

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.16380 and 16381/2021

in

V-5, Thirumangalam P.S. Crime No.109/2021

B.Surendher

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.16380/2021 / Accused

S.Sasi Kumar

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.16381/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.
in all the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.Inthu Karunakaran and JP Karunakaran, Counsel for the petitioners and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 465, 466, 468, 471 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.109/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsels for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are the tenants in the defacto complainant's property and running a hotel therein. There was some misunderstanding in payment of rent during the covid lockdown. The defacto complainant's men threatened the staff of the petitioners multi-cusion restaurant. There was a complaint by the petitioners against the defacto complainant and others. Being aggrieved at, the false complaint has been given against the petitioners as if they have obtained E.B. service connection in the name of the defacto complainant by affixing the photograph taken from Facebook and by forging the signature, they have obtained another E.B. service connection in the leased premises without any permission. But it is not so. In fact, the defacto complainant's family attended the inauguration function of the restaurant. They are

well aware of the E.B. service connection and deposit of security amount to the E.B. by the petitioners. Whatever it be, the dispute is civil in nature. They apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent on the basis of the false complaint and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this is the 2nd application for anticipatory bail. The earlier application was dismissed by this court on 19.5.2021. There is no change of circumstances and prays for dismissal.

5. On perusal of the records, it appears the earlier application moved for anticipatory bail by another counsel in CrI.M.P.No.9708/2021 was dismissed after hearing the intervenor. There is no change of circumstances. The intervenor is not before this court. Though there are documents to show the relationship of landlord and tenant between the petitioners and defacto complainant, in the absence of intervenor, passing any orders while the earlier petition was dismissed by this court, may lead to miscarriage of justice. Thus, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.15257/2021

in

R.R.No.Not known/2021

CBIC-DIN-202102DSS2000000B08A

CBIC-DIN-202102DSS200004141C

CBIC-DIN-202107DSS20000723314

CBIC-DIN-202107DSS2000000CC0F

1. Vanchinathan Thangavel

2. Sudharsan Palanikumar

3. Karthik Kathiresan

All Directors of

M/s.FLDEC Systems Pvt. Ltd.,

M/s.AFABLEZ Semiconductor Pvt. Ltd.,

Level-2 & 3, Olympia Teknos Park,

Plot No.28, Sidco Industrial Estate, Guindy,

Chennai-600032.

4. A.Athmaram

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

1. Deputy Director,

Office of the Director General of GST Intelligence (DGGI),

Chennai Zonal Unit,

No.16, Greams Road,

BSNL Building, Tower-2, 8th Floor,

Chennai-600006.

2. Senior Intelligence Officer,

Office of the Director General of GST Intelligence (DGGI),

Chennai Zonal Unit,

No.16, Greams Road,

BSNL Building, Tower-2, 8th Floor,

Chennai-600006.

..Respondents/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.M.Mohammed Rafi, J.H.Batchu, R.Joe Anand and S.Aishwarya and of Mr.N.P.Kumar, Special Public Prosecutor for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent for the alleged offences punishable u/s 132 of Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 in R.R.No.Not known/2021 on the file of the respondent, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are having roots in the society. They are running a 300 crore company with 400 employees. There is no chance for absconding. They are ready to abide by any condition imposed by this court and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor filed written counter and submitted that the earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this court after elaborate discussion. Immediately, another application has been filed by the petitioners for anticipatory bail. Such practice should not be encouraged. Further, the amount involved in nearly Rs.27 crores. If they are prepared to deposit the entire amount, their application may be considered.

5. For which, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are ready to deposit Rs.50 lakhs. So, there is no consensus between the defacto complainant and petitioners over deposit of amount due. The amount involved in Rs.27 crores. After paying some amount still there is Rs.18 crores is due to the Government. There is no change of circumstances. The observations made by this court in the earlier application stands good even on this day. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory 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
Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.16006/2021

in

C-2, Elephant Gate P.S. Crime No.1242/2021

Prem Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Mohan Raj, R.Bhuvaneshwari and C.Pradeep 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 384, 392 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.1242/2021 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 since the petitioner happens to be the friend of one Ramesh Babu, he has been falsely implicated in this case. Further, the petitioner is the Secretary of Kondithope Merchants Welfare Association. In respect of misdeeds of the Assistant Engineer, TANGED of a particular locality, he has raised several complaints to the authorities. Being aggrieved at, he has been falsely implicated in this case and prays for anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that one Ramesh Babu claiming himself as Reporter of Ezhuthu Thoodu, threatened the defacto complainant as he would publish the article exposing the corruptive practices of defacto complainant Karthik Ganesh and demanded Rs.1.5 lakhs in order to avoid publication of such material and he also received Rs.30,000/- from him under such threat. The petitioner accompanied the said Ramesh Babu at the time of threat and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The documents produced by the petitioner would go to show the petitioner is the Secretary of a Merchant Association. Even as per the F.I.R., the alleged threat is by

Ramesh Babu, the Editor of Ezhuthu Thoodu. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner. There is chances for false implication of the petitioner due to the complaints raised by him against the defacto complainant. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, C-2, Elephant Gate Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.16006/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.16118/2021

in

AVS-2 P.S. Crime No.9/2021

Naveen Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Anti Vice Squad-2,
Chintadripet,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.N.Sridhar and Y.Venkatesan, counsel for the petitioner and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a, 5(d) of ITP Act and Sec.370-A(2) of IPC in Crime No.9/2021 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 case has been registered in connection with prostitution at massage center. The petitioner is no way connected with the offence. In fact, he is one of the customer, who came to the massage center. He too has been arrested and remanded to custody. He is in custody from 3.9.2021 and prays for bail.

4. Even as per the alteration report, the petitioner was a customer of the massage center. He is in custody from 3.9.2021. Considering the duration of custody and the fact that he is the customer to the center, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.16118/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.16487/2021

in

AVS-2 P.S. Crime No.11/2021

Dhinesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Anti Vice Squad-2,
Chintadripet,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a of ITP Act altered to Sec.3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a, 5(1)(d) of ITP Act and Sec.370-A(2) of IPC in Crime No.11/2021 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 case has been registered in connection with prostitution at massage center. The petitioner is no way connected with the offence. In fact, he is one of the customer, who came to the massage center. He too has been arrested and remanded to custody. He is in custody from 17.9.2021 and prays for bail.

4. Even as per the remand report, the petitioner was a customer of the massage center. He is in custody from 17.9.2021. Considering the duration of custody and the fact that he is the customer to the center, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.16487/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.16358/2021

in

AVS-2 P.S. Crime No.10/2021

1. Saran
2. Arun

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Anti Vice Squad-2,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.M.Dhayalan, B.Saravanan and P.Kamal Raj, Counsel for the petitioner and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 8.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a of ITP Act altered to Sec.3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a, 5(d) of ITP Act and Sec.370-A(2) of IPC in Crime No.10/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the case has been registered in connection with prostitution at massage center. The petitioners are no way connected with the offence. They are in custody from 8.9.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners are the Manager of the Spa. They have indulged in the offence of prostitution. They have been arrested only on 8.9.2021 and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are Manager and running the center. They are the prime accused, involved in the offence. The arrest is very recent. Investigation is at the budding stage. Considering all those circumstances, 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.**

Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.16248/2021

in

AVS-2 P.S. Crime No.10/2021

Vijaykumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Anti Vice Squad-2 Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.N.S.Amarnath, R.Balaiah, R.Rajkumar and K.Manikandan, counsel for the petitioner and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a of ITP Act altered to Sec.3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a, 5(d) of ITP Act and Sec.370-A(2) of IPC in Crime No.10/2021 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 case has been registered in connection with prostitution at massage center. The petitioner is no way connected with the offence. In fact, he is one of the customer, who came to the massage center. He too has been arrested and remanded to custody. He is in custody from 8.9.2021 and prays for bail.

4. The petitioner was a customer of the massage center. He is in custody from 8.9.2021. Considering the duration of custody and the fact that he is the customer to the center, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.16248/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.16492/2021

in

AVS-1 P.S. Crime No.3/2021

P.Loganathan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Anti Vice Squad-1,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a of ITP Act altered to Sec.3(2)a, 4(1), 5(1)a, 5(d) of ITP Act and Sec.370-A(2) of IPC in Crime No.3/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case has been registered in connection with prostitution at massage center. The petitioner is no way connected with the offence. He is in custody from 13.9.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is the Manager of the Spa. He has indulged in the offence of prostitution. He has been arrested only on 13.9.2021 and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is the Manager and running the center. He is the prime accused, involved in the offence. The arrest is very recent. Investigation is at the budding stage. Considering all those circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge.