

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11661/2021**

in

**P.R.C.No.191/2009**

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

in

**G.2, Periamet P.S. Crime No.333/2009**

Ambeth @ Ambedhkar

..Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State by:

The Inspector of Police,  
G.2, Periamet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner who was arrested on 27.11.2020 under P.T. warrant for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 336, 397, 506(ii) IPC in P.R.C.No.191/2009 in Crime No.333/2009 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 due to the absence of the petitioner, NBW was issued against him on 5.11.2019. Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation, the petitioner was unable to recall the warrant in the earlier occasion. The petitioner was remanded in this case on 27.11.2020 under P.T. warrant. Subsequently, he was detained under Act 14 of 1982. Now, the detention order against the petitioner was set aside by the Hon'ble High Court in HCP.No.219/2021 dated 16.7.2021. Hereinafter, the petitioner undertakes to attend the court regularly. The petitioner is in custody for more than 8 months and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is having 8 previous cases. NBW was issued in the year 2019. After much effort, the petitioner was secured during November 2020. He objects granting bail stating that if the petitioner is released on bail, he will abscond and the case proceedings would be stalled.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than 8 months. The detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court. Considering the same and 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 each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11791/2021**

**in**

**D.1, Triplicane P.S. Crime No.527/2021**

Ramachandran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
Inspector of Police,  
D.1, Triplicane Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Ravichandran, S. Menaka, A. Gomathi, the counsel for the petitioner and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.527/2021 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 has been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.11337/2021 in Cr.No.483/2021 on the file of the respondent police by order dated 2.7.2021. After granting of anticipatory bail, deliberately, this petitioner was arrested in this case by foisting false case and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.350/- and cellphone from him at knife point. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 4 previous cases.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 13 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, considering the representation made by the counsel for the petitioner and the factum of granting anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High

Court and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

(a) the sureties shall affix their 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 learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11791/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11799/2021**

in

**N.4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Cr.No.817/2021**

1. D. Madhan

2. Siva

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

N4, Fishing Harbour Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 3.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.817/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. Since the petitioners are having previous cases, the respondent police foisted this false case against them. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. The petitioners are in custody from 3.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money for consuming liquor, that on his refusal, the accused abused him and assaulted him with hands and at knife point robbed Rs.1350/- from him. He objects granting bail stating that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 13 previous cases and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 2 previous cases.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 26 days. According to learned CPP, both the petitioners are having previous cases. However, considering the fact that the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner/Siva is having only 2 previous cases, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner alone subject to condition. In respect of 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/D. Madhan is concerned, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him considering his bad antecedents.

6. Accordingly, the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is concerned, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11799/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.Nos.11800/2021**

in

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

Santhosh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

N.2, Kasimedu Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was 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 petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody from 12.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 4 accused involved in this case. Petitioner herein is A2. It is alleged that the defacto complainant's father was murdered by the accused and on the date of occurrence, they other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money for conducting the murder case, that on his refusal, at knife point they robbed Rs.3000/- from him. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases. Co-accused bail petition was dismissed by this court yesterday. 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 petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11801/2021**

**in**

**N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.642/2021**

1. Rajesh @ Pey Rajesh

2. Isaivannan

3. Vishal

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

Inspector of Police,

N.2, Kasimedu Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Nithiyavel, R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Kokila, the counsel for the petitioners and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 12.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.642/2021 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 no way connected with the offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are in custody from 12.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, they robbed Rs.1800/- from him at knife point. However, he submits that the petitioners have no bad antecedent.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have no bad antecedent. Considering the same and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11801/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11802/2021**

**in**

**K-4, Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No.552/2021**

Sala @ Solomon

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 385, 506(i) of IPC altered to 147, 385, 506(i) r/w 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.552/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 1.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is a B.J.P. Functionary. During the lockdown, he has involved in social work and at that time, the accused demanded money from him as mamool. During investigation, the defacto complainant gave statement that on 8.6.2021, five persons came to his place in a Deo and Splender two-wheelers and handed over a phone for speaking to Madurai Bala. The said Madurai Bala through phone asked the defacto complainant to handover money to the persons came there, which he has avoided. Based on the statement of the defacto complainant, this petitioner was arrested. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 5 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 28 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has 5 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody and the fact that 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 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 learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11802/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.Nos.11888/2021**

in

**E.1, Mylapore P.S. Cr.No.920/2021**

Manikandan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

E.1, Mylapore Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C. Ganesh Pandian, A. Shabanal, M. Nanda Gopal, M. Mohamad Yusuff, C. Prabakar, K.N. Paridhi Arasu, U. Mohamed Siddiquedeen, 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 24(1) COTPA Act r/w. 328 of IPC in Cr.No.920/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 21.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused was indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products in the shop namely Kumaran Cool Bar. During search, Remo-10 pockets, RMD Panmasala-10 pockets, Rasiklal Manichand-10 pockets, Hans-60 pockets, Cool Lips-40 pockets were seized from the shop. A2/the petitioner herein, who is working in the shop was arrested. Whereas A1/shop owner is still absconding and investigation is pending. He seriously objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner was arrested only on 21.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. A1 is still absconding. Investigation is at the budding stage. Nowadays, these type of offences are on the rise of the City. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.Nos.11889/2021**

in

**E.1, Mylapore P.S. Cr.No.919/2021**

M. Radha Krishnan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E.1, Mylapore Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C. Ganesh Pandian, A. Shabanal, M. Nanda Gopal, M. Mohamad Yusuff, C. Prabakar, K.N. Paridhi Arasu, U. Mohamed Siddiquedeen, 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 24(1) COTPA Act r/w. 328 of IPC in Cr.No.919/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 21.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner was indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products in his. During search, Remo-59 pockets, V-1 Tobacco, MDM-14 pockets, Vimal Panmasala-68 pockets, Cool Lips-7 pockets, RMD, Rasiklal Manichand-2 pockets, Hans-65 pockets, were seized from the shop. According to learned CPP, the petitioner was arrested recently and investigation is pending and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner was arrested only on 21.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Investigation is at the budding stage. Nowadays, these types of offences are on the rise of the City. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11900/2021**

**in**

**P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.796/2021**

Manimaran @ Thotti Mani

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
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. M. Ramesh Babu, R. Sampath, K. Dinesh Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.796/2021 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 and the victim are friends. There was only a wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Petitioner is in custody from 21.6.2021 for more than a month and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner/accused demanded money from his friend(defacto complainant) for taking alcohol and on his refusal, the petitioner assault him with knife and caused severe injuries. He further submits that the petitioner is having one previous case and objects objects granting bail.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 39 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having one previous cases. However, it is reported that injured has been discharged from the hospital. Under such circumstances, 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 learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11900/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.Nos.11906/2021**

in

**K.6, T.P. Chatram P.S. Cr.No.136/2021**

R. Sanoj Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.6, T.P. Chatram Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section Sec.7(1) r/w. 20(2) COTP Act and Sec.294(b), 353, 328, 506(i) of IPC 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 innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 16.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that when the police party was on routine check-up, the petitioner was found in possession of banned tobacco products in a plastic gunny bag. When the police enquired him, he abused the officials and prevented them from performing their duty. He was arrested and from him Maava-50pockets(each 14 grams) were recovered under mahazar. The accused took the police to the place, where he manufactured the contraband and the police have recovered Maava-600 pockets(each 14 grams) ; white colour plastic bag containing 6.200 grams of Maava ; White colour plastic bag containing betel-nuts -17.300 grams, red colour

gunny bag containing rice flour -16.800 grams, slaked lime – 4 boxes, colour powder-1 box were seized. The police also recovered weighing machine-1, heating machine-1, red colour Grinder-2 and cash Rs.54,470/- and also the two wheeler used for selling the contraband. He further submits that petitioner is from North India. The arrest is very recent. Huge quantity of banned tobacco products were recovered and thus, strongly opposed the petition.

5. The petitioner, who came from other State indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products. Huge quantity of banned tobacco and selling cash Rs.54,470/- were seized from the petitioner. Petitioner was arrested only on 16.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Investigation is at the budding stage. Nowadays, these type of offences are on the rise of the City. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12070/2021**

in

**P.R.C.No.58/2021**

**(On the file of the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)**

in

**N-4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Cr.No.60/2021**

Muthamizhan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.4.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 174 Cr.P.C. altered to 147, 148, 201, 302, 341 of IPC in Cr.No.60/2021 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 three months. Originally, the case was registered u/s 174 Cr.P.C., subsequently, altered to 302 IPC. The present petitioner is no way connected to the death of one Appunu @ Selvakumar. He is the friend of the petitioner. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Investigation is over. Charge sheet was also filed and pending for committal. Co-accused was granted bail by this court and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 302 IPC. This petitioner along with other accused murdered the deceased and objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the records, it is a case of circumstantial evidence. There is no eye-witness. The accused is in custody for more than three months. Investigation is over. Charge sheet was filed and taken on file in P.R.C.No.58/2021 and posted for committal. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail by this court. Considering all those circumstances 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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

**nmk**

CrI.M.P.No.12070/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12208/2021**

**in**

**P.5, MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No.922/2021**

Arun

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Sub-Inspector of Police,  
P.5, MKB Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Ashok Kumar, M. Chandru, P. Parthipan, J. Jayashree, J. Ram Kumar, the counsel for the petitioner and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 14.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.922/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are in custody from 14.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, they robbed Rs.300/- and a cellphone from him at knife point. However, he submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedent.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 16 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has no bad antecedent. Considering the age, the fact that the petitioner is a first offender 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 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 learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12208/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12287/2021**

in

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

H. Harish

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D.3, Ice House Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

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

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Since the petitioner is having previous cases, the respondent police foisted this false case against them. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. No one sustained injury. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 8.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with another accused assaulted him with hands and tried to attack him with knife. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 3 previous cases and earlier petition was dismissed only on 22.7.2021.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 22 days. Already co-accused was granted bail by this court. Since the petitioner is having 3 previous cases, earlier petition

was dismissed. Hence, 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 learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12287/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12288/2021**

**in**

**E.2, Royapettah P.S. Crime No.317/2021**

Vimalraj @ Vimal

.. 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 M/s. S.V. Karthikeyan, P. Paul Jayakaran, the counsel for the petitioner and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Crime No.317/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. It is an unnamed FIR. The petitioner is in custody from 4.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's new bicycle, which was parked inside the compound wall. According to CPP, the property was recovered from this petitioner and thus objects granting bail. However, he submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedent.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 26 days. According to learned CPP, the property was recovered and the petitioner has no bad antecedent. Under such circumstances, considering the duration of custody and the fact that the petitioner is a first offender, 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 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 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 learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12288/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12291/2021**

**in**

**K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.544/2021**

Manikandan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Ruthra Kumar, S. Yogaraj, G. Renalds Shinto, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 392 IPC in Crime No.544/2021 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 noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. This petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail by this Court on 27.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused came in a two wheeler and snatched the mobile phone from the defacto complainant. However, he submits that property has been recovered and the petitioner has no bad antecedent.

5. It is a case of mobile phone snatching. The petitioner is in custody for the past 44 days. Property has been recovered and the petitioner has no bad antecedent. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail. Considering 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 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.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12291/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12292/2021**

in

**P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 744/2021**

Srinivasan @ Seena

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 394, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 744/2021 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 has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Since the petitioner is having some previous cases, he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 14.6.2021, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant's brother and robbed Rs.2000/- from him at knife point. On the same day, at 6.30 p.m. when it was questioned by the defacto complainant, the accused attacked him using knife and caused injury on his head and gave life threat to him. He objects granting bail that the petitioner is having 10 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 45 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 10 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 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12292/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.12293 and 12294 of 2021**

in

**F.4, Thousand Lights P.S. Cr.No.281/2021**

Jitendra Biswal

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12293/2021

Abdul Barek

.. Petitioners/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12294/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

For Petitioner : M/s. S. Surendran, Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.12293/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. K. Archunan, Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.12294/2021

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, who were arrested on 25.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 269, 328, 353, 506(i) of IPC r/w. 24(i) COTP Act in Cr.No.281/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They are in custody from 25.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on information, when the respondent police came to search New Apollo Lodge, the present petitioners who tried to escape from the place, were apprehended and gave statement that these petitioners along with A1 indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products, which were brought by A1 from other States. The petitioners were arrested and Hans-176 pockets, Swagat Gold Tobacco-115 pockets, Missile Super Strong Tobacco-16 pockets, Sardar Zafrani Zarda-4 pockets, Chandtara Special Khaini-6 pockets, Rajnigandha Flavoured Pan Masala-29 pockets, Signature Finest Panmasala-189 pockets, Signature Panmasala Orange-1200 pockets, V-1 Tobacco Orange-1140, V-1 Tobacco Red-880 pockets, Vimal Pan Masala-26 pockets, Sardar Deluxe Chewing Tobacco-287 pockets, Vimal Pan Masala-89 pockets, Cool Lip-404 pockets, V1-Tobacco-89 pockets, V-1 tobacco -51 and Sardar Deluxe chewing tobacco-4 pockets were seized. He further submits that Jitendra Biswal is the native of Odisha and Abdul Barek is from Assam. The petitioners are wholesalers. Petitioners were arrested recently and investigation is pending and thus objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners, who came from other states indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products. Huge quantity of banned tobacco products were seized from the petitioners. According to learned CPP, the accused are wholesalers. Petitioners were arrested only on 25.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Nowadays, these type of offences are on the rise in the City. Under such circumstances, considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, both the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**CrI.M.P.Nos.12295/2021**

in

**CCB, Team II, EDF-1 Cr.No.345/2020**

Vijaya Nirmala

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

CCB, Team-II, EDF-1,

1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Room No.1C,

Commissioner Office, Vepery,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 420, 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.345/2020 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 and her husband had business dealings with the defacto complainant. They were running a shop by name M/s. Jeans Brand Factory. For the said firm, they have purchased garments from the defacto complainant's shop at Chennai. Some of the goods were returned. According to the complainant, the petitioner and her husband owes a sum of Rs.83,08,883/-, but they have to pay only Rs.33 lakh. Earlier complaint given by the complainant was closed by the police as civil dispute. However, the defacto complainant managed to get forward order from the learned Magistrate u/s.156(3) of Cr.P.C and on forwarding the very same complaint, the present case was registered against the petitioner and others. An application has been moved before the Hon'ble High Court for quashing the FIR, in which, private notice was

ordered and the same is pending. Petitioner and her husband were arrested and remanded to custody in order to coerce them. Petitioner is in custody from 23.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the amount involved is huge in nature and objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that there was business dealings between the defacto complainant's company M/s. Bee Tee Fabrics and Garments and M/s. Jeans Brand Factory. The earlier complaint was in the year 2019. After investigation, the then police closed the case as civil in nature. However, another complaint has been filed before the learned Magistrate, which was forwarded to the police and this case was registered and the petitioner and her husband were arrested. Though the earlier complaint was in the year 2019, this petitioner and her husband have not chosen to settle the dispute meanwhile. It is alleged in the complaint that the petitioner and her husband closed the shop and went away in order to cheat the suppliers, which has to be decided only during the trial. Even the petitioner is not prepared to deposit the admitted amount due to the defacto complainant. The accused is in custody only for the past 7 days. Though the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner is sound, in view of the huge amount involved 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**  
**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12296/2021**

in

**CCB Cr.No.9/2020**

1. Ashok Kumar  
2. Kamatchi

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch, Team-1,  
Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.A.Sathiya Prakash, K.T.S.Sivakumar and S.M.Karthikeyan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 19.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 120(B), 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC and Sec.43, 66(C), 66(D) of Information Technology Act in Cr.No.9/2020 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 other accused / A4 collected amount in his account. The petitioners have not indulged in any offence. They are residing at Delhi. Even as per the complaint, the alleged amount cheated by the petitioners is Rs.12 lakhs and Rs.8 lakhs has been recovered from the petitioners. The 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having female children. They are in custody from 19.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of online cheating. The petitioners induced the general public and on the guise of getting loan from the reputed finance companies, they have received considerable amount from them. As far as the defacto complainant is concerned, they have received Rs.82,800/- and cheated her. The

petitioners are from New Delhi and if they are released on bail, there is every chance for absconding, thus, he seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners contacted the innocent public by using simcards of other accused and induced them that they would arrange loan at lower rates, thereby collected huge amount from the innocent public. In some cases, they have obtained the OTP from the public and transferred money in illegal means to their accounts. It is a case of Online fraud. Investigation is at the budding stage. There are chances for receiving more complaints of similar nature against the petitioners. Considering the gravity of offence and stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12297/2021**

in

**P.5, MKB Nagar P.S. Cr.No.892/2021**

Praveen Kumar @ Bullu Pravin

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P.5, MKB Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 7.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.892/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured was discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were enlarged on bail. The petitioner is in custody from 7.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> accused, who is having previous enmity with the defacto complainant, joined with other accused, including this petitioner, formed an unlawful assembly and waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him with knife. The victim sustained bleeding injury on his neck and admitted in the hospital. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 2 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past four weeks. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 2

previous cases. However, on perusal of FIR, prime accused/Karthikeyan used knife in the offence. This petitioner is A3 and no specific overt act with deadly weapon. 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 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 learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

ss

Cri.M.P.No.12297/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12298/2021**

in

**H-3, Tondiarpet P.S. Cr.No.1190/2021**

Manikandan @ Kulla Mani

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-3, Tondiarpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 452, 341, 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1190/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He had only friendship with the Transgender. However, a false complaint has been given as if he has assaulted the grandmother of the Transgender. The petitioner is in custody from 4.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is having 10 previous cases, including a murder case and thus, he strongly opposed the petition.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. The petitioner is having 10 previous cases, including one 302 case. He is in custody from 4.7.2021. Considering the nature of case, antecedents and duration of custody 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**  
**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12300/2021**

in

**C.C.No.2020/2015**

**(On the file of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)**

in

**K-10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.520/2015**

Stephen Raj @ Dharmalingam

.. Petitioner/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.J.Samiullah and P.Sathish, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.2.2021 on N.B.W. for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in C.C.No.2020/2015 in Crime No.520/2015 on the file of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner's father was bedridden, the petitioner could not able to attend the court. So, N.B.W. was issued against him. He was arrested on 17.2.2021. He is in custody for the past five months and prays for the bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner was absconding for six years. He is having one previous case and thus, seriously objects granting bail.
5. However, considering the 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 (both the

sureties must be the blood relatives of petitioner) 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 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 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

Crl.M.P.No.12300/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.11251/2021**

in

**N-3, Muthialpet P.S. Crime No.Not known/2020**

R.Baanurekha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
N-3, Muthialpet 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.Gopalakrishnan, M.Krishnamurthy and D.Gopinathan 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) and 420 of IPC in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, no case and no F.I.R. is pending against the petitioner before the respondent police.
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  
Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Cr.L.M.P.No.12101/2021**

in

**J-4, Kotturpuram P.S. Crime No.395/2021**

Ramesh

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.N.Shanmuga Thayumanavan, G.Gokul and S.Premanand 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 147, 294(b), 332, 341 and 506(i) of IPC r/w Sec.4(1)(a) of T.N.P. Act in Crime No.395/2021 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 other accused were arrested and released on bail. The petitioner has no overtact. He has no bad antecedents. He apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner was selling other state liquor. When the police tried to apprehend him, the petitioner and other accused, who gathered there, assaulted the police and also prevented them from discharging their duty.

5. Earlier petition was dismissed on 15.6.2021 on the representation made by the learned CPP that the case is likely to be altered to 353 IPC. As per CPP, as on date, no such section has been included. Except 506(i) IPC, other offences are bailable. Investigation is almost completed. Considering the above 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 IX 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 IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, J-4, Kotturpuram Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.12101/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.12220/2021**

in

**P-3, Vyasarpadi P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021**

Vinoth Kumar

.. 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.Kannabiran and S.Selvarajan 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 324 and 506(ii) 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, no case and no F.I.R. is pending against the petitioner before the respondent police.

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  
Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.12222/2021**

in

**PEW Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No.221/2021**

S.Sharvanth

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.D.John Samuvel and S.Dinesh Babu 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 4(1-A), 4(1)(aaa) of Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act r/w Sec.188 and 269 of IPC in Crime No.221/2021 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 a Civil Engineering Contractor. He was falsely arrayed as an accused in this case. The 2<sup>nd</sup> accused was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. 3<sup>rd</sup> accused was released on bail by this court. 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> accused were granted bail by the learned Magistrate. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner is the main accused / A1 and huge quantity of liquor has been recovered. He is having one previous case.

5. It is a case of 4(1-A) TNP Act. Huge quantity of liquor has been recovered. According to the petitioner's counsel, the petitioner is a contractor and prays for anticipatory bail. Co-accused were released on bail after sufficient period of incarceration.

The petitioner is having one previous case. Considering the nature of offence and quantity recovered, 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**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Cr.L.M.P.No.12223/2021**

in

**K-6, T.P.Chathiram P.S. Crime No.46/2021**

1. Sampath Kumar
2. Gopinath
3. Madhurambal

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-6, T.P.Chathiram 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.S.V.Karthikeyan and P.Paul Jayakaran 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 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.46/2021 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. When the defacto complainant's relative was operating water pump during night hours, the petitioners questioned them. However, 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 when the defacto complainant's relative was fetching water in the hand pump, the petitioners picked up quarrel with her and assaulted the defacto complainant with knife. He sustained injury near his eye.

5. Quarrel between neighbours over taking water in the hand-pump. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of case, 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 V 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K-6, T.P.Chathiram Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.12223/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.12230/2021**

in

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

Gnanaprakash @ Bra

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D-5, Marina 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.D.Umashankar and R.Vasanthi 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, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.575/2021 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. Earlier petition was dismissed on 8.7.2021. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with three other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.150/- from him at knife point. The petitioner is having two previous cases and thus, seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of 397 IPC. Earlier petition was dismissed on 8.7.2021 considering the nature of case and antecedents. No change of circumstances. The remedy is to approach the Hon'ble High Court. Hence, 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**

Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.12225/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.10963/2021**

in

**Crime No.171/2021**

N.Sundarraaj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-5, Virugambakkam 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.E.Paramasivan and E.Chandru 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.10963/2021, dt: 25.6.2021.
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.10963/2021, dated 25.6.2021 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 for 17 days.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 17 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. However, the petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police as and when required.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.12226/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.11450/2021**

in

**Crime No.163/2019**

C.Thala @ Surya

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-7, I.C.F. 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.Balaji 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.1424/2021, dt: 1.2.2021.
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.1424/2021, dated 1.2.2021 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 14.7.2021 to 27.7.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for two weeks. 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.

Delivered by me today.

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



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.12227/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.11012/2021**

in

**Crime No.298/2021**

Vicky @ Vigneshwaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P-4, Basin Bridge 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.Jagan, P.Raj and S.Ram Kamal 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.11012/2021, dt: 7.7.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11012/2021, dated 7.7.2021 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.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12228/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.11362/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.6944/2020**

**in**

**K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.32/2020**

1. T. Chinnadurai  
2. C. Selvi

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,(crime branch)  
K.10, Koyambedu Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.K.Thenrajan, S.Krishnamoorthy and K.Rahul, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.6944/2020 on 24.6.2021 for the offences u/s. 406, 420 and 506(ii) of IPC on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a like sum and to deposit Rs.2,00,000/- to the credit of the above said crime number before the court concerned and also to appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.11362/2021, dated 9.7.2021, the time was extended for 15 days to furnish the sureties.

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

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

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that due to present pandemic situation, the petitioners are facing financial crisis and they are unable to mobilize the funds to comply the order within the stipulated time. Hence, prayed to extend the time.

5. Already extension of time was granted for 15 days. The matter was pending before Mediation sufficiently for a long period. So, absolutely it appears there is no intention for the petitioners to settle the matter. Hence, this court is not inclined to extend the time further. Thus, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. Learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. Inspector of Police, K.10, Koyambedu Police Station, Chennai.

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.12204/2021**

in

**P.R.C.No.55/2014**

**(On the file of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)**

in

**P-5, M.K.B.Nagar P.S. Cr.No.775/2013**

Soozhchi Suresh @ Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P-5, M.K.B.Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.P.G.Santhosh Kumar, K.Ravikumar, Sangeetha Rajkumar and P.Dharmaraj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.3.2021 on P.T.warrant for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 336, 427, 302 r/w 149 of IPC in P.R.C.No.55/2014 in Crime No.775/2013 on the file of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was regularly appearing before the court. Whiles, he was arrested in connection with Cr.No.945/2020 on 30.10.2020 and he was detained under Goondas Act in December 2020. He was produced under P.T. warrant in this case. Now, the detention order has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court in H.C.P.No.60/2021, dated 12.7.2021. Thus, prays for granting bail.
4. Learned CPP submits that the case is pending before the learned XXII Additional Sessions Court, Chennai in S.C.No.186/2021.
5. On perusal of records, it appears the petitioner was produced under P.T. warrant on 15.3.2021. Originally he was arrested on 30.10.2020 in Cr.No.945/2020 for the offences u/s 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 302 IPC r/w 149 and 120(B) IPC. Now, the detention order has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court. The learned Magistrate committed the case to

Sessions Court after issuing warrant u/s 209 Cr.P.C. According to the petitioner's counsel, the petitioner was in Coimbatore prison and due to lockdown, he was not produced physically before the Sessions Court. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks in this case. Considering all those circumstances, 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 (both the sureties must be the blood relatives of petitioner) each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XXII Additional Sessions Judge, 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 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 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 XXII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Coimbatore.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.12204/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.12290/2021**

in

**PEW – Anna Nagar P.S. Cr.No.289/2021**

Rosini

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.D.John Samuvel and S.Dinesh Babu, 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) and 4(1)(i) of TNP Act in Crime No.289/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. She is noway connected with the alleged offence. She is the native of Trichy District. She came to Chennai and working under 2<sup>nd</sup> accused. She is in custody from 21.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the police have searched the premises of the accused and seized 33 boxes, each containing 24 bottles of Old Tavern Whisky, 6 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Bagpiper Whisky, 24 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of 8 PM Whisky, 12 boxes, each containing 9 bottles of Bejois Vsop Brandy, 4 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Mcdowells Brandy, 6 boxes, each containing 9 bottles of Old Admiral Vsop Brandy, 3 boxes, each containing 12 bottles of Old Munk XXX rum along with cash Rs.25,300/- The liquor was alleged to have been

transported from Karnataka State. The arrest is very recent and seriously objects granting bail.

5. Huge quantity of liquor seized from the accused. The petitioner herein is living with the prime accused. He is having one more case. The petitioner was arrested only on 21.7.2021. Considering the short duration of custody and quantity of liquor seized, 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