

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11612/2021

in

D-5 Marina P.S. Crime No. 575/2021

Ajith @ Ajith Kumar

.. 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. D. Gopi Krishnan, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinoth Kumar, 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 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 575/2021 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. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 7.7.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021. He is in custody from 22.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.150/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. He objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 8 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 8 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 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 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11612/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11615/2021

in

V-4 Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No. 571/2021

Nagaraj

.. 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. D. Ravichandran, Raj, P. Ajith, Pradeepa, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 571/2021 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. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 14.7.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.11483/2021. The petitioner is in custody from 24.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 14.6.2021, at about 3.30 p.m. this petitioner and other accused attacked the defacto complainant with knife when he demanded their two wheeler for buying water bottle to consume liquor and also robbed Rs.2000/- from his shirt pocket. According to CPP, the petitioner has no bad antecedents and that the amount involved in this case has been recovered.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. It is reported that the property involved in this case has been recovered. Considering the above facts and 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 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 today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11615/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11642/2021

in

R-1 Mambalam P.S. Crime No. 519/2020

Bharath Selvam

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-1 Mambalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. J. William Shakesphere, V. Ravi, T. Srikanth, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 506(ii) and 307 IPC in Crime No. 519/2020 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 this petitioner was already granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No. 240/2021 on 15.2.2021. Due to lock down, the petitioner could not be able to return back from his native place and therefore, he was unable to surrender before the Magistrate within the stipulated time. When he returned from the native place, he was arrested by the respondent police. The petitioner is in custody from 9.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, on 4.9.2020, this petitioner along with other accused with intention to eliminate the defacto complainant attacked him with knife and caused multiple cut injuries. According to CPP, fortunately, the victim had a narrow escape and sustained simple injury.

5. Already anticipatory bail was granted to the petitioner by this court. However, he failed to surrender before the concerned Magistrate Court and sureties not furnished. Therefore, he was arrested by the police. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days. Considering the above facts and 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 XVII 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 XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11642/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11654/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 961/2021

Gopi @ Kamalakannan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. B. Kalaiarasan, D. Percivul Pericles, S.M. Raghuram, R. Surendar Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 961/2021 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. Since the petitioner is having some previous cases, false case has been foisted on him with intention to detain him under Act 14/1982. This petitioner is in custody from 9.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.700/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. He objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 4 previous cases.
5. The petitioner is in custody for more than two weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 4

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. 11654/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11707/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 961/2021

Prabhu

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 961/2021 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. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. This petitioner is in custody from 9.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.700/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. According to him this petitioner is having one previous case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than two weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. 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

CrI.M.P.No. 11707/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 11702 & 11995/2021

in

K-4 Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No. 549/2021

Tamil Selvan

.. Petitioner/Accused.
in Crl.M.P.No.11702/2021

1. R. Vijay
2. M. Madhan
3. B. Vijaykumar @ boxer Vijay
4. Michel @ Stephan raj

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11995/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-4 Anna Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Mohanraj, counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11702/2021 M/s. S. Ilavarasan, counsel for the petitioners in Crl.M.P.No. 11995/2021 and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11702/2021 was arrested under PT Warrant on 8.7.2021 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.11995/2021 were arrested on 8.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 364(A), 352 and 511 IPC in Crime No. 549/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 11702/2021 submits that this petitioner was originally arrested in Crime No.542/2021 on the file of F-5 Choolaimedu

Police Station on 21.6.2021. In this case, he was formally arrested under PT Warrant on 8.7.2021. No such incident was taken place as alleged in the FIR. The real fact is that quarrel arose between the petitioner and the defacto complainant while overtaking the car and asked the defacto complainant to get down from the vehicle. Except that nothing has happened. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. In this case he is in custody from 8.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.11995/2021 submits that these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. No such incident was taken place as alleged in the FIR. The real fact of the case is that there was some controversy between the defacto complainant and his business enemies. These petitioners are not at all present at the scene of occurrence. The petitioners are in custody from 8.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

5. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused tried to kidnap the defacto complainant in a Car bearing registration No. TN 07 CM 7780 Mahindra XUV 500. He further submits that the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11702/2021 is having one previous case of similar nature.

6. On perusal of the FIR, it would go to show, these petitioners along with other accused overtook the defacto complainant's car and asked him to get down from the vehicle and dragged him from the car. Thereafter, the complainant drove his car fastly and went from that place. Primafacie, no offence made out u/s.364(A) IPC. No previous case is reported as against the petitioners. The petitioners are in custody from 8.7.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Kancheepuram.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11702 & 11995/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 11703/2021

in

F-5 Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No. 542/2021

Tamil Selvan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Mohanraj, 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, 364, 365 and 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 542/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the friend one Varun, who had love affair with one Dilshith Begam. The family refused to marry her to the said Varun. In pursuance of that, there was a panchayat, in which the petitioner participated. Nothing more than that had happened. However, a false case has been registered against the petitioner and others. He has been arrested on 21.6.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant's son Thaslim Basha is the cousin of Dilshith Begam. The mother of Dilshith Begam refused to marry her to the said Varun, since he refused to convert into Muslim. Thereafter, marriage was arranged to Dilshith Begam with another person by Towfiq. Being aggrieved at, the said Varun along with the petitioner and others kidnapped the defacto complainant's son

Thaslim Basha in order to coerce their family to send Dilshith Begam to Varun. They have kidnapped the defacto complainant's son in a Fortuner Car from Anna Nagar and taken him to a remote place near Chengalpet and there, he was assaulted and threatened and seriously objects granting bail. He further submits that this petitioner is having one previous case of similar nature.

5. Dispute arose over marriage of the petitioner's friend. Victim was rescued. The petitioner is in custody from 21.6.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 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 XVII 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 XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Kancheepuram.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11702 & 11995/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11710/2021

in

J-4 Kotturpuram P.S. Crime No. 515/2021

Sathish @ Sathish Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-4 Kotturpuram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 323, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 515/2021 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. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 25.6.2021 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.700/- from her at knife point. He objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 6 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past one month. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 6 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 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.

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11710/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11982/2021

in

P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 777/2021

Joseph

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. 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 offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 777/2021 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. No such occurrence was happened as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on the petitioner only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 23.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.1600/- from the defacto complainant at knife point and also assaulted him using legs repeatedly. He objects the grant of bail stating that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 4 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 4 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11982/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11981/2021

in

PEW Anna Nagar Range Crime No. 221/2021

Rosini

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
PEW Anna Nagar Range,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 4(1-A), 4(1)(aaa) of TNP Act and sec. 188, 269 IPC in Crime No. 221/2021 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 he is not pressing this bail application as against the petitioner.
4. Recording the same, this petition is dismissed as not pressed.

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**

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11983/2021

in

J-6 Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No. 667/2021

1. Deena @ Kuthirai Deena
2. Anwar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 19.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 397, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 667/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 19.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.650/- from him at knife point. He objects the granting of bail stating that the petitioners are having 3 previous cases and the arrest of the petitioners is very recent one.

5. It is a case of robbery. The petitioners were arrested only on 19.7.2021. According to CPP, each petitioner is having 3 previous cases. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioners and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11986/2021

in

K-3, Aminjikai P.S. Cr.No.664/2021

Ranjith

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.D.Prasanna, P.Arasammal, R.Saritha, R.Lekha Sowjanya and L.Subi Priya, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 336, 505(1)(b) of IPC and Sec.25(1)(a) of the Arms Act in Cr.No.664/2021 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 is working in the corporation as daily wage caretaker of Corona patients. He only done Tiktok video, which has been uploaded by someone. The police has registered the present case with false complaint. He has not threatened anybody. No one sustained injury. He is in custody from 9.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that on 9.7.2021, at about 11 a.m., the petitioner threatened the public by rotating the knife. When the defacto complainant questioned him, he abused him. Thereafter, on the same day night, he celebrated his birthday and uploaded the video of rotating the knife in the internet and thereby created panic among the public. He is having five previous cases and objects granting bail.

5. As per the complaint, the petitioner was found in possession of long knife and rotating the same in the public. There is a video for the public. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is only a Tiktok video, which has been uploaded by someone.

Nobody was threatened as per the complaint. There are chances of implicating the petitioner with the crime in view of Tiktok video uploaded by him. Considering the absence of any threat to public and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Maduranthagam, Chegalpet District.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11986/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.11988/2021

in

G-3, Kilpauk P.S. Cr.No.274/2021

Thiruna @ Thirunavukarasu

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-3, Kilpauk Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 5.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 392 r/w 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.274/2021 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 and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody from 5.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that on 5.7.2021, at about 10 a.m., when the defcto complainant was in his tiffin-shop, the petitioner went there and picked up unnecessary quarrel with him. When the defacto complainant questioned him, he assaulted him with hands on his stomach and at knife point, he snatched Rs.200/- from his pocket and also threatened him. The petitioner is having one previous case and objects granting bail.

5. Though the petitioner is having one previous case, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past three weeks. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11988/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11990/2021

in

R-4, T.I.W. P.S. Cr.No.136/2021

Santhosh Bharathi

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R-4, T.I.W. Pondy Bazaar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.S.Vellioss and M.Gopalakrishnan, Counsel for the petitioner and of 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 279, 308 of IPC and Sec.3(2) of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act and Sec.185 of Motor Vehicles Act in Cr.No.136/2021 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 a driver. When he was driving a car, one bull was crossing the road. In order to avoid dash against the bull, he applied brake and lost the control and dashed against a TATA Ace vehicle, which has dashed against an Electric Lamp. No injury to anyone. However, an exaggerated complaint has been given and the petitioner was arrested on 14.7.2021. He is in custody for the past 12 days and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner drove the car under the influence of alcohol and dashed against a TATA Ace vehicle and electric post. Due to the said incident, the TATA Ace vehicle damaged on the front and rear side. The Electric Post and compound wall were also damaged due to the accident. The total damage is assessed to Rs.25,000/-

5. No one sustained injury in the incident. In fact, the petitioner sustained injuries. The vehicles, electric post and compound wall were damaged. According to CPP, the total damage is Rs.25,000/- Considering the damage caused and the fact that no one sustained injury, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition to deposit Rs.10,000/-

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees ten thousand only) to the credit of the Crime No.136/2021 before the said court and the final order in respect of the amount will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court.

(c) 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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(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 learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11990/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11991/2021

in

K-10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.611/2021

1. Manikandan
2. Sanjay @ Korilla

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 27.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 384 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.611/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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 and they have not committed any offence as alleged. Since the petitioners are having some previous cases, they have been implicated in this case for statistical purpose. They are in custody from 27.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point, they robbed Rs.200/- from him. The petitioners are having two previous cases each.
5. Though the petitioners are having two previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, they are in custody for the past one month. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

6. Accordingly, 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.

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11991/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11996/2021

in

K-9, Thiru.Vi.Ka.Nagar P.S. Cr.No.32/2021

Jhonson

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-9, Thiru.Vi.Ka.Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.M.Surekha, Madhan Kumar and Kuttyappan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.32/2021 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 and he has not committed any offence as alleged. Since the petitioner is having some previous cases, he has been implicated in this case for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 19.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner along with two others waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point, they robbed Rs.800/- from him. The petitioner is having three previous.
5. Though the petitioner is having three previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for more than a month. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11996/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.11545 and 11546/2021

in

V-4, Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No.571/2021

Prasad

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.11545/2021 / Accused

Madhan Kumar

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.11546/2021 / Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.S.Venkatachalam, N.Vinodh Kumar and M.Madhavan 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 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.571/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. There was a wordy quarrel between the friends over not giving the motor-cycle. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The police has registered the case against both the parties u/s 397 IPC. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10985/2021. In fact, no offence u/s 397 IPC has been committed and prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On perusal of F.I.R., it reads as follows :

"நாங்கள் மது அருந்துவதற்கு வாட்டர் பாட்டில் தேவைப்படவே
கோபியிடம் வண்டி கேட்டோம். அவன் தரமறுத்து மேலும் இரண்டு
நபர்களை வரவழைத்து எங்களை தகாத வார்த்தையால் திட்டி கையால்

அடித்தார்கள். நாங்கள் சத்தம் போடவே நிஜாந்த் மறைத்து வைத்திருந்த கத்தியை எடுத்து காட்டி சத்தம் போட்டால் குத்தி கொலை செய்து விடுவேன் என மிரட்டி எனக்கு தலையில் இரத்த காயம் ஏற்படுத்தியபோது கோபி எனது பாக்கெட்டிலிருந்து பணம் ரூ.2000/-தை எடுத்துக் கொண்டான்."

So, the contents of the F.I.R. would go to show petty quarrel between two groups. Prima facie, offence u/s 397 IPC was deliberately included in this case. Considering the facts and circumstance of the case and co-accused have been granted bail, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 XIII 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 XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.Nos.11545 and 11546/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11665/2021

in

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

P.Naresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.B.Viswanathan and P.Suresh 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 379 of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the petition. Hence, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

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

Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.11926 and 11927 / 2021

in

Crl.M.P.Nos.10669 and 10670/2021

in

CCB Crime No.108/2021

Sunitha

.. Petitioner in

Crl.M.P.No.11926/2021 / Accused

Shivkumar

.. Petitioner in

Crl.M.P.No.11927/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB-1 P.S.,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.B.Ganesha Moorthy, A.Regan and B.Gubendran and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.Nos.10669 and 10670/2021, dt: 16.6.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.Nos.10669 and 10670/2021, dated 16.6.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. According to the petitioners' counsel, the 1st petitioner is a lady. The petitioners have complied the condition from 25.6.2021. Investigation is almost completed and prays for relaxation of the condition.
5. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition for one month.
6. The petitioners have complied the condition for a month. Considering the nature of case and number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

7. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed. However, the petitioners are directed to appear before the respondent police as and when required.

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

Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.11904 and 11993/2021

in

B-1, North Beach P.S. Crime No.923/2021

Vignesh

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.11904/2021 / Accused

Jangees Khan @ Jangishkhan

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.11993/2021 / Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.M.Mohamed Riya and M.Manimaran and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.923/2021 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 there was a clash between two groups of Muslims. In fact, the petitioners are the affected parties. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners are in custody for the past 12 days and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there is a counter case in Cr.No.922/2021. Apart from that, one more case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered at the instance of police officials. The petitioners and counter parties are creating law and order problems and attacked each other, which affected the public peace and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D. and trial court's order, it appears two groups of Muslim clashed each other over claiming political right over the Tamil Nadu Muslim Munnetra Kazhagam office, in which, it appears the general public has been affected. As submitted by the learned CPP, another case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered against all the parties concerned. Releasing the petitioners may aggravate the situation and thus, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petitions are 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
Monday, the 26th day of July, 2021.**

Cr.L.M.P.No.11669/2021

in

B-1, North Beach P.S. Crime No.923/2021

1. Mohammed Meeran
2. Syed Niyamathullah
3. Imrankhan
4. Thameem Ansari @ Ansar Ali
5. Jai Ramesh @ Ramesh
6. Syed Anwar Jamal
7. Ayubkhan
8. Abdul Khader
9. Sowbar Sadiq

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Mohamed Riyas, M.Manimaran and K.Kaviyarasu and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.923/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was a clash between two groups of Muslims. In fact, the petitioners are the affected parties. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there is a counter case in Cr.No.922/2021. Apart from that, one more case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered at the instance of police officials. The petitioners and counter parties are creating law and order

problems and attacked each other, which affected the public peace and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D. and trial court's order, it appears two groups of Muslim clashed each other over claiming political right over the Tamil Nadu Muslim Munnetra Kazhagam office, in which, it appears the general public has been affected. As submitted by the learned CPP, another case in Cr.No.924/2021 was registered against all the parties concerned. Arrested accused are still in custody. Granting anticipatory bail may aggravate the situation and thus, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory 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
Monday, the 26th day of July 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.11997/2021

(intervene petition)

in

Crl.M.P.No.11701/2021

(Bail petition)

in

CCB, Cr.No.126/2021

Ashok Sachdev

.. Petitioner/Intervener

- Vs.-

1. P.K. Ramesh

.. 1st Respondent/Petitioner/
Accused.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Team V,
Forgery Wing, Vepey
Chennai.

.. 2nd Respondent/Respondent/
Complainant

This petition came on 23.7.2021 before me for hearing, upon hearing Senior Counsel Mr. Maninder Singh, for M/s. M/s. B. Divakaran, B. Dineshkumar, Smriti Asmita, Counsel for the petitioner and of Senior Counsel Mr. N.R. Elango for M/s. Ganesh Rajan, J. Asokan, N. Gandhi, Counsel for the 1st respondent and of CPP for 2nd respondent this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The 1st respondent/accused, who was arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 409, 420, 465, 468 r/w.34 and 109 IPC in Cr.No.126/2021 on the file of the respondent police filed bail application in Crl.M.P.No.11701/2021.
2. The petitioner herein filed this petition in Crl.M.P.No.11997/2021 seeking permission to intervene the said bail petition.
3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, learned Senior Counsel for the 1st respondent and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

4. The point to be decided is,

“Whether the petition in CrI.M.P.No.11997/2021 deserves to be allowed?”

5. Mr. Ashok Sachdev, petitioner herein is the complainant in Cr.No.253/2019 filed against the accused/1st respondent(petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11701/2021). After investigation, the said case was closed as if the dispute is civil in nature. As against the Closure Report it appears, Mr. Ashok Sachdev is taking steps to question the same before the higher authorities. As far as this case is concerned, the complainant is one Mr. Sreedhar Narayanan(petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11781/21), Executive Director of M/s. Annai Builders Real Estate Pvt. Ltd., The petitioner(Mr. Ashok Sachdev) is noway connected with the defacto complainant in the present Cr.No.126/2021. However, during the course of arguments, learned CPP and counsel appearing for Mr. Sreedhar Narayanan, on previous occasions submitted that in respect of disputed property at Perumbakkam, there was a previous Joint Venture Agreement between the accused herein with the said Ashok Sachdev and by burking the same, the accused entered into another Joint Venture Agreement with M/s. Annai Builders. So, incidentally in connection with antecedents of the accused herein, the name of Mr. Ashok Sachdev has been referred in the earlier bail orders.

6. Now, during the course of hearing the bail application(CrI.M.P.No.11701/21), through VC the Senior Counsel Mr.Maninder Singh from Delhi entered appearance and submitted that petitioner’s name has been referred in the bail applications and he had been instructed to represent in the bail application in connection with Cr.No.126/2021. He also filed intervene petition in CrI.M.P.No.11997/21 during the course of the day. At his request the case was adjourned to 2.30 p.m for hearing him again.

7. At 2.30 p.m., the Junior Counsel of the said Senior Counsel Mr. Maninder Singh entered appearance through Video Conference and submitted that his Senior Counsel is engaged in some other work and she seeks for an adjournment. However, about the maintainability of the petition, the Senior Counsel was heard sufficiently in the morning itself and thus, this Court is not inclined to give adjournment and chosen to reserve the matter for orders.

8. As per the petition affidavit, it is alleged that the petitioner herein(Ashok Sachdev) is also one of the victim. In the previous orders passed in CrI.M.P.No.11003/2021 and 11347/2021 there was discussion about the petitioner and the facts have been twisted and in order to put forward his case, he cause to be impleaded to intervene in the bail petition filed now(CrI.M.P.No.11701/2021).

9. No doubt, there was some reference in the earlier bail orders about the petitioner's (Ashok Sachdev) earlier complaint and subsequent closure by the Investigating Agency etc., only to show the antecedents of the accused herein. No order has been passed by this court affecting the rights and liabilities of Mr. Ashok Sachdev. Under such circumstances, as far as this case is concerned, he is noway connected. Mere reference about the bad antecedents of the accused/1st respondent(petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11701/2021) in connection with the petitioner herein(Ashok Sachdev) does not give any right to the petitioner to object granting of bail in Cr.No.126/2021. Thus, this court is of the considered view that the present petitioner/Mr. Ashok Sachdev has no locus standi to raise objections in respect of Cr.No.126/2021 and thus, this court finds the petition deserves to be dismissed.

10. In the result, 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

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11701/2021

And

Cr.M.P.No.11781/2021

(intervene petition

in

CCB, Cr.No.126/2021

P.K. Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Team V,
Forgery Wing, Vepery
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

For Petitioner/accused in

CrI.M.P.No.11701/2021 : Learned Senior Counsel Mr. N.R. Elango
for M/s. Ganesh Rajan, J. Asokan, N. Gandhi, Advocates

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor.

For Intervener/defacto
complainant in

CrI.M.P.No.11781/2021 : Learned Senior Counsel Mr. A.R.L. Sundaresan
for M/s. M. Mohammed Rafi, J.H. Batcha, R. Joe Anand,
S. Aishwarya, Advocates

The petitions came on 23.7.2021 before me for hearing, upon hearing above said Senior Counsel for the petitioner, CPP for respondent and Senior Counsel for the intervener, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 409, 420, 465, 468 r/w.34 and 109 IPC in Cr.No.126/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, learned CPP and learned Senior Counsel for the intervener were heard through Video Conference.

3. The counsel for the petitioner and the intervener/Mr. Sridhar Narayanan were heard in detail. On earlier occasions, the bail application moved by the petitioner/accused was dismissed twice. On 12.7.2021, petitioner/P.K. Ramesh's wife has been granted bail considering her gender. The facts of the case remains the same. Now, the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that considering the duration of custody, the petitioner may be enlarged on bail and further he submits that he is prepared to settle the issues. He is ready to deposit Rs.1 Crore into the Court as token of intention to settle. He also submits that the rights of the defacto complainant has been duly secured as there are sufficient properties to meet the amount due to the defacto complainant. There was an order by the Arbitrator imposing a condition on the petitioner to deposit Rs.10 Crore before selling the property at Perumbakkam and also to allot some flats in the project called 'USHERA' at Sholinganallur. So, he prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned Senior Counsel appearing for intervener submits that there is no change of circumstance. Though the said order was passed by the Arbitrator nearly a year ago, so far no amount has been paid and objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the records, it appears the dispute between the defacto complainant and the petitioner is pending before the Arbitrator duly appointed by the Hon'ble High Court, Madras. The learned Arbitrator Hon'ble Justice Mr. Paul Vasanthakumar, passed orders directing the petitioner herein to sell the Perumbakkam property to settle the amount due to the defacto complainant herein. The complaint given by Mr. Ashok Sachdev is of similar nature, which has been closed by the prosecution as the dispute is civil in nature. The same logic can be applied to this case also. There are ample records to prove the transaction. Prima facie, it can be viewed as civil dispute. Apart from that Arbitration proceedings is pending. The petitioner is sufficiently in custody for more than a month. Keeping him inside the prison for ever may not yield result in settling the amount due to the intervener. The amount due to the defacto complainant is nearly Rs.20 Crore according to the defacto complainant. The petitioner herein is prepared to deposit Rs.1 Crore as a token of settlement into the Court. However,

considering the amount due to the defacto complainant and failure to honour the condition imposed by the Arbitrator, this court is of the considered view that directing the petitioner to deposit Rs.2 Crore into the Court as condition for bail would meet both the ends.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on deposit of Rs.2 Crore to the credit of the Crime No.126/2021 before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate Court, exclusive trial for CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai and 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 Magistrate of the said Court 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 final order in respect of the amount will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court. Mean while the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate is directed to deposit the said sum in a Nationalised bank in Reinvestment plan.

(c) 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 learned Metropolitan Magistrate,
exclusive trial for CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11701/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 26th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11309/2021

And

Cr.M.P.No.11387/2021

(intervene petition

in

W.22, AWPS, Mylapore, Cr.No.7/2021

1. G. Allwin Chelliah
2. C. Godwin
3. J. Sarojabai

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition came on 23.7.2021 before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Mammallan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and of M/s. N.S. Siva Kumar, K. Kishore Kumar, Maria Rose Shilpa, Counsel for the intervener, 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. 498(A), 406, 420, 354(C) IPC in Crime No.7/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner, learned CPP and learned Counsel for the intervener were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1st petitioner is the husband and the petitioners 2 and 3 are the in-laws of the defacto complainant/Akshayaa Benjamin. The father of the defacto complainant/Benjamin, the petitioners 1 and 2 as well as the defacto complainant/Akshayaa Benjamin are all Advocates practicing at High Court of

Madras and Madurai. The marriage between the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant took place in the early 2020. There was some matrimonial dispute according to the counsel for the petitioner, due to which, an exaggerated complaint has been given in order to dictate terms to the petitioners herein. Further, since it is a matrimonial dispute, arresting the petitioners and interrogating them in custody is absolutely unnecessary. In fact, it would spoil the matrimonial life in total. Further, he submits that there are directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to consider the anticipatory bail application liberally in such cases to keep the chances of settlement alive and thus prays for granting anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. On the other hand, defacto complainant's counsel appeared and filed intervene petition in CrI.M.P.No.11387/2021 and submits that it is a grave case of cruelty. The entire expenses for marriage was by the parents of the defacto complainant. The 1st petitioner with all vices misappropriated the jewels and cash provided by the parents of the defacto complainant. In fact, he had committed marital rape on the defacto complainant and demanded a premises for running office. Since it was not conceded, he started abusing her referring about her physique and colour. He also had some illicit affair with another woman. Burking the same, he had been married to the defacto complainant. The life of the defacto complainant became miserable due to the conduct of the first petitioner. The other petitioners are also responsible for demanding office space, Benz Car, etc., and objects for granting anticipatory bail.

5. Case Diary was perused. The case was registered in Cr.No.7/2021 on the file of W.22, AWPS, Mylapore. On perusal of the complaint given by the defacto complainant, it is evident that the marriage between the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant was an arranged marriage, though they belongs to two different sects of Christian Community. There are allegations against the husband/1st petitioner herein, which are serious in nature. There are chances for exaggeration at the hands of the complainant, a law graduate in order to settle score due to failed marital life. The wife chosen to make allegations against the husband as if he had prior sexual experience with some other woman and continuing the same with the said woman appears to be the primary cause for the dispute. It appears both the families are reasonably wealthy family.

Prima facie, it appears, money is not the matter between the families. The relationship and the conduct of the 1st petitioner alone appears to be the reason for the rift between the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant. The father and mother of the 1st petitioners, namely, the petitioners 2 and 3 are residing at Madurai and attending the court work at Madurai. The 1st petitioner is practicing at Chennai High Court. So, there are lesser chances for the petitioners 2 and 3 to make a demand of dowry in person. On perusal of the Case Diary, there was communication between the fathers of the Bride as well as Bridegroom running to pages, both of them are Advocates, about the misunderstanding between the spouses and possible solution for that including treatment to the 1st petitioner and consulting a Psychologist etc., etc., So, considering the smooth relationship and exchange of ideas between the parents, this court is of the considered view that the dispute is primarily marital dispute not involving dowry. The prosecution has not registered the case under Dowry Prohibition Act also. The allegations against the 1st petitioner are appears to be serious in nature. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner. In respect of the petitioners 2 and 3, considering their age and chance for impleading them too by the defacto complainant, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 2 and 3 alone subject to following conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners 2 and 3 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 XVIII 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 2 and 3 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 2 and 3 shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

[c] the petitioners 2 and 3 shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners 2 and 3 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 2 and 3 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 2 and 3 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 2 and 3 thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as the 1st petitioner is concerned, petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, W.22, AWPS, Mylapore, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11309/2021