him at knife point. On his refusal, he forcibly robbed Rs.650/- from him.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

6. The petitioner is in custody for more than three weeks. Considering the duration of custody, 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 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. 13882/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No. 13883/2021

in

K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 428/2021

Surya

.. 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. C. Jagan, R. Sarath Kumar, M. Kavitha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 428/2021 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 the offence. He is aged 20 years. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 30.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner snatched the mobile phone from the defacto complainant and ran away from the spot.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. He is aged 20 years. He is in custody from 30.7.2021. Considering the age of the petitioner and duration of custody, 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 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. 13883/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No. 13890/2021

in

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

Devaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.7.2021 under P.T. Warrant for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 998/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Originally, this petitioner was arrested in Crime No. 716/2021 in P3 Vyasarpadi Police Station on 17.7.2021. In this case, he was formally arrested under PT Warrant on 26.7.2021 for the offence u/s.379 IPC. This petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

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

5. The petitioner was arrested only on 26.7.2021. It is alleged that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's Duke 200 motor cycle when it was parked in front of his house. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 12.8.2021. Considering the allegation made against the petitioner and no change in circumstance was reported after the dismissal of earlier bail application , this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No. 13893/2021

in

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

Sirajudeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 380 IPC in Crime No. 67/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

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

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner and his wife has committed theft of 56 sovereigns of gold ornaments from the defacto complainant's house. Still co-accused is at large. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

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

According to CPP, 56 sovereigns of gold ornaments were recovered from this petitioner. This petitioner's wife is not yet arrested. The arrest of the petitioner is very recent. Earlier bail petition was dismissed on 9.8.2021. No change in circumstance was reported after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Investigation is not yet completed. In the said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13801/2021

in

H.1,Washermpet P.S. Cr.No.2511/2021

Meenakshi

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. J.B. Solomon Peter Kamaldoss, J.B. Hepsibah Jeyanthi, R. Kisoth Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 353, 506(ii) of IPC and Sec.7, 9(ii) of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Smoking & Spitting Act 2003 in Crime No.2511/2021 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 innocent. She is noway connected with the alleged offence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. Arrested accused were granted bail by the Court below. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products. While A1 to A4 were arrested, this petitioner along with her husband managed to escape from the place of occurrence.

Huge quantity of banned tobacco products and other items used for manufacturing Maava were seized. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. According to learned CPP, the accused were in possession of huge quantity of banned tobacco products. Any how, the petitioner is a woman. Arrested accused were enlarged on bail within 3 days of arrest. Considering the gender and the release of co-accused, 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 her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the XV 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H.1, Washermenpet Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.13801/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13803/2021

in

D.3, Ice House P.S. Crime No.370/2021

Nawaz

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D.3, Ice House Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Hussaini Basha, I. Gowri Shankar, Shaik Abu Thahir, 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. 406, 420 of IPC in Crime No.370/2021 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 innocent. As per FIR, it is alleged that the defacto complainant/Alwin Gnanadurai came to petitioner's office and had given cash Rs.87,50,000/- for money transaction through RTGS. No amount has been given by the defacto complainant as alleged. Other accused A2, A3 and A4 were arrested and from them entire money was recovered. This petitioner has nothing to do with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is the prime accused. The defacto complainant/Alwin Gnanadurai is a Sub-Broker in ICICI Direct and he is doing E-Commerce business and also hotel business. On 17.7.2021, he went the petitioner's office and had given office money Rs.87,50,000/- to the petitioner for money transaction through RTGS. This petitioner along with other accused, under the guise of counting the money escaped from the place with cash and thus committed cheating. He further submits that earlier petition was dismissed on 2.8.2021 and there is no change of circumstance and thus the 2nd anticipatory bail petition before this court is not maintainable and thus objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a grave case of cheating. The amount involved is huge in nature. According to the prosecution, this petitioner is the prime accused. Earlier petition was dismissed on 2.8.2021. No change of circumstance. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 18th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13804/2021

in

F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No.648/2021

Vijayakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-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. D. Gopikrishnan, U. Yuvraj, M. Mohamed Saifulla, M. Mariraj, N. Mukesh, 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. 353, 506(i) of IPC and Sec.20(2) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Acts 2003 in Crime No.648/2021 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 innocent. The petitioner has no knowledge about the transportation of banned tobacco products through the bus. He is only the owner of the bus, through which the contraband were seized. The persons who involved in the offence were arrested. Only based on the confession statement of arrested accused, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is the prime accused. He is the owner of the Omni Bus, through which banned tobacco products were transported from Bangalore, illegally and stored in the godown and supplied to the retailers. Driver and Cleaner of the bus and others were arrested while deloading the stuff and huge quantity of banned tobacco products were seized from the bus as well as from the godown. It is a recent occurrence. Investigation is pending. Hence, seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Petitioner is a Transport Operator. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is noway connected with the offence. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that huge quantity of banned tobacco products were transported through the vehicle of the petitioner. From the confession of other accused, it came to light that it is the usual practice of the petitioner to transport the banned tobacco products through his vehicle. Considering the objection raised and the fact that huge quantity of banned tobacco products being transported through petitioner's vehicle, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13806/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11396/2021

in

J.7, Velachery P.S. Cr.No.784/2021

Srikanth @ Light House Srikanth

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

J.7, Velachery Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11396/2021, dt: 19.7.2021.

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.11396/2021 on 19.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 23.7.2021 to 16.8.2021. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13807/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11525/2021

in

D.3, Ice House P.S. Cr.No.343/2021

Prasad

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

D.3, Ice House Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C. Vimal Kumar, S. Devan, K. Ganesan, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11525/2021, dt: 15.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11525/2021 on 15.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 18.7.2021 to 16.8.2021. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13808/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.11639/2021

in

S.C.No.93/2021

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

in

E.1, Mylapore P.S. Cr.No.1234/2020

Anand Babu @ Anand

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
E.1, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11639/2021, dt: 19.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11639/2021 on 19.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the Court concerned daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for more than 20 days till 17.8.2021 except on 10.8.2021. Case already been committed to Court of Sessions and is now pending on the file of XX Additional Sessions Court. Under such circumstances, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.13809/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11404/2021

in

B.2, Esplanade P.S. Cr.No.584/2021

N. Sridhar @ Sheeba

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

B.2, Esplanade Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11404/2021, dt: 12.7.2021.

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.11404/2021 on 12.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 14.7.2021 to 16.8.2021. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.13792/2021

in

S.C.No.159/2021

(On the file of the learned III Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

P-4, Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No.927/2020

1. Raji @ Thadi Raji
2. Ashok @ Ashok Kumar
3. Yuvaraj
4. Saravanan
5. Ansar Basha
6. Subash
7. Sarathkumar @ Babu @ Sarathbabu .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.R.Lingesan, N.Naresh and S.Y.Syed Parvez, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 29.12.2020 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 302, 506(ii) IPC altered to 147, 148, 341, 302, 506(ii) IPC r/w 149 IPC in Crime No.927/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in this case final report has been filed and the case has been committed to sessions court and pending before the III Additional Sessions Court, Chennai. Further, the petitioners are in custody for the past 7 ½ months and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners were already detained under Goondas Act as per the Detention Order No.20 to 26/BCDFGISSSV/2021, dated 29.1.2021 and the same has not yet revoked.

5. The petitioners were already detained under Goondas Act and the same is not yet revoked. Considering the same, 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**

Wednesday, the 18th day of August, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.12688/2021

in

J-3, Guindy P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

S. Mathivanan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S. Kartik 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 406 and 420 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.

SS

Principal Sessions Judge