

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 11440 and 11633 of 2021

in

P.R.C.No.107/2021

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

in

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

Surya @ Kundu Surya

.. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.11440/2021

Selva @ Vellai Selva

.. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.11633/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

For Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11440/2021: M/s. V. Saravanan, R. Raji and M. Arjunan
Advocates

For Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11633/2021: M/s. R. Sasikumar, V. Manimaran,
S. Thiyagarajan, A. Tamilselvan, Advocates

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

Both the petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the
counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11440/2021 was arrested under PT Warrant on
10.5.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11633/2021 was arrested on 9.4.2021 for the
offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 302 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime
No.199/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11439 and 11163/2021 dated 12.7.2021. Investigation is completed and charge sheet has been filed. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11440/2021 was originally arrested in Crime No. 02/2021 on 9.4.2021 and in this case he has been brought into custody under PT Warrant on 10.5.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11633/2021 is in custody from 9.4.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there was dispute between two rival groups. On the occurrence day, the accused went to the house of the victim and assaulted him with knife. He died on the spot. Charge sheet has been filed and numbered as PRC.No.107/2021 on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate Court and is pending at the stage of committal. The prosecution is taking speedy steps for conducting trial. If the petitioners are released on bail at this stage, there is every possibility of their abscondance and the case proceedings would be stalled and thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than 3 months. Investigation is over. Already charge sheet has been filed and is pending in P.R.C.No.107/2021. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court on 12.7.2021. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, both the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the 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.

(c) the petitioners shall appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Chengalpattu daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.Nos. 11440 & 11633 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11632/2021

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 02/2021

Selva @ Vellai Selva

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 427, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 02/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 10.6.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.10686/2021. He is in custody from 9.4.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner/A3 along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and his brother who came in a two wheeler after celebrating new year with friends and assaulted the defacto complainant using knife and caused head injury. The accused also damaged the two wheelers and Load vehicle with wooden log belonged to the persons, who came to rescue the defacto complainant. Damage has been assessed at Rs.10,000/-. Learned CPP

further submits that this petitioner is having 3 previous cases and thus objects granting bail.

5. The alleged occurrence said to have been taken place on 1.1.2021. The petitioner has been in custody for more than 3 months. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 10.6.2021. Investigation is over. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11632/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11527/2021

in

N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.625/2021

Madhan @ Erupen Madhan

.. 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, M. Kokila, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 625/2021 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 this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 21.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.650/- from him at knife point. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is habitual offender and having 8 previous cases.

5. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past one month. Investigation is almost completed. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail 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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

(f) 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11527/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11530/2021

in

V-1 Villivakkam P.S. Crime No. 945/2020

Suresh @ Sulchi Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V-1 Villivakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Ajith, 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 30.10.2020 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 302, 294(b), 324 r/w 149 IPC in Crime No. 945/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 8 months. He was detained under Act 14/1982 and now the detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court in HCP No. 60/2021 dated 12.7.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. Learned CPP submits that the detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court.

5. Considering the fact that the detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court and the duration of custody 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 XIII 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.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No.11530/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 11630/2021

in

Thiruvanmiyur Railway P.S. Crime No.11/2021

Anantha Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Railway Police Station, Thiruvanmiyur,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 353, 307, 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 11/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was wordy quarrel between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. The petitioner is in custody for more than 3 months and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is a CRPF. He was working as a night guard. On the occurrence day, this petitioner was lying in the railway station platform. When it was questioned by him, wordy quarrel arose between the petitioner and the defacto complainant and this petitioner assaulted the complainant and due to which the complainant sustained bleeding injury on his nose.

5. According to CPP, injured discharged from the hospital. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for more than 3 months. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail 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 IX 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.

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

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

(f) 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11630/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11631/2021

in

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

Guna @ Gunasekaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-2 Kodambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.60/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way connected with the offence. Injured was discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were granted bail by this in Crl.M.P.Nos.11150 & 11533/2021 on 2.7.2021 and 14.7.2021. He is in custody from 13.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. Two persons sustained injury. This petitioner is the prime accused. He along with other accused took Briyani in the defacto complainant's shop and refused to pay money for that, over which there was a quarrel. The present petitioner came along with other accused subsequently went to the defacto complainant's house and assaulted him. He further submits that this petitioner is having 4 previous cases.

5. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 2.7.2021 and 14.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above aspects and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the 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 XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11631/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11645/2021

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No.724/2021

Sathish @ Sanda Koli Sathish

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
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.K. Masthan, K. Sujan Kumar, T. Ramesh Kumar, G. Sivakumar, counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.724/2021 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 this petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. This petitioner was taken to police station under the pretext of enquiry. Subsequently, he has been implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 4.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is a vegetable vendor selling vegetables in a pushcart. This petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money. On his refusal, the accused threatened him and robbed Rs.750/- from him. The petitioner is a history sheeter having 12 previous cases. If he is released on bail, again he will indulge in similar nature of crime and seriously objects the grant of bail. He also furnished the list of cases pending against the petitioner.

5. On perusal of the list furnished by the CPP, it would go to show that the cases pending against the petitioner are of offences u/s.392, 379 and 380 IPC which are triable by Magistrate and according to counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is on bail in those cases. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody from 4.6.2021. Considering the above aspects and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the 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 photograph and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11645/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11658/2021

in

N-3 Muthialpet P.S. Crime No. 748/2021

Vineetha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
N-3, Muthialpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C.Johnson Samuel, M.B.Prabhu, counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 307 of IPC in Crime No.748/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was some relationship between the petitioner and victim. The petitioner is a married woman. Having left her husband, she lived along with the injured Vignesh. There was some settlement to leave the said Vignesh by the mother of Vignesh. She also executed documents stating that she is discontinuing the relationship with Vignesh. Thereafter, she had no connection with the said Vignesh. It appears that the said Vignesh was assaulted by some other persons. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Victim was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is a woman. She is in custody for about a month and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. Having received some amount as a settlement, at the instance of the petitioner, the said Vignesh was assaulted with knife by the hooligans. Serious injury has been caused and the petitioner is

the brain behind the crime. Identification Parade was conducted and the persons who attacked the victim were identified. Thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for about a month. It is reported by the CPP that victim was discharged from the hospital. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the gender of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison (for Women), Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11658/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11786/2021

in

E-2 Royapettah P.S. Crime No. 333/2021

Aravind @ Aravindan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
E-2 Royapettah Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. U. Yuvaraj, D. Gopi Krishnan, A. Vinothkumar, P. Praveen Kumar, 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 offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 307, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.333/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this 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. No one was hospitalized. The petitioner is in custody from 13.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.500/- from him and also tried to assault him with knife. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 9 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The victim had a narrow escape. The petitioner was arrested only on 13.7.2021. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioner and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11787/2021

in

D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 219/2021

B. Palani

.. 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. P. Thinesh, T. Sundarbabu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested under PT Warrant on 5.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 219/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Originally, this petitioner was arrested on 24.7.2021 in Crime No. 218/2021 with the respondent police. He was formally arrested in this case under PT Warrant on 5.5.2021. In the main case, he was arrested and granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.11925/2021 dated 14.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 5.5.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with two other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.900/- from him at knife point.

5. This petitioner was formally arrested in this case under PT Warrant on 5.5.2021. Originally, he was arrested on 27.4.2021 in Crime No. 218/2021. It is reported that in the main case, he was released on bail by the Hon'ble High Court on 14.7.2021. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11787/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11789/2021

in

V-4 Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No. 617/2021

Sunil

.. 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. S. Illavarasan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 395, 458 and 511 of IPC in Crime No.617/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way connected with the occurrence. No doubt, there was an occurrence of dacoity in the defacto complainant's house on 19.6.2021. As per the complaint, about five persons entered into the house and committed the offence by tying down the defacto complainant. On the other hand, 10 persons were roped as accused and the petitioner was also arrested and remanded to custody. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence and he has been waiting outside at the time of scenario and he has not aware of the activities done by his friends. He is a first year college student. He is not an identified accused. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 20.7.2021. He is in custody from 25.6.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 395 IPC. Totally 10 accused involved in this case. The accused all conspired together and planned to commit dacoity in the defacto complainant's house. Five persons entered into the house by wearing mask to conceal their identity. When the defacto complainant, aged about 16, a minor girl, was alone, she has been tied to the chair and her mouth was closed by cello-tape. Thereafter, the persons came to the house searched for the amount. Having smelt the arrival of some other persons, they escaped with the looted amount. As such, the complaint was lodged. Though the present petitioner not entered into the house, he is waiting outside the home to give signal about the movement in outside. The petitioner and others hatched a plan to commit dacoity in the house of the defacto complainant. By watching the movement of the adult members and availability of sufficient amount in the house, they entered into action. The petitioner controlled the entire episode by keeping himself away. From the confession of the other accused, it came to light that the petitioner and others are behind the crime. So, all of them were roped in this case.

5. Admittedly, this court granted bail to one of the co-accused on the ground that he was not present at the scene of occurrence. But, as far as this petitioner is concerned, he himself admitted that he was waiting outside the house at the time of occurrence. According to CPP, this petitioner is waiting outside the house to give signal to his associates who are indulged in committing dacoity. Hence, he also having knowledge about the plan to commit dacoity at defacto complainant's house. So, he cannot claim parity with the co-accused, who was granted bail by this court. Considering the gravity of offence and that investigation is at crucial stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

Cr.L.M.P.No. 11790/2021

in

D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 297/2021

Harish @ Chinna Harish

.. 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. 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 10.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392,397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 297/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Already all the co-accused were enlarged on bail. The petitioner is in custody from 10.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1,200/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 8 previous cases and the petitioner was also convicted in one case in the year 2016 and seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is reported that all the co-accused were enlarged on bail . Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody from 10.6.2021. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11790/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11655/2021

in

S.C.No. 286/2013

(On the file of XIX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

H-1 Washermenpet P.S. Crime No.140/2010

John Jaisingh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
H-1 Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. B. Shankar, Mohamed Aasif, V. Venkatesan, R. Shanthosh Kumar, counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.12.2020 on execution of N.B.W. for the offences punishable under Section 452, 341, 302, 120(B) r/w 34 IPC in S.C.No. 286/2013 on the file of the learned XIX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, in Crime No.140/2010 on the file of 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 N.B.W. was issued against the petitioner on 10.1.2019 due to his non-appearance before the trial court. Due to Covid pandemic situation, this petitioner is unable to recall the warrant. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereinafter, the petitioner will regularly appear before the court and prays for granting bail.

4. Learned CPP submits that NBW was issued against the petitioner for his non-appearance. NBW was executed on 21.12.2020. After much effort, the petitioner was

secured by the police. Now, the case is posted for examination of witnesses. If the petitioner is released on bail, again, he will abscond and the case could not be proceeded further and therefore, opposes the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. The case is of the year 2013. Now, the case is pending for examination of witnesses. On perusal of the records, it would go to show that the petitioner is a frequent absentee. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Considering the stage of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11795/2021

in

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

Appu @ Arun Murugan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

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

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is aged 19 years. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused murdered the deceased using deadly weapons. Investigation is underway. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility in tampering the witnesses. Hence, seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. The petitioner was arrested only on 17.6.2021. Investigation is going on. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/-R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11796/2021

in

P.5, M.K.B. Nagar P.S. Cr.No.937/2021

Sekar

.. 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. 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 18.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 328 of IPC in Cr.No.937/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 18.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner was found in possession of banned tobacco products and from him 740 gms of Maava and cash Rs.600/- were recovered. He further submits that the petitioner was arrested recently and investigation is pending and thus objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner was arrested only on 18.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11797/2021

in

D.3, Ice House P.S. Cr.No.350/2021

1. Sarath @ Maadu Sarath
2. H. Harish

.. Petitioners/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. C. Jagan, S. Ajith, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 8.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.350/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. Since the petitioners are having previous cases, the respondent police foisted this false case against them. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. No one sustained injury. The petitioners are in custody from 8.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioners assaulted him with hands and tried to attack him with knife. He objects granting bail stating that the 1st petitioner is having 1 previous case and the 2nd petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 15 days. According to learned CPP, both the petitioners are having previous cases. However, considering the fact that the 1st petitioner/Sarath @ Maadu Sarath is having only 1 previous case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 1st petitioner alone subject to condition. In respect of 2nd petitioner/Harish is concerned, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him considering his bad antecedents.

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

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

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

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

(d) the 1st petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 1st petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 1st petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the 1st petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as 2nd petitioner is concerned, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk CrI.M.P.No.11797/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.11798/2021

in

D.5, Marina P.S. Cr.No.575/2021

Vishal

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D.5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.575/2021 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. Since the petitioner is having previous cases, he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. He is in custody for the past one month and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.150/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender having 9 previous cases and his earlier petition was dismissed on 7.7.2021. If he is released on bail, he will again indulge in similar offence and thus objects granting bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedents and the objection of learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11803/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.690/2021

1. Dinesh @ Manda Dinesh
2. Akash

.. Petitioners/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. Selvarajan, M. Jaikumar, L. Vinothkumar, P. Kamaraj, T. Lavanya, Sh. Vazhavan Karthikeyan, P.S. Mercy Gnanammal, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 336, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.690/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They are in custody from 15.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, they assaulted him and at knife point robbed Rs.800/- from him. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 8 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 2

previous cases. The petitioners were arrested recently and investigation is pending and thus objects granting bail.

5. Petitioners were arrested only on 15.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. According to learned CPP, both the petitioners are having previous cases. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedents and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11807/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.624/2021

1. Madhankumar

2. Arun @ Arun Kumar

.. Petitioners/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. P. Govindarajan, L. Ramu, M. Selvin, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 30.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 399 of IPC in Cr.No.624/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are native of Dindigul District. They are working under a Flower Merchant at Koyambedu. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. They petitioners are in custody from 30.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused were preparing to commit dacoity.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more the past 23 days. The allegations against the petitioners is that they prepared for committing robbery. No bad antecedent

was reported against the petitioners. Co-accused was already granted bail. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to 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 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 petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11807/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.11713/2021

in

P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.992/2021

1. Muthulakshmi
2. Mari @ Suresh

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police(L&O),
P.1, Pulianthope Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.3 and 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 and Sec.294(b), 427, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.992/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are relatives. In fact, the defacto complainant, friend of the 1st petitioner borrowed amount from her and failed to repay the same. When the petitioners demanded the defacto complainant to return the amount with interest at 1.5% p.a., she lodged this false and exaggerated complaint. The petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant borrowed money from the 1st petitioner as hand loan and she owes Rs.4 lakh to her, for which, the petitioners demanded exorbitant interest and threatened her with dire consequences.

5. There was some money transaction between the defacto complainant and the petitioners. It is alleged that the petitioners are demanding exorbitant rate of interest. The case has been registered u/s. 3 and 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 and Sec.294(b), 427, 506(ii) IPC. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of dispute between the parties, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to following conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police(L&O), P.1, Pulianthope Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11713/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11714/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.4472/2021

in

J.1, Saidapet P.S. Cr.No.79/2021

Chandrasekar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

J.1, Saidapet Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. T.K.S. Gandhi, M. Arun, 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.4472/2021, dt:15.3.2021.

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.4472/2021 on 15.3.2021 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 19.3.2021 to 19.7.2021. 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.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11715/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.3195/2021

in

J.1, Saidapet P.S. Cr.No.80/2021

Chandrasekar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

J.1, Saidapet Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. T.K.S. Gandhi, M. Arun, 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.3195/2021, dt:4.3.2021.

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.3195/2021 on 4.3.2021 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 19.3.2021 to 19.7.2021. 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.

Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11716/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.10764/2021

in

E.1, Mylapore P.S. Cr.No.190/2021

Santhakumar

... 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. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, R. Vimal, 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.10764/2021, dt:16.6.2021.

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.10764/2021 on 16.6.2021 for the offence u/s.302 IPC 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. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 23.6.2021 to till date. The petitioner is the sole bread winner of his family and due to the above said condition, he is unable to maintain his family. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has been complying the condition regularly. However, considering the nature of offence, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows:

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd./-R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021.**

Cr.L.M.P.No.11808/2021

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.R.S.Indira and M.Dhanraj and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 14.7.2021 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 no offence u/s 376 IPC is attracted. There was a lover 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 about a week and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 376 IPC. Investigation is at the budding stage and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., 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. So, the first occurrence is without valid consent. The investigation is at the budding stage. The accused is in custody only for the past one week. Considering the short duration of

custody 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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 22nd day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11809/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.56/2021

against

M.P.No.29/2021

in

LIR No.582/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2020

in

H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.137/2020 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C.

Karthick
/

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent

Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner of Police, Washermenpet, Chennai.
2. The State represented by
Inspector of Police,(Law & Order),
H-1, Washermenpet 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.R.Mukesh Kannah, B.Durai and M.Nithiyavel 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.29/2021 in LIR No.582/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2020 in H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.137/2020 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 114 days for violation of bond executed u/s 107 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 6.7.2021.

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

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 114 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

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

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

9. The Revision is posted on 23.8.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

1. The XV 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 22nd day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11814/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.57/2021

against

M.P.No.30/2021

in

Rc No.26/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021

in

N-4, P.S. SL No.02/2021 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C.

Thameem Ansari
/

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent

Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner
Washermenpet Range, 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.30/2021 in Rc No.26/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021 in N-4, P.S. SL No.02/2021 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C. U/s 107 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 181 days for violation of bond executed u/s 107 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 3.7.2021.

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

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 181 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

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

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

9. The Revision is posted on 23.8.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss