

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11788/2021

in

K.2, Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No.354/2021

Danush

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K.2, Ayanavaram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Hussaini Basha, I. Gowri Shankar, Shaik Abu Thahir, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested under PT Warrant on 12.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Cr.No.354/2021 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. Originally, the petitioner was arrested on 26.6.2021 in K.7, ICF P.S. Crime No.118/2021, wherein he was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.11715/2021 on 12.7.2021. On the same day, the petitioner was formally arrested in this case under PT Warrant. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused who came in a two wheeler, snatched the mobile phone from the defacto complainant. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having previous cases and if he is released on bail he will again indulge in similar offence.

5. Originally, the petitioner was arrested on 26.6.2021 in K.7. ICF PS Crime No.118/2021, wherein, on 12.7.2021, he was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court on 12.7.2021. On the same day, he was shown formal arrest in this case under PT Warrant. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. 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 V 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. Learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11788/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos.11792 and 12076 of 2021

in

P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Cr.No.962/2021

1. Karthick
2. Syed Asim

.. Petitioners/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.11792/2021.

1. Prakash
2. Manoj Kumar @ Manoj

.. Petitioners/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.12076/2021.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

For Petitioners : M/s. M. Hussaini Basha, I. Gowri Shankar and
Shaik Abu Thahir, Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11792/21

For Petitioners : M/s. E. Velu, N. Naresh, Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.12076/21

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 above said Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.11792/21, who were arrested on 14.7.2021 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.12076/21, who were arrested on 13.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.962/2021 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. Only wordy quarrel arose. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody for more than 2 weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and wooden log and caused injuries. The victim was admitted to the hospital and later discharged. He further submits that the petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.11792/2021 are having previous cases. He objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than two weeks. The assault is with wooden log and hands. The victim was already discharged from the hospital. Under such circumstances, considering the duration of custody and age of the petitioners, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners in both the petitions 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 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 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

Copies to :

1. Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11792 and 12076 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11793/2021

in

N.3, Muthialpet P.S. Crime No.861/2021

Sanjai @ Jeba @ Sebastian

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,(crime)
N.3, Muthialpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 336, 427, 394, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.861/2021 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. He is a working as a coolie in Lorry Shed in Broadway. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. When he came to the Parcel Office to demand extra wages for additional work, there was some quarrel with the workers and employer. An exaggerated complaint has been given. He is in custody from 10.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused came to the Parcel Office, where the defacto complainant is working and assaulted him and damaged the office articles and taken away the mobile phone belonged to the owner, which was kept in the table and demanded Rs.10,000/- to return the mobile

phone and escaped from the place. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 4 previous cases.

4. The petitioner is in custody for the past 19 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, no previous case u/s.397 is reported. Considering the duration of custody and the absence of any previous theft case against 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 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. Learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Maduranthagam.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11793/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11898/2021

And

Crl.M.P.No.12199/2021

(intervene petition)

in

D.4, Zam Bazaar P.S. Crime No.81/2021

Abdul Kadhar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D.4, Zam Bazaar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Bakiyaraj, L. Sathishkumar, E. Brinda, K. Anand, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and no representation having been on behalf of M/s. Kanimozhi Mathi, S. Vasuki, V. Rajeshwari, R. Veerapandian, counsel for the intervener, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 323, 302 IPC in Crime No.81/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference. No representation having been made on behalf of intervener.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. All are family members. The petitioner is taking medicines for his psychological problem. Due to intoxication the occurrence took place. He has not committed any offence as alleged. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He never gave any voluntary confession statement

before the respondent police. The petitioner is in custody from 8.5.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to learned CPP and as per the contents in the intervene petition this petitioner is the step father of the defacto complainant. There exists dispute between the petitioner and the family members. On the date of occurrence, this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's mother house and developed wordy altercation with her mother Ghouse Unnisa and her grandfather Musafar due to family dispute. After heated argument, this petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant's mother and her grandfather Musafar using deadly weapon and murdered them. He seriously objects granting bail as if the petitioner is released on bail he will certainly tamper the witnesses.

5. It is a case of double murder. Petitioner is the step father of the defacto complainant. As per FIR, the eye witness is a minor. There is every possibility of assaulting the witness and tampering the witness. Considering the gravity of offence and the objection made by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this 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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Cr.L.M.P.Nos.11984/2021

in

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

1. Ramesh @ Attu Ramesh
2. Neeresh Kumar

.. Petitioners/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. D. Karthick, G. Dineshkumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 12.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.641/2021 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 noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are in custody from 12.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, at knife point they robbed Rs.3000/- from him. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is a habitual offender having 21 previous cases including one murder case. Investigation is pending and if the petitioners are released on bail, they will again indulge in similar offence and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the objection made by learned CPP, 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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12086/2021

in

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

1. Vetri

2. Vijay @ Pallu Vijay

.. Petitioners/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 petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were 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 petitioners and the CPP were heard through video conference.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent..

The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. Being the relatives of A1, they have been falsely implicated in this case. Victim was discharged from the hospital and he married another lady and settled in his life. A1 was also granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11658/2021 on 22.7.2021. The petitioners are in cusoty for more than a month and hence prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. A1/Vineetha, who is a married woman had illegal affair with the Vignesh(victim herein). Even after arriving settlement with Vignesh to discontinue the relationship by receiving some amount, at the instance of A1, the said Vignesh was assaulted with knife by these petitioners. Serious injury has been caused and the victim was admitted to the hospital. The

petitioners were identified in the Identification Parade conducted and they were arrested and thus, objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than a month. It is reported by the CPP that victim was discharged from the hospital. A1 was already granted bail by this Court. Under such circumstances, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the following condition.

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

Copies to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12086/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12100/2021

in

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

Dhanam @ Dhanalakshmi

.. 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 apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 307 of IPC in Crime No.748/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Being the mother of A1, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. She is noway connected with the alleged offence. Victim was discharged from the hospital and he married another lady and settled in his life. A1 was also granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11658/2021 on 22.7.2021. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. A1/Vineetha, who is a married woman had illegal affair with the Vignesh(victim herein). Even after arriving settlement with Vignesh to discontinue the relationship by receiving some amount, the said Vignesh was assaulted with knife by A1 and others. He objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Petitioner is aged 58 years. Since she happens to be the mother of A1, she has been implicated in this case according to the petitioner's counsel. Victim was discharged from the hospital. Arrested accused already released on bail. There is no specific overt act by the petitioner. Hence, considering the gender and age, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to following conditions.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd./ R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, N.3, Muthialpet Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12100/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12096/2021

in

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

Saravanan

.. 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, R. Surendar Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offences 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 and he has not committed any offence as alleged. Since the petitioner is having one murder case, this case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 9.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.700/- from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is having 4 previous cases including one murder case and thus objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 20 days. 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 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. Learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12096/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12200/2021

in

S.C.No.185/2017

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

in

R.2, Kodambakkam PS, Crime No.143/2017

Sasi @ Sasitharan

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.7.2021 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 307, 302, 506(ii) IPC r/w. 34 of IPC in S.C.No.185/2017 in Crime No.143/2017 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. According to the petitioner's counsel, due to his non appearance before the trial court on 26.3.2021, NBW was issued against him and the same was executed on 20.7.2021. The petitioner was absent for only one hearing. Hereafter he undertakes to appear before the court, regularly. Hence, prays for granting bail.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner jumped bail. NBW was issued on 26.3.2021 and the same was executed only on 20.7.2021. Due to the absence of the petitioner, the case could not be proceeded further. If the petitioner is released on bail, again he will abscond. He objects the grant of bail.
5. NBW was issued on 26.3.2021 and the same was executed only in the month of July 2021. So far, the petitioner has not chosen to surrender himself before the court to recall the warrant. With great difficulty, he has been arrested and remanded to judicial

custody only on 20.7.2021. It is a case of 302 IPC. The case is pending from 2017 without any progress due to the absence of the accused one after another. Considering the above facts and very 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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12203/2021

in

K.1, Sembium P.S. Crime No.761/2021

C.Venkatesan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
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. A. Arunkumar and E.Chandru, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC r/w Sec.4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.761/2021 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 defacto complainant made character assassination on petitioner's wife, over which, there was quarrel between them. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 13.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and defacto complainant are living in platform. When the defacto complainant informed the illegal affair of petitioner's wife to him, he caused cut injury in her throat. She was admitted in the hospital as in-patient for 23 days. Tracheostomy collar was fixed on the throat of the defacto complainant. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 3 previous cases and his earlier petition was dismissed only on 16.7.2021 and there is no change of circumstance.

5. Considering nature of offence, injury inflicted on the victim and the period of treatment undergone by the victim, 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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12205/2021

in

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

R. 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. Ilavarasan, 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 458, 395 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 innocent. He is no way connected with the occurrence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were already granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court as well as by this Court. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. Hence, prays for granting 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. This petitioner along with other accused unlawfully entered into the house of the defacto complainant and at knife point threatened her and tied her with rope and robbed a sum of Rs.51,000/- Having smelt the arrival of some other persons, they escaped with the looted amount. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 9 previous cases.
5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 9 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody,

age and the fact co-accused were already enlarged on bail, 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 above petitioner 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 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. Learned XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12205/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.12212/2021

in

TIW Guindy P.S. Cr.No.327/2021

Jafer Sathic Sheik Abdul Kader

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Traffic Investigation Wing,
Guindy Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 279, 338, 308 IPC r/w. 185 M.V. Act @ Sec. 279, 304(ii) IPC r/w. 185 MV Act in Cr.No.327/2021 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 did not drive the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner. The deceased alone without following the traffic rules crossed the road, which ended in the alleged accident. The petitioner is in custody from 25.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner under the influence of alcohol drove the Car in a rash and negligent manner and hit the deceased who was crossing the road and the victim died in the hospital. He seriously objects granting bail stating that it is a recent occurrence.

5. The petitioner, under the influence of alcohol, drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and caused accident. The victim died in the hospital. A valuable life has been lost. The petitioner is in custody only for 4 days. 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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12213/2021

in

S.C.No.139/2020

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

in

C.5, Kothavalchavadi P.S. Crime No.866/2014

Janarthanan @ Jana

..Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State by:

The Inspector of Police,
C.5, Kothavalchavadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner who was arrested on 11.11.2020 under P.T. warrant for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 397 r/w. 392, 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No.139/2020 in Crime No.866/2014 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner was remanded in this case on 11.11.2020 under P.T. warrant and produced before the Court of Sessions along with two other cases. Since then, he is in custody for more than 8 months. Hereinafter, the petitioner undertakes to attend the trial court regularly and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is having 6 previous cases. Apart from this case, two more cases are pending before the XVII Additional Sessions Court for trial and if the petitioner is released on bail, he will abscond and the case proceedings would be stalled. He seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than 8 months. According to CPP, the petitioner is having 6 previous cases and the present three cases are pending for trial. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to following conditions.

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(both of them must be the blood relatives of the petitioner) each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVII Additional Sessions Judge, 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 said Court 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. Learned XVII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12213/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12216/2021

in

S.C.No.141/2020

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

in

C.5, Kothavalchavadi P.S. Crime No.733/2014

Janarthanan @ Jana

..Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State by:

The Inspector of Police,
C.5, Kothavalchavadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner who was arrested on 11.11.2020 under P.T. warrant for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 392 r/w. 397, 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No.141/2020 in Crime No.733/2014 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was remanded in this case on 11.11.2020 under P.T. warrant and produced before the Court of Sessions along with two other cases. Since then, he is in custody for more than 8 months. Hereinafter, the petitioner undertakes to attend the trial court regularly and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is having 6 previous cases. Apart from this case, two more cases are pending before the XVII Additional Sessions Court for trial and if the petitioner is released on bail, he will abscond and the case proceedings would be stalled. He seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than 8 months. According to CPP, the petitioner is having 6 previous cases and the present three cases are pending for trial. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to following conditions.

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(both of them must be the blood relatives of the petitioner) each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVII Additional Sessions Judge, 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 said Court 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. Learned XVII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12216/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12217/2021

in

S.C.No.140/2020

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

in

C.5, Kothavalchavadi P.S. Crime No.718/2014

Janarthanan @ Jana

..Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State by:

The Inspector of Police,
C.5, Kothavalchavadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner who was arrested on 11.11.2020 under P.T. warrant for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 307, 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No.140/2020 in Crime No.718/2014 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was remanded in this case on 11.11.2020 under P.T. warrant and produced before the Court of Sessions along with two other cases. Since then, he is in custody for more than 8 months. Hereinafter, the petitioner undertakes to attend the trial court regularly and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is having 6 previous cases. Apart from this case, two more cases are pending before the XVII Additional Sessions Court for trial and if the petitioner is released on bail, he will abscond and the case proceedings would be stalled. He seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than 8 months. According to CPP, the petitioner is having 6 previous cases and the present three cases are pending for trial. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to following conditions.

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(both of them must be the blood relatives of the petitioner) each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVII Additional Sessions Judge, 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 said Court 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. Learned XVII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12217/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.12214/2021

in

G-2, Periamet P.S. Cr.No.388/2021

1. N.Vijaya @ Vijayanarayanan
2. M.Kannadhasan

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-2, Periamet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.C.K.M.Appaji, A.Stephen, G.Azhagiri and G.Vasanth, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 11.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.388/2021 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. They are in custody from 11.7.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand the learned CPP submits that the petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant, who was coming in an Auto and robbed Rs.650/- from him at knife point. The petitioners are habitual offenders, involved in 8 previous cases and thus, he seriously objects granting bail.
5. The petitioners are having 8 previous cases. As far as this case is concerned, they were arrested on 11.7.2021. It is a case of robbery. Considering the nature of case, duration

of custody and bad antecedents of the petitioners, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

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
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.12215/2021

in

CCB Cr.No.397/2015

Kandhan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.S.N.A.Hussainy, S.MD.Kassim, J.Jayakumaran and S.Abdul Khadhar, 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 406 and 420 of IPC r/w Sec.76(1) of Chit Funds Act in Cr.No.397/2015 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. In fact, he issued a legal notice. He is not evading or absconding. On the basis of the false complaint, he has been arrested and remanded to custody. He is in custody from 9.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner was running an unauthorised chit. The defacto complainant is one of the subscriber. He joined Rs.1 lakh chit and paid Rs.5,000/- per month as subscription. He has paid Rs.95,000/- However, the petitioner failed to pay the chit amount and absconded. The complaint was lodge in 2015. Now, the police have arrested the petitioner. Totally 24 complaints have been received and the cheated amount is Rs.24,40,000/- If he is released on bail, he may abscond and seriously objects granting bail.

4. The complaint is for cheating of Rs.95,000/- by conducting unauthorised chit. The case was registered in the year 2015. So far, the petitioner is not settled the matter with the defacto complainant. As per CPP, 23 more complaints are pending. The total amount cheated is more than Rs.24 lakhs. Considering the absconding for a sufficient period of time by the petitioner and failure to settle the matter all these years, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. 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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No.11252/2021

in

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

1. A.Kamaal Basha
2. B.Dinesh Kumar

.. Petitioners/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.R.Deepak 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 120(B), 408, 417, 420, 465, 469, 471 of IPC r/w 43, 60, 65 of IT Act, 2000 ad u/s 41(1)(a)(b) of Cr.P.C. in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, F.I.R. has been registered in Cr.No.655/2021.

4. Considering the representation of CPP, this petition is dismissed with liberty to file fresh petition with crime number.

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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.11311/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.11252/2021

in

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

M/s.S10 Healthcare Solutions Pvt. Ltd.,
Rep. by its Human Resources Recruiter,
102, Mahalingapuram Main Road,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai-600034.

.. Petitioner/Intervenor/
Defacto complainant.

Vs.

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

..Respondent / Complainant

2. Kamaal Basha.A

3. B.Dinesh Kumar

..Respondents / Accused

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.M.Venkatakrishnan, T.Pandiyam and N.Rajendra Kumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. This application has been filed to permit the petitioner to intervene in the anticipatory bail application in CrI.M.P.No.11252/2021 filed by the respondents 2 and 3 herein.

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

3. The anticipatory bail petition was dismissed with liberty to file fresh petition with crime number. Hence, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11359/2021

in

E-2, Royapettah P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

Chandrakala

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

E-2, Royapettah 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.Manjula, S.Krishnan and P.Sundararajan and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. According to CPP, petition enquiry conducted and closed as civil matter.

4. Considering the representation of CPP, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.11581/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.11359/2021

in

E-2, Royapettah P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

Prasanth,

Rep. by Power Agent Vivek.

.. Petitioner/Intervenor/
Defacto complainant.

Vs.

1. Chandrakala

.. Respondent / Accused

2. State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

E-2, Royapettah 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.Nathan and Associates and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. This application has been filed to permit the petitioner to intervene in the anticipatory bail application in CrI.M.P.No.11359/2021 filed by the 1st respondent herein.

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

3. The anticipatory bail petition was dismissed recording the representation of CPP that the petition enquiry was conducted and closed as civil matter. Hence, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.11998 and 11999/2021

in

V-1, Villivakkam P.S. Crime No.655/2021

R.Iyyappan

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.11998/2021 / Accused

P.Rocky

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.11999/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V-1, Villivakkam 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.Naresh, K.Dakshinamoorthy and V.Jagadeesan 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 and 506(i) of IPC and Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998 in Crime No.655/2021 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. One advocate Muthuraman assaulted A1 Madhanraj. His mother rescued him and lodged a complaint. However, due to influence, the police has not taken any action, instead, they have registered the present case against A1 and petitioners with false allegation. A1 was arrested and released on bail by Magistrate. In fact, the petitioner Iyyappan was intervened and compromise the parties and the petitioner Rocky was attending online exam on that day staying at Thiruvannamalai District. However, the police have wantonly implicated them since they are friends of A1. The

petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there was electricity failure in the 1st street of Annai Sathiya Nagar. The defacto complainant, who is an Advocate, gave a complaint before E.B. office and when the E.B. connection was restored, the petitioners and others demanded mamool for restoring the E.B. connection, which was refused. Due to the said incident, the petitioners and others went to the house of one Rajesh, who is working in the Advocate office and abused the family members and also pushed down the defacto complainant, who sustained injury on his hand and leg.

5. A1 already released on bail. Dispute over giving E.B. connection in the street houses. It is alleged that A1 is the friend of these petitioners, hence, they have been implicated in this case. Considering the nature of offence and the fact that A1 / main accused has been grant bail, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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 Metropolitan Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, 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 Metropolitan Magistrate, Addl. Mahila Court, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, V-1, Villivakkam Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.Nos.11998 and 11999/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.12102/2021

in

P-3, Vyasarpadi P.S. Crime No.701/2021

Dillibabu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-3, Vyasarpadi 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.R.Mukesh Kannah, S.Hari Kumar and M.Nithiyavel 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 448, 341, 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.701/2021 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 suspecting illicit intimacy with the defacto complainant's wife, the petitioner has been summoned for enquiry. In fact, as per the F.I.R., the assault is by two unknown persons. The present petitioner is no way connected with the offence. He is the relative of the defacto complainant. He apprehends arrest ad prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the injured has been discharged from the hospital.

5. Considering the nature of offence and the fact that except 506(ii) IPC, other offences areailable, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvallur daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the 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. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-3, Vyasarpadi Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.12102/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.12103/2021

in

E-3, Teynampet P.S. Crime No.956/2020

Chandraprakash @ Chandru

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-3, Teynampet 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.D.Jayachandran 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 341, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.956/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the defacto complainant's son Lionrajan was following the daughter of the friend of the petitioner one Kishore, hence, the petitioner and the said Kishore warned him not to follow the said girl. However, a false complaint has been lodged. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant's son was having friendship with one Harini, who is the neighbour. On the occurrence day, the petitioner and the brother of Harini took the defacto complainant's son to a ground and assaulted him with knife and caused injuries to him.

5. The occurrence took place seven months ago. Dispute over love affair. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of

this order, before the XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, E-3, Teynampet Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.12103/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.**

Cr.L.M.P.No.12104/2021

in

D-5, Marina P.S. Crime No.600/2021

Rasul Basha

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Chandrasekar, K.Balaji and T.Kumar 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 294(b), 323, 324, 427 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.600/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. A false complaint has been lodged. Main accused / A1 was arrested and he is in custody. The petitioner is arrayed as A3. He apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner along with two others entered the house of the defacto complainant and assaulted him with knife and also assaulted his sisters. Further, the accused have damaged the window glasses and a two-wheeler. The damage as per the complainant is Rs.50,000/- The injured took treatment in the hospital.

5. The petitioner's name found place in the F.I.R. Arrested accused is still in jail. The petitioner is absconding. Considering the nature of case and damage caused, 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
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.12131/2021

in

N-2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.656/2021

1. Selvi
2. Manikandan
3. Moorthi
4. Desam
5. Desam @ Kattuvaasi

.. Petitioners/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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.R.Mukesh Kannah and M.Nithiyavel 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, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.656/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks 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. False complaint has been lodged. Counter case in Cr.No.657/2021 was also registered. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners and others picked up unnecessary quarrel with the defacto complainant's parents and assaulted them with stone.

5. Dispute between neighbours. Case and counter-case has been registered. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering all those circumstances, 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 XVI 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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, N-2, Kasimedu Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.12131/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11812/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11014/2021

in

Crime No.725/2021

K.Ferose Khan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-5, M.K.B.Nagar 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.J.Janarthanan, P.Archana and J.Elanjchezhein and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11014/2021, dt: 29.6.2021.
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.11014/2021, dated 29.6.2021 with condition to appear before the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvallur daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 3.7.2021 to 26.7.2021
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 24 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) 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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.12106/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11300/2021

in

Crime No.397/2021

M.Dhina

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-7, K.K.Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Balasubramanian, K.Boopathy, S.V.Badriah and N.Varuni and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11300/2021, dt: 8.7.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11300/2021, dated 8.7.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 10.7.2021 to 27.7.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 18 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) 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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.12107/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.7361/2021

in

Crime No.56/2021

Prakash @ Goyya Kannu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-5, Foreshore Estate 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.R.Velmurugan and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.7361/2021, dt: 16.4.2021.
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.7361/2021, dated 16.4.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 20.4.2021 to 10.7.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for about 80 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) 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
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.12209/2021

in

K-11 C.M.B.T. Crime No.405/2021

Vinoth Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.D.Gopi Krishnan, U.Yuvarj and A.Vinoth Kumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 364-A r/w 34 of IPC in Crime No.405/2021 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 there was some money transaction between one Periyasamy and defacto complainant's husband Sakthi Vadivelan. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, no offence u/s 364-A IPC is committed. In order to escape from his liability, he created a concocted story and his wife lodged a false complaint. The petitioner is in custody from 15.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of kidnapping for ransom. A sum of Rs.25 lakhs has been demanded from the family members of the victim. The prime accused Periyasamy is not yet arrested. Investigation is at the budding stage and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the victim Sakthi Vadivelan is the native of Dharmapurai District owes some money to Periyasamy. Under the guise of advancing further loan, he has been asked to come over to Chennai. As soon as he reached Chennai,

he had been kidnapped in a car by the petitioner and others and detained in the factory premises of one Stalin. The accused made phone call to the family members of Sakthi Vadivelan and demanded Rs.25 lakhs to release the victim. The wife of the victim has given a complaint. On such complaint the present petitioner and others were arrested and the victim was rescued. Some of the accused were arrested and some of them remain at large. The petitioner is in custody only for 14 days. Investigation is at the initial stage. Under such circumstances, 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
Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.**

Cr.L.M.P.No.12132/2021

in

W-6, A.W. P.S. Crime No.6/2021

V.Vijayagopalan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-6, All Women Police Station, Aynavaram,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Shankar, P.Stalinselvasekaran and D.Mohanaselvan 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 294(b), 494, 509 of IPC in Crime No.6/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire allegations in the F.I.R. is false. The petitioner had not met the defacto complainant after 29.1.2020 when the disposal of O.S.No.133/2021 by the V Additional Family Court, Chennai. On all the earlier occasions, the complaints given by the defacto complainant and M.V.Devi against the petitioner was enquired and closed. The petitioner preferred C.M.A. before the Hon'ble High Court against the decree passed in O.S.No.133/2021 and the same is yet to be numbered. Since there is no suit by the defacto complainant that she is the wedded wife of this petitioner, the offence u/s 494 IPC would not attract. The petitioner got married in the year 1985. Now, he is aged 65. He has two children, who are all got married. Under such circumstances, with false allegations, the present complaint has been lodged with an intention to grab money. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and defacto complainant lived as husband and wife and when the defacto complainant was 7 months

pregnant, the petitioner left her and went to Hyderabad. The defacto complainant begotten a female child. Thereafter, the defacto complainant came to know that he got married another woman. When she approached him, the petitioner abused her. In the year 2010, she filed a suit to prove the petitioner is the biological father of her daughter. Through D.N.A. Test, it has been proved that the petitioner is the biological father of her daughter. Thus, she lodged the complaint and investigation is pending.

5. The defacto complainant has been cheated by the present petitioner. She has given birth to a girl child. She was able to prove the paternity of the child by conducting D.N.A. Test. When the defacto complainant and her daughter were in lurch, the petitioner married some other woman and lived sufficiently for a long period. Even after D.N.A. Test, he refused to accept the paternity and abused the daughter. The case has been registered u/s 494 and 509 IPC. The petitioner is a retired police official. Considering the conduct and status of the petitioner, 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

Wednesday, the 28th day of July, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.11448/2021

in

P-6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

Arulraj Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was money transaction between the defacto complainant and petitioner during the year 2014, which has been repaid. Due to some misunderstanding, the present complaint has been given. The police are threatening the petitioner of arrest and thus, he prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On perusal of the C.D., though the complaint was lodged on 28.6.2021, the prosecution has not chosen to register the case so far. The complaint would go to show borrowing of Rs.2 lakhs in the year 2014 and another Rs.1 lakh in 2019 by the petitioner. Further, there is a document acknowledging the receipt of Rs.2 lakhs in the year 2014. Prima facie, it appears the dispute is civil in nature. Invoking criminal action, prima facie, appears to be not correct. Thus, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two

sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11448/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 28th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11660/2021

in

G.3, P.S. Kilpauk P.S. Cr.No.153/2021

Iniyavan @ Jeysudasan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K.B. Udhayan, V. Meganathan and S. Raja Vignesh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 363, 365, 342, 376, 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.153/2021 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 in custody for more than two months. Even according to the prosecution, he has aided the prime accused Sakthivel in kidnapping the victim girl. He is no way connected with the offence of rape. He happens to be the friend of prime accused and he has been falsely implicates in this case and prays for granting bail.

4. On perusal of the C.D., the offence u/s 376 IPC is attracted only against A1. The petitioner and others aided to kidnap the woman from Chennai to Vellore. Co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.No.9962/2021 on

7.6.2021. This petitioner is in custody for more than two months. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail.

5, Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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.11660/2021