

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13144/2021**

in

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

Selvaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 5.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a), 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No. 1778/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. The petitioner is 55 years old. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 5.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that during routine vehicle check, the respondent police seized 37 bottles of TASMAL brandy from the autorickshaw which was driven by one Vinoth. On enquiry, he confessed that this petitioner and himself sold the liquor bottles at higher price on instruction of one Manimegalai.

5. According to CPP, the property involved in this case has been recovered and the petitioner has no bad antecedents.

6. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. He is in custody for the past two weeks. Considering the age of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to following condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13144/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13429/2021**

in

**J-3 Guindy P.S. Crime No. 639/2021**

Nithiyantham

.. 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 M/s. M. Kaveri Selvam, Balaji Sankara Moorthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC in Crime No. 639/2021 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. Deceased is the wife of this petitioner. He is no way connected with the alleged offence and he was not at all present at the scene of crime at the time of occurrence. He is in custody from 13.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is the husband of the deceased. Their marriage was held on 4.11.2020. Suspecting her fidelity, this petitioner committed murder of his own wife. The deceased sustained multiple stab injury all over her body. Investigation is at an early stage. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of brutal murder. A valuable life has been lost. The allegation against the petitioner is that, he suspected his wife's fidelity and murdered her brutally. Investigation is at budding stage. Considering the gravity of offence and the stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13884/2021**

in

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

1. Abdul Barek  
2. Jitendra Biswal

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A. Anandaraman, P. Surendran, G. Pandian, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 25.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 269, 328, 353 and 506(i) IPC r/w 24(1) of COTPA Act in Crime No. 281/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. A1 is the main accused. These petitioners are no way connected with the alleged offence. A1 supplied tobacco products from other State. These petitioners are only employees under him and they indulged in selling the same here. The petitioners are ready to furnish local surety. They are in custody from 25.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on information, when the respondent police came to search New Apollo Lodge, the present petitioners who tried to escape from the place, were apprehended and gave statement that these petitioners along with A1 indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products, which were brought by A1 from

other States. These petitioners are arrayed as A2 and A3 in this case. The banned tobacco products such as Hans 176 packets, Swagat Gold Tobacco 115 packets, Missile Super Strong 16 packets, Sardar Zafrani Zarda – 4 packets, Chandtara Special Kahini 6 packets, Rajnigandha flavoured Pan Masala 29 packets, Signature Finest Panmasala -189 packets, Signature Panmasala Orange 1200 packets, V-1 Tobacco Orange 1140, V-1 Tobacco Red-880 packets, Vimal Pan Masala 26 packets, Sardar Deluxe Chewing Tobacco-287 packets, Vimal Pan Masala -89 packets, Cool Lip 404 packets, V1 Tobacco-89 packets, V1 tobacco 51 and Sardar Deluxe Chewing tobacco 4 packets were seized. He further submits that Jitendra Biswal is the native of Odisha and Abdul Barek is from Assam. The petitioners are wholesalers. Prime accused is not yet arrested. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is alleged that these petitioners are employees under A1. No one is reported as hospitalized due to the consumption of alleged contraband. The petitioners are in custody for more than three weeks. 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 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, one surety must be a blood relative, each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XIV 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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13884/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13885/2021**

in

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

Rajiv @ Rajubai @ Raj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P-5 MKB Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.8.2021 under PT Warrant for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 726/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Originally, he was arrested on 27.6.2021 in the main case in Crime No.666/2021 on the file of P3 Vyasarpadi Police station and he was granted bail in the main case by this court in CrI.M.P.No.12477/2021 dated 3.8.2021. In this case, this petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody under P.T. Warrant on 3.8.2021. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court on 29.6.2021 and 1.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody for more than 1 ½ months and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with 5 other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and his friend at knife point and snatched their motor bikes(2 nos) and also attacked them with knife and thereafter escaped from the spot. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 6 previous cases and thus seriously objects the grant of bail.



5. According to counsel for the petitioner that in main case, this petitioner was granted bail by this court. In this case, this petitioner was formally arrested under PT Warrant. Co-accused was already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody for more than two weeks. 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 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. 13885/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13886/2021**

in

**K-8 Arumbakkam P.S. Crime No. 924/2021**

1. Esuva @ Ramesh

2. Nagoor Hussain

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-8 Arumbakkam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 29.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 380 IPC in Crime No. 924/2021 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 petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 29.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners along with other accused break opened the defacto complainant's house and stolen away 3 sovereigns of gold ornaments, cash Rs.5000/- and some silver articles from the house.

5. According to CPP, a portion of the property was recovered from the petitioners. The 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 2 previous cases. The petitioners are in custody only for two weeks. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners 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**

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August , 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14017/2021**  
in  
**W-10, A.W.P.S. Crime No. 6/2021**

M.Sivakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W-10, All Women Police Station,  
Flower Bazaar,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s. Y. Mohamed Ghouse, H. Navas Basha, M.G. Abdul Mujeeb and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 376, 417 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No. 6/2021 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 complaint itself discloses that there was consensual sexual intercourse between the petitioner and the complainant. Hence, the offence u/s 376 IPC is not attracted. There was a love affair between the petitioner and defacto complainant, which was broken due to the relationship of the defacto complainant with some other persons. Being aggrieved at, a false and exaggerated complaint has been given. The accused is in custody for more than a month and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 376 IPC. Investigation is not yet completed and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it appears there was relationship and sexual intercourse between the defacto complainant and petitioner on several occasions. As per the complaint, the first sexual intercourse with the defacto complainant is by administering sedative drugs. Subsequent sexual intercourse is by threat. So, the first occurrence is without valid consent. The investigation is at crucial stage. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 3.8.2021 . No change in circumstance was brought to the notice of this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Considering the stage of the investigation and offence against a woman, that too, a sexual assault, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14019/2021**

in

**K-3 Aminjikai P.S. Crime No. 645/2021**

Abraham

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-3 Aminjikai Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 394, 395, 397 IPC in Crime No. 645/2021 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 been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him with an ulterior motive. Co-accused were already granted bail on 16.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 9.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that when the defacto complainant playing cards with his friends, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the complainant with knife and robbed 19 sovereigns gold ornaments and cash Rs.25,000/- from him and escaped from the spot.

5. According to CPP, the arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Though occurrence taken place on 29.6.2021, this petitioner absconded for a long time and the police is able to arrest the petitioner only on 9.8.2021. His antecedents are yet to be ascertained. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the allegations made against the petitioner and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14021/2021**

in

**G-5 Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No. 199/2021**

Prasanth @ Kulla Karuppa

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Kingston Jerold, S. Anandhan, P. Syed Amir Kasim, T. Ajith, 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 offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 427, 336, 397 and 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 is innocent of the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him with an ulterior motive. The petitioner is in custody from 6.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner had tea and snacks from the defacto complainant's shop and refused to pay money for that. When demanded money, he attacked the complainant with hands and taken away Rs.110/- from his shirt packet.

5. Learned CPP objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is a habitual offender having 6 previous cases.



6. Considering the allegations made against the petitioner and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14026/2021**

in

**P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 902/2021**

Aravindhhan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P-5 MKB Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 392 IPC in Crime No. 902/2021 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. Co-accused were already granted bail by the trial court. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.30,000/- from the defacto complainant. He further submits that this petitioner is having one previous case.

5. It is reported that co-accused were granted bail by the trial court. This petitioner is in custody for more than a month. 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 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. 14026/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14028/2021**

in

**B-1 North Beach P.S. Crime No. 925/2021**

Chandan Sahni

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
B-1 North Beach Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 420, 379 IPC in Crime No. 925/2021 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. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. Only on suspicion, this petitioner was arrested. This petitioner's salary amount Rs.24,000/- has been seized from him by the respondent police. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner along with another accused committed theft of ATM Card from the defacto complainant and misused the same by withdrawing cash Rs.1,99,000/- from her bank account.

5. According to CPP, only Rs.24,000/- was recovered from this petitioner and remaining amount is yet to be recovered. This petitioner is also having one previous case.

The petitioner is native of Bihar. Co-accused is still at large. If the petitioner is released on bail, certainly, he will abscond and seriously objects the grant of bail.

6. On perusal of the FIR, it would go to show that this petitioner along with other accused used the ignorance of the defacto complainant at ATM Centre, and committed theft of her ATM card and withdrawn cash Rs.1 lakh on various occasions and also used the same at Saravana Gold Jewellery shop for purchasing gold jewels for the value of Rs.99,000/-. Totally Rs.1,99,000/- was looted from the defacto complainant's bank account. Co-accused is still at large. Investigation is at crucial stage. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14030/2021**

in

**H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 1051/2021**

Sathish @ Manga Sathish

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC and u/s.3 of TNPPDL Act in Crime No. 1051/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than two months. He was detained under Act 14/1982 and now the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board in G.O.Rt. No. 3641 dated 13.8.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

3. The case of the prosecution is that, there was a gang war between two groups. On 4.6.2021, at about 4.45 p.m. due to previous motive, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him using knife. In the clash between two groups, vehicles belongs to third parties were damaged.

4. Learned CPP submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 11 previous cases. However, he submits that the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board.

5. Considering the fact that the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board and the duress period of the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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 in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No.14030/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 14035/2021**

in

**H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 1052/2021**

Sathish @ Manga Sathish

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC and u/s.3 of TNPPDL Act in Crime No. 1052/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than two months. He was detained under Act 14/1982 and now the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board in G.O.Rt. No. 3641 dated 13.8.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

3. The case of the prosecution is that, there was a gang war between two groups. On 4.6.2021, at about 4.20 p.m. due to previous motive, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him using knife. In the clash between two groups, vehicles belongs to third parties were damaged.

4. Learned CPP submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 11 previous cases. However, he submits that the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board.



5. Considering the fact that the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board and the duress period of the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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 in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No.14035/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14033/2021**

in

**P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 2040/2021**

Ashik @ Mohammed Ashik

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 273, 328 IPC and sec. 24(1) of COTP Act in Crime No. 2040/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is withdrawing this bail application as against the petitioner.

3. In view of the representation made by the counsel for the petitioner, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 14037/2021**

in

**V-4 Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No. 765/2021**

Ramasamy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
V-4 Rajamangalam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 328 IPC and sec. 24(1) of COTP Act 2003 in Crime No. 765/2021 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 been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. This petitioner is running grocery shop. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 17.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that he went to the petitioner's shop and purchased tobacco product. After consuming the same, he suffered by vomiting and other symptoms. Based on his complaint, FIR was registered. He further submits that the arrest of the petitioner is very recent. Investigation is at budding stage and seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it appears that the complainant suffered vomiting and other symptoms after consuming the tobacco products which was sold by the petitioner herein in his grocery shop. This petitioner sold banned tobacco products in his shop. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Investigation is at budding stage. Under such 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  
Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.13894/2021**

in

**N.4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Cr.No.1025/2020**

Sanjay

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Nithiyavel, R. Mukesh Kannah, B. Anju, M. Kokila, 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. 341, 294(b), 392 of IPC in Crime No.1025/2020 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 this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. It is an unnamed FIR. Petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused under the influence of alcohol, threatened the defacto complainant and his friend at knife point and robbed cellphone, Camera and wallet from them and also attacked the defacto complainant with knife. He further submits that the petitioner is having two previous cases and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of 392 IPC. Granting anticipatory bail in such cases may send a wrong signal to the society at large. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. 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  
Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13895/2021**

in

**N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Cr.No.641/2021**

Sambath

.. 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 M/s. M. Nithiyavel, R. Mukesh Kannah, B. Anju, M. Kokila, 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.341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.641/2021 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 this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Arrested accused were already enlarged on bail by this court. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 4 accused involved in this case. The petitioner herein is A4. The defacto complainant's father was murdered by the accused earlier. On the date of occurrence, the accused waylaid the defacto complainant who is the son of the deceased and demanded money from him for conducting the murder case. On his refusal, at knife point, they robbed Rs.3000/ from him. He further submits that the petitioner is having 6 previous cases including one case u/s.302 IPC and he cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who

have been granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of robbery. Granting anticipatory bail in such cases may send a wrong signal to the society at large. Further the petitioner is having 6 previous cases including one murder case. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. 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**

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.13897/2021**

in

**K.11 C.M.B.T. P.S. Crime No.405/2021**

M. Periyasamy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-11, C.M.B.T. Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 364(A) r/w. 34 of IPC in Crime No.405/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been arrayed as A1 in this case. As per the complaint, the defacto complainant's husband/Sakthi Vadivelan owes a sum of Rs.1,96,000/- to the petitioner. In connection with that, it is alleged, Sakthi Vadivelan, who came to Chennai to get some more money from the petitioner was kidnapped. According to him, it is a false case. In fact, there was no lending transaction between the petitioner and the so called victim Sakthi Vadivelan. In fact, the petitioner is in the field of fish merchant. There was some business transaction, for which, Sakthi Vadivelan received commission through Phonepay and G.pay. There are ample evidence to show the payment through Phonepay and G.Pay to Sakthi Vadivelan and his wife. In fact, the victim and defacto complainant came to Chennai together. On the other hand, the

complaint has been given as if Sakthi Vadivalan came to Chennai previously and on his information of kidnap alone, the defacto complainant rushed to Chennai. It is totally a false allegation. In order to settle the financial dispute, a false and exaggerated complaint has been given. Arrested accused were already enlarged on bail and hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is the prime accused. For the amount repayable by the victim(husband of the defacto complainant), this petitioner along with others kidnapped him and demanded money from the defacto complainant to release him. Initially, the victim was taken to one Karuppaiya's house. From there, he was moved to the factory premises of Elshaddai Nutricare Company. The victim was rescued from one of the co-accused Stanley's business place at Puduper Village, Nandampakkam and arrested some of the accused there. He further submits that petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed on 27.7.2021 and he cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who have been granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration. There is no change of circumstance and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petition before this court is not maintainable and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a grave case of kidnapping for ransom. Though other accused were released on bail, the petitioner is the prime accused. This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> petition. Earlier petition was dismissed on 27.7.2021 and there is no change of circumstance. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13915/2021**

in

**E.1, Mylapore P.S. Cr.No.1229/2020**

S. Senthil @ Ruban

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. 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. A. Anandha Raj, 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. 7, 9 of COTPA Act and Sec.328 of IPC in Crime No.1229/2020 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 this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He was not at all present in the scene of occurrence. There was no recovery from the petitioner. Only based on the confessional statement of the co-accused, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Prime accused were arrested and released on bail. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is one of the prime accused. This petitioner along with other accused indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products, which were transported from Bangalore, illegally and stored in the godown and supplied to the retailers. During vehicle check-up, the vehicle/Eicher Goods Carrier was

intercepted by the police parties and found that huge quantity of banned tobacco products were transported through the said vehicle and arrested A1 to A3. Totally, 5 tonnes of banned tobacco products were seized along with the vehicle. He further submits that co-accused were granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration and the present petitioner who moved anticipatory bail petition cannot seek parity with that of the co-accused and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of illegal transportation of banned tobacco products for sale. Nowadays, this type of offences are in the rise of the City. Totally, 5 Tonnes of banned tobacco products transported through vehicle were seized. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is noway connected with the alleged offence. According to CPP, this petitioner is one of the prime accused and during investigation it came to light that only based on the instruction of this petitioner, the banned tobacco products were distributed to various places for sale. Considering the objection raised and the fact that huge quantity of banned tobacco products being transported through 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**

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.13718/2021**

**in**

**CrI.M.P.No.11531/2021**

**in**

**J.4, Kotturpuram P.S. Cr.No.532/2021**

1. M. Murugesan

2. F. Mohamed Ashik

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

J.4, Kotturpuram Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K. Kannan, R. Ravichandran, E. Bhuvaneshwari, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11531/2021, dt: 14.7.2021.

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

3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11531/2021 on 14.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition from 17.7.2021 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**

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13898/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.11890/2021**

**in**

**R.2, Kodambakkam P.S. Cr.No.570/2021**

R. Gangadharan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

R.2, Kodambakkam Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Ajith Kumar, R. Dinesh Kumar, S. Ramanathan, 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.11890/2021, dt: 23.7.2021.

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.11890/2021 on 23.7.2021 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 28.7.2021 to 17.8.2021. 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**

**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13899/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.11642/2021**

**in**

**R.1, Mambalam P.S. Cr.No.519/2020**

Bharath Selvam

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

R.1, Mambalam Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. J. William Shakesphere, V. Ravi, A. Gurumoorthy, 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.11642/2021, dt: 26.7.2021.

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.11642/2021 on 26.7.2021 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 29.7.2021 to 17.8.2021. 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**  
**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13900/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.11492/2021**

**in**

**R.6, Kumaran Nagar P.S. Cr.No.380/2021**

K.Vijay

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R.6, Kumaran Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A. Veeran, M. Magesh, 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.11492/2021, dt: 13.7.2021.
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.11492/2021 on 13.7.2021 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 20.7.2021 to 17.8.2021. 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  
Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13901/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.11597/2021**

in

**EOW-II, Cr.No.14/2021**

1. Kasthuri
2. S. Priya
3. A. Sampath Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
EOW.II, Head Quarters Police Station,  
Guindy,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Balaji, K. Easwar, P. Kumar, S. Gugappriya, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.11597/2021 on 16.7.2021 for the offences u/s.420, 409 r/w. 34 of IPC on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a like sum and to deposit Rs.2,00,000/- each to the credit of the above said crime number before the court concerned and also to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Subsequently, on petition, time was extended for further period of 10 days vide order dated 2.8.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.12417/2021.

2. Now the present petition has been filed for extension of further time.

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

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that as ordered by this court, the petitioners have deposited Rs.6,00,000/-(each Rs.2 lakh) into the Court. However, due to their illness, they were unable to furnish sureties before the Court concerned. Hence,

prayed for extension of further time to furnish sureties. Learned counsel for the petitioner also produced the copy of the receipt for payment of Rs.6 lakh dated 17.8.2021.

5. Though the petitioners deposited Rs.6,00,000/- into the Court, according to learned counsel for the petitioners, they were unable to furnish sureties due to their illness. Considering the amount deposited by the petitioners vide receipt dated 17/8/21 this court is inclined to extend the time for further period of 10 days from today. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. Inspector of Police, EOW-II Headquarters Police Station, Guindy, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.13901/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI  
Present: **Thiru.R.Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.14016/2021**

in

Crl.R.C.No.71/2021

against

M.P.No.39/2021

in

LIR No.132/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021

in

N-4 P.S. SL.No.5/2021 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C.

Subramani

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent /  
Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner,  
Washermenpet, Chennai.
2. The State represented by  
Inspector of Police (Law & Order),  
N-4, Fishing Harbour Police Station,  
Chennai.

.. Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/  
Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the revision petition.
2. The counsel for the petitioner was heard through Video Conference.
3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.39/2021 in LIR No.132/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021 in N-4 P.S. SL.No.5/2021 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 326 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 6.8.2021.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has fair chance of success in the revision. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 326 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

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

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

9. The Revision is posted on 20.9.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

**Copy to :**

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

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13790/2021**

in

**P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.905/2021**

Dinesh

.. 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.S.Vinoth, N.Vasanth and A.Manikandan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 323, 366, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.905/2021 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 dispute is over love affair. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner is in custody from 8.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner kidnapped the victim girl in an auto and compelled her to marry him.
5. The petitioner is alleged to have kidnapped a girl with whom he fell in love. The victim was immediately rescued. The accused is in custody for about 1 ½ month. Considering the nature of offence and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.
6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvallur daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvallur.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.13790/2021