

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.Nos.13791 and 13887 of 2021

in

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

Ragul @ Ragulraj

.. Petitioner/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.13791/21

Nirmal Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.13887/21

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police(L&O),
G.7, Chetpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. T.V Somasundaram, U.Yuvaraj, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

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

2. The counsel for the petitioners and 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. Prime accused already detained under Act 14 of 1982. These petitioners have no previous case. They are in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of revenge murder. Due to previous enmity, deceased was done to death by assaulting with deadly weapons by 8 persons and seriously objects granting bail.

5. As per FIR, there was previous enmity between the accused and the deceased/Karuppu @ Vadivazhagan. The petitioners and others waylaid him at about 9.45 p.m. and assaulted him with knife and stone and done him to death. It is a brutal murder. Prima facie, the petitioners appears to be a rowdy element. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Both the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14036/2021

in

N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.672/2021

Sowmiya

..Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N.2, Kasimedu Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC and Sec.4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act 2002 in Crime No.672/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. There exists property dispute between defacto complainant's family and A1's family. This petitioner is the lover of A1. In fact she was not at all present at the time of occurrence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. She is in custody from 16.8.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to property dispute between the relatives, the accused including this petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant and his family members with knife and iron pipe. He objects granting bail.

5. Dispute between family members. According to learned CPP, injured has been discharged from the hospital. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The

petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. Considering the gender 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 her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Cr.L.M.P.No. 14036/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14274/2021

in

D-1 Triplicane P.S. Crime No. 599/2021

Karthik @ Mama Karthik

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The 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. A. Arunkumar, B. Karthikeyan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 7.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.599/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail by this court. Petitioner is in custody from 7.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, they tried to attack him using knife and also robbed Rs.850/- cash and a cell phone from him at knife point. However, he submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedent.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 25 days. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail by this court. Considering the above aspects 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.14274/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14277/2021

in

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

Ramesh @ Attu Ramesh

.. 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. D. Karthick, G. Dineshkumar, 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 offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.641/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Co-accused were granted bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody from 12.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 4 accused involved in this case. The petitioner herein is the main accused. The defacto complainant's father was murdered by the accused earlier. On the date of occurrence, the accused waylaid the defacto complainant who is the son of the deceased and demanded money from him for conducting the murder case. On his refusal, at knife point, they robbed Rs.3000/- from

him. He further submits that the petitioner is having 21 previous cases and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 50 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 21 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody and the 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 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.14277/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14278/2021

in

N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.668/2021

1. Sathick Baasha
2. Vanjeenathan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N.2, Kasimedu Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 10.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.668/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. They are in custody from 10.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, they robbed Rs.900/- at knife point. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 1 previous case and the 2nd petitioner has no bad antecedent.

5. Both the petitioners are in custody for the past 22 days. No previous case is reported as against the 2nd petitioner and the 1st petition has only one previous case. Considering the above aspect and the 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 above petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Chengalpattu.

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.14278/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14280/2021

in

B.2, Esplanade P.S. Crime No.1372/2021

M. Magimai Doss

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

B.2, Esplanade Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. E. Ashok Kumar, G. Vinodhkumar, V. Rajasekar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 14.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 384, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1372/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 14.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner accused waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point threatened him to give mamool on every month and extorted Rs.600/- from him. However, he submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedent.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 18 days. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. Considering the same 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 VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.14280/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14283/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No.1000/2021

1. Ajith Kumar @ Sharma Nagar Ajith

2. Kallarai John @ Anandan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-1 Sembium Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. B.M. Santharam, M. Elumalai, A. Umar Farook Ali, S. Vijayakumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 IPC @ 120-B, 392 r/w 34 IPC in Crime No. 1000/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks 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. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. They are in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners came in a motorbike and snatched the cell phone of the defacto complainant and escaped from the spot. He objects granting bail stating that the 1st petitioner is having 1 previous case and the 2nd petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

5. Both the petitioners are in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, 1st petitioner is having 1 previous case and the 2nd petitioner is having 3 previous

cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.14283/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14527/2021

in

B-1 North Beach P.S. Crime No. 925/2021

Chandan Sahni

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

B-1 North Beach Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 420, 379 IPC in Crime No.925/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. Only on suspicion, this petitioner was arrested. This petitioner's salary amount Rs.24,000/- has been seized from him by the respondent police. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 26.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused committed theft of ATM Card from the defacto complainant and misused the same by withdrawing cash Rs.1,99,000/- from her bank account. He further submits that only Rs.24,000/- was recovered from this petitioner and remaining amount is yet to be recovered. This petitioner is also having one previous case. The petitioner is native of Bihar. Investigation is still pending. He seriously objects granting bail stating that

petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed only on 19.8.2021 and there is no change of circumstance.

5. It is a case of on-line fraud. This petitioner along with other accused used the ignorance of the defacto complainant at ATM Centre, and committed theft of her ATM card and withdrawn cash Rs.1 lakh on various occasions and also used the same at Saravana Gold Jewellery shop for purchasing gold jewels for the value of Rs.99,000/-. Totally Rs.1,99,000/- was looted from the defacto complainant's bank account. Investigation is pending. Earlier petition was dismissed on 19.8.2021 and no change of circumstance was brought to the knowledge of this court. Petitioner belongs to State of Bihar and there is every possibility of his abscondence, if he is released on bail.. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.14617/2021

in

K.8, Arumbakkam P.S. Crime No.924/2021

1. Esuva @ Ramesh

2. Nagoor Hussain

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K.8, Arumbakkam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 29.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 380 IPC in Crime No.924/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks 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. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.14442/21 on 25.8.2021. The petitioners are in custody from 29.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners along with other accused break opened the defacto complainant's house and stolen away 3 sovereigns of gold ornaments, cash Rs.5000/- and some silver articles from the house. According to CPP, portion of the property was recovered from the accused. He objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than a month. No bad antecedent was reported against the 1st petitioner. According to learned CPP, the 2nd petitioner is having 3

previous cases. However, considering duration of custody and co-accused was already enlarged on bail, 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) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.14617/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.14618/2021

in

RPF Chennai Central P.S. Crime No.8/2020

Mohammed Jasim @ Sukku

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
RPF, Chennai Central Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 3(a) RP (UP) Amended Act 2012 in Crime No.8/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2019. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case in order to close the pending case. He is in custody for about three weeks and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of theft of goods during transit in the goods carriage by breaking open the same. With great difficulty, the accused has been secured. He is native of Nagpur, Maharashtra State. Petitioner's earlier petition was dismissed on 18.8.2021 and there is no change of circumstance. He seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner and others entered into the luggage van by breaking open the same and stolen some of the parcels containing cloths. He was arrested nearly after 2 years. Investigation is pending and other accused involved in the offence are yet to be secured. Petitioner belongs to Nagpur, State of Maharashtra and there is every chance for absconding, if he is released on bail. Earlier petition was dismissed on 18.8.2021 and there is no change of circumstance. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.14724/2021

in

G.5, Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No.175/2021

Raju @ Kattu Raja @ Kalidas

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
G.5, Secretariat Colony Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 427, 397, 336, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.175/2021 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 is in custody from 20.7.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's tea shop and after having tea and bun refused to pay money, that on demand, he assaulted the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.110/- from his pocket and also damaged the glass tumblers. He seriously objects granting bails stating that the petitioner is having 5 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 43 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 5 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.14724/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.14725/2021

in

R.5, Virugambakkam, P.S. Crime No.141/2021

Karthik

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
R.5, Virugambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.141/2021 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 arranged for MS admission in UK, for which he had received only Rs.15 lakh from the defacto complainant. Due to pandemic situation, he could not be able to get the seat as well as to return the money to the defacto complainant. While so, an exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner is in custody from 26.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that nearly Rs.39 lakh was received by the petitioner and cheated the defacto complainant. Apart from the defacto complainant, there are chances for cheating some other persons also and the case is under investigation and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the objection raised and nature of offence and the failure to return the amount to the defacto complainant, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14726/2021

in

K-9 Thiru Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 976/2021

Balaji

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 328 IPC in Crime No.976/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case He is in custody from 17.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during regular vehicle check, this petitioner was found in possession of 3 Kg Maava, a banned tobacco product in his vehicle for sale. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having one previous case.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 15 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having one previous case. As far as this case is concerned, property involved in this case has been recovered and no one was hospitalized due to the consumption of contraband. 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.14726/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14733/2021

in

D.6, TIW-Anna Square P.S. Cr.No.184/2021

Rathinakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
D.6, TIW-Anna Square Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 308 IPC, Sec.3(1) of TNPPDL Act, Sec.179, 185, 177 of MV Act 1988 and Sec.236 of TN Motor Vehicle Rules 1989 in Cr.No.184/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He did not drive the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner. It was an accident. The petitioner is in custody from 23.8.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner/accused in a drunken mood drove the container Lorry in a rash and negligent manner and even after the caution given by the defacto complainant/S.I. of the respondent police, the accused entered into the Gengu Reddy Sub-way, which is prohibited for entry to the heavy vehicles and dashed

against the iron barricade and damaged the public property. He seriously objects granting bail stating that it is a recent occurrence.

5. The petitioner, under the influence of alcohol, drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and caused accident. He damaged the public property. The petitioner is in custody only for 9 days. Considering the nature of offence, the conduct of the petitioner 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.No.14734/2021

in

J.1, Saidapet P.S. Cr.No.611/2021

Kathir @ Kathiravan @ Kadhivel

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J.1, Saidapet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. N.S. Amarnath, R. Balaiah, 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 offences punishable under Section 307 of IPC in Cr.No.611/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 8.7.2021 and hence prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and his friends who came in a two wheeler and assaulted them. In the said attack, defacto complainant's friend Karan was assaulted by the accused with knife and he sustained severe injury on both the hands. Learned CPP further submits that injured is still taking treatment as in-patient and the petitioner is having 2 previous cases and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. On perusal of the FIR, it appears that the assault is with deadly weapon on the victim. The victim sustained severe injuries on both hands and he is still undergoing treatment as in-patient as reported by learned CPP. Two previous cases were reported against the petitioner. 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.No.14735/2021

in

G.2, Periamet P.S. Cr.No.419/2021

1. Kumar @ Yaanaikal Kumar
2. S. Ravi
3. K. Deena

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. 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. G. Sivakumar, S.K. Masthan, A. Umar Farook Ali, S. Vijayakumar, R. Manikandan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 23.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.419/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 23.8.2021 and hence prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod and wooden log and caused grievous injuries on the head, right hand and face. Learned CPP further submits that the petitioners were arrested only on 23.8.2021 and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. On perusal of the FIR, it appears that the assault is with deadly weapon on the victim. The victim sustained grievous injuries on the head, face and right hand. Considering the nature of offence, the injuries inflicted on the victim and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos.14736 and 14737 of 2021

in

G.5, Secretariat Colony P.S. Cr.No.198/2021

1. Sriram

2. Ajith Kumar @ Vellai Ajith

.. Petitioners/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.14736/2021

Ramesh @ poratta srini

.. Petitioners/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.14737/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G.5, Secretariat Colony Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

For Petitioner : M/s. C. Jagan, P. Senthil Kumar, K. Sarath Kumar,
Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.14736/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. C. Jagan, K. Sarath Kumar,
Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.14737/2021

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 3.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 336, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.198/2021 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 appearing 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. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were granted bail by this Court. The petitioners are in custody from 3.8.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that that the petitioners are rowdy elements. Due to previous enmity, the petitioners and other assaulted the victim with deadly weapon. Victim sustained cut injuries on the shoulder, forearm and multiple fresh cut injury on the foot etc., and he was admitted in the hospital for 3 days as in-patient. He objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 29 days. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Already co-accused were granted bail. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.Nos.14736 and 14737 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 31st day of August 2021

CrI.M.P.Nos.14633 and 14636 of 2021

in

W.4, Kilpauk AWPS Crime No.11/2021

1. Joseph Thadeus
2. Mary Madona

..Petitioners/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.14633/2021

David Raynell J

..Petitioner/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.14636/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W.4, Kilpauk All Women Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Chandrasekar, M. Subhadra and T.A. Raghavan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 506(i) and 498-A of IPC in Crime No.11/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.14636/21 is the husband and petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.14633/21 are the in-laws of the defacto complainant. The marriage between the petitioner/David Raynell and the defacto complainant/Lydia Devakumar took place on 21.6.2017. Immediately after the marriage, there was some dispute between the spouses, which resulted in separation from 26.10.2017 onwards. The efforts made by the friends and relatives to reunite them ended in vain. In pursuance of the dispute between the spouses, David Raynell, the

husband filed a Matrimonial petition in OP.No.485/2021 in January 2021. Immediately, the wife lodged a complaint before the All Women Police Station, Kilpauk. Since the police issued notice for appearance of the petitioners, they moved Hon'ble High Court for quashing the complaint in CrI.O.P.No.1245/2021 and the same was disposed by the Hon'ble High Court on 1.2.2021 with direction to the respondent not to harass by calling them on regular basis. The petitioners are co-operative for the investigation. All Women police also referred the matter to the Social Welfare Officer in February 2021. The report of the Social Welfare Officer is not yet received by the All Women Police, Kilpauk. Meanwhile, the complainant approached the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court and got the complaint forwarded u/s.153 of Cr.P.C., and on the basis of the said order, FIR has been registered in Cr.No.11/2021 with all false allegations against the petitioners. The petitioners apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the case has been registered as per the directions of the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate and the allegations levelled in the complaint also serious and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail. He also submitted that the report from the Social Welfare Officer is awaited.

5. On perusal of the complaint, it would go to show number of allegations running to several pages. But in the heading, it has been stated as "Wedding date 21.6.2017. Date of Separation 26.10.2017". Very first complaint was given in the year 2021. Meanwhile, it appears that there were talks of settlement. When the matrimonial life span is only for 4 months, it is quite unimaginable to say that the allegations made in the FIR are all nothing but truth. As evidenced by the copy of the OP.No.485/2021 filed before the Family Court, it appears that the divorce was sought for on the ground of non consummation of marriage. Apart from this, the defacto complainant also moved Mahila Court under the Domestic Violence Act. Case in DVC.No.84/2021 was filed against all the three parties. However, the learned Magistrate has taken the case on file only against the husband. So, roping all the family members of the husband, making allegations running to pages, all would go to show some sort of exaggeration at the hands of the complainant. Arrest of the petitioners and remanding them to custody is unnecessary, provided they are ready to co-

operate with the investigation. It is not the case of the prosecution that they failed to appear for enquiry. Approaching more than one forum by the defacto complainant also would go to show the intention behind it. Considering all such circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

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 learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute 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 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, W.4,AWPS, Kilpauk, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.Nos.14633 and 14636 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.14069/2021

in

F-4, Thousand Light P.S. Crime No.281/2021

Nurul Amin

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-4, Thousand Light 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.Dhilipan and K.Arjun 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 269, 328, 353, 506(i) of IPC r/w 24(1) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act in Crime No.281/2021 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. 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 seriously objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner and other accused were found in possession of 5281 pockets of banned tobacco products.

5. Huge quantity of tobacco products were found in possession of the accused. Granting anticipatory bail in these type of cases will send a wrong signal to the society. Considering all those circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.14473/2021

in

H-4, Korukkupet P.S. Crime No.1538/2021

Akash @ Dhanesh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-4, Korukkupet 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.V.Karthick and A.G.Abdul Kareem 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), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1538/2021 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. It is alleged that the petitioner and others assaulted the victim with wooden log. In fact, the petitioner's side was also sustained injuries and counter case was registered. The petitioner has no previous case. He apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the injured was admitted in the hospital for five days.

5. Dispute between neighbours. There are injuries on either side. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H-4, Korukkupet Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Cri.M.P.No.14473/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.14632/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 1313/2021

1. Surya
2. Amuthan @ Amudharaj
3. Suganthi

.. Petitioners/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 M/s.M.Ramesh Babu, K.Senthil Kumar and K.Dinesh Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1313/2021 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 of the offence. It is a case and counter case. In the counter case, accused was granted bail by this court. In this crime number co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.13599/2021 on 18.8.2021. The petitioners have no bad antecedents. Victim was discharged from the hospital. Hence, he prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioners along with other accused attacked the victim using knife and caused injuries to him. The injured was discharged from the hospital.

6. No previous case is reported as against the petitioners. Co-accused were granted bail and anticipatory bail. Victim was discharged from the hospital. Considering the above

facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to following condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall report 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-4 Basin Bridge Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.14632/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.14634/2021

in

P-2, Otteri P.S. Crime No.1255/2021

S.Bavani

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-2, Otteri Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.4(1)(a) r/w 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No.1255/2021 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 she has not committed any offence as alleged. When she questioned the arrest of the other accused, she has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner was escaped from the occurrence place. The petitioner and other accused were found in possession of 20 bottles of brandy each 180 ml. without valid licence. The petitioner is having one previous case.

5. According to the petitioner's counsel, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. According to the prosecution, she is having one previous case. As per the F.I.R., she was escaped from the scene of occurrence. The petitioner is a woman, aged 27 years. Escaping from the occurrence place when a male accused was arrested, is not acceptable.

There are chances for falsely implicating the petitioner. Considering the quantity of liquor found in possession of the co-accused, 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 her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.14634/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No.14640/2021

in

J-3, Guindy P.S. Crime No.655/2021

1. Babu Dinesh Kumar

2. A.Kamaal Batsha

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J-3, Guindy Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.408 of IPC and Sec.66 of Information Technology Act, 2000 in Crime No.655/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. In fact, Sec.408 of IPC and Sec.66 of Information Technology Act is not attracted. By their own hard-work, the petitioners gained their client base and if at all any violation of service condition is found, it is purely a civil wrong. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioners are ex employees of the defacto complainant. They have violated the employment agreement and started a new business and gained the clients of the defacto complainant, thereby caused a loss of Rs.10 lakhs to the defacto complainant's firm.

5. According to the petitioners, they are the ex-employees of the defacto complainant. After resigning themselves from the said company, they have started some other company. According to the prosecution, it is against the agreement entered with the defacto complainant. According to the petitioners, it is only a civil contract and criminal offence is not attracted. The contract between the employer and employee prohibiting the

employer from doing same business after resignation. It is purely civil contract. The loss can be quantified with money. Hence, 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 IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners 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 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 report 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, J-3, Guindy Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.14640/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.14652/2021

in

CSCID Crime No.227/2021

M.Balamurugan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CSCID Chennai Unit,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.6(4) of TNSC (RDCS) Order r/w 7(1)a(ii) of EC Act, 1955 in Crime No.227/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek 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 Driver, who had carried the rice bags belonging to the other accused without knowing that those rice are meant for public distribution. He apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the police intercepted the vehicle and found 72 bags of rice, each 50 kgs., which is meant for public distribution.

5. No previous case is reported. Though the petitioner was very much available in the scene of occurrence, the police not chosen to arrest him immediately. Considering the nature of case, 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 VI 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 report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The VI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, CSCID Chennai Unit, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.14652/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.14642/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11638/2021

in

Crime No.393/2021

Sarath @ Sarath Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.K.Jayaraman 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.11638/2021, dt: 20.7.2021.
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.11638/2021, dated 20.7.2021 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 till 26.8.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for about a month. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.14643/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.11713/2021

in

Crime No.992/2021

1. Muthulakshmi
2. Mari @ Suresh

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11713/2021, dt: 22.7.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11713/2021, dated 22.7.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition till 26.8.2021.
5. The petitioners have complied the condition for about a month. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.14648/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11986/2021

in

Crime No.664/2021

Ranjith

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-3, Aminjikarai 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.Prasanna, P.Arasammal, R.Saritha, R.Lekha Sowjanya and L.Subi Priya 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.11986/2021, dt: 26.7.2021.
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.11986/2021, dated 26.7.2021 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 till 26.8.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 26 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.14649/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11568/2021

in

Crime No.832/2021

1. Gokulakrishnan
2. Vignesh (vicky)

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11568/2021, dt: 15.7.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11568/2021, dated 15.7.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition till 26.8.2021.
5. The petitioners have complied the condition for more than a month. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.14650/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.12414/2021

in

Crime No.1304/2020

R.Manikandan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J-6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.J.Gukulakrishnan and Y.Venkatesan 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.12414/2021, dt: 2.8.2021.
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.12414/2021, dated 2.8.2021 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 till 25.8.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 18 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.5813 and 6220 / 2021

in

W-8, A.W. P.S. Crime No.1/2021

1. M.Kumar
2. K.Rajeshwari
3. V.Ponmari

.. Petitioners in
Crl.M.P.No.5813/2021 / Accused

K.Saravanan

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.6220/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-8, All Women Police Station, Aynavaram,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.V.Subramani, V.Murugesan and G.Karthy and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 498(A), 294(b) and 506(ii) and 34 of IPC in Crime No.1/2021 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. They apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Though the matter was referred to Mediation, the defacto complainant / wife not chosen to appear before the Mediation Center. Since there are previous matrimonial disputes are pending, 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 II 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.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, W-6, All Women Police Station, Aynavaram, Chennai.

ss

CrI.M.P.Nos.5813 and 6220 / 2021.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 31st day of August, 2021.**

Crl.M.P.No.5989/2021

and

Crl.M.P.No.12306/2021

(Intervene Petition)

in

C-2, Elephant Gate P.S. Crime No.43/2021

Vijay Sayaji Salunkhe

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Prashanth and CPP for respondent and M/s.T.R. Sivakumarnath and T.R.Kathirvanan, Counsel for the intervener, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406 of IPC in Crime No.43/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Matter settled in Mediation. Hence, the petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge