

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.13793/2021**

**in**

**J-3, TIW Guindy P.S. Crime No.350/2021**

R.Thameem Ansari

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.V.Ramana Reddy, V.Chandrasekara Reddy, M.Dhayalan, B.Saravanan and P.Kamal Raj, Counsel for the petitioner and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 279, 336, 338, 308 of IPC and Sec.185 of M.V. Act in Cr.No.350/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. He is aged 21 years. The petitioner is in custody from 10.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner drove an auto in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and dashed against a transgender, who sustained injuries on his right hand, back and back side of the head. The investigation is at the budding stage.
5. It is a case of drunken-driving. The petitioner drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against the victim and caused injuries to him. The petitioner was arrested only on 10.8.2021. Considering the conduct of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant 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 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.14182/2021**

in

**R.R.No.18/2021**

Srinatha Reddy

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

The Senior Intelligence Officer,  
DGGI, Chennai Zonal Unit,  
No.16, BSNL Building, Tower-II,  
5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Floors, Greams Road,  
Chennai-600006.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.R.Rajeshhkumarr, R.Dhanasekar and M.Sivakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of M/s.N.P.Kumar, Special Public Prosecutor for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 132(1)(c) and 132(1)(i) of CGST Act, 2017 in R.R.No.18/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 4.8.2021. An exaggerated complaint has been lodged against the petitioner. He is ready to co-operate with the investigation and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecution appearing for the respondent department filed a detailed counter stating that the petitioner as a Director of a company namely, M/s.Bulldyers Integrated Solutions (P) Ltd., engaged in supply of service of supplying manpower, security and house-keeping to business entities like malls, hospitals etc. Though they are engaged in service of supply of manpower, they have produced invoices without any actual supply of services from certain non-existing firms and availed

input tax credit to the tune of Rs.19 crores. Investigation is at the budding stage and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the records and the orders passed by the learned Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, E.O.II, Chennai, it appears that the wrongful input tax credit availed by the petitioner's company is about Rs.19.22 crores. There is no explanation from the side of the petitioner to the contra. After considering the case, a detailed order was passed by the learned Magistrate dismissing the petition stating that it is an economic offence and it cannot be viewed leniently. As stated earlier, the amount involved is Rs.19 crores. The learned Special Public Prosecutor submits that the amount so wrongfully gained by the petitioner was invested in real estate and some other field. So, it appears the alleged fraud was deliberately committed by the petitioner. The offence is cognizable and it cannot be simply argued as if since it is a tax evasion case, bail to be extended. Considering the gravity of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

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 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.14641/2021**

in

**E.1, Mylapore P.S. Crime No.975/2021**

S. Kupammal

..Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Sub-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.P.Krishnan, V. Balaji, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 323, 427, 448, 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.975/2021 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on the basis of the unregistered Will, without resorting to the probate proceedings or civil proceedings, the defacto complainant is trying to evict the petitioner, a close relative, by force. The case has been registered in Cr.No.975/2021. On such complaint, the police officials are trying to evict the petitioner and her husband from the property. Arrested accused were already released on bail. The petitioner is a woman and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Considering the gender and nature of civil dispute between the parties, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

SS

CrI.M.P.No.14641/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.13353/2021**

And

**CrI.M.P.No.14038/2021**

(intervene petition)

in

**W.8, AWPS Crime No.not known of 2021**

1. R. Rajasekar
2. R. Ravi
3. Vijayalakshmi
4. Lavanya
5. Kishore Kumar

..Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W.8, All Women Police Station,  
M.K.B. Nagar,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.S.Venkatesan, K. Kalimuthu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and of M/s. K. Satish Kumar, S. Kousik, Counsel for the intervener, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 498-A, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.not kown of 2021 on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was a matrimonial dispute between the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner and his wife. The other petitioners are the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner's parents, sister and sister's husband. In order to settle the score, deliberately, a false

complaint has been given by the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner's wife before Avadi All Women Police Station. Enquiry was conducted and the police advised to approach the appropriate court for reliefs. Having not satisfied with the first complaint, now, she filed another complaint before the All Women Police Station, M.K.B.Nagar. On such complaint, the petitioners are being harassed by the police and prays for granting anticipatory bail. In support of the same, he also filed copy of the petition in H.M.O.P.No.2195/2021 filed by the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner against the wife Dactchayani @ Sindhu.

4. The earlier complaint before the All Women Police Station, Avadi is not denied by the intervener. Now, she is residing in the jurisdiction of the respondent police and thus, the complaint was given. From the document, it appears there is a matrimonial dispute is pending before the competent court. Arresting the petitioners may aggravate the conflict between the spouses. In fact, the defacto complainant chosen to implicate the sister and sister's husband also as accused in this case. That itself would go to show the motive behind the complaint. Further, there are chances for mediation and settlement. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

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

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

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

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the



conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, M.K.B.Nagar All Women Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.13353/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.14723/2021**

in

**B-2, Esplanade P.S. Crime No.1296/2021**

Rajesh

.. 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.S.Conscious Ilango, M.P.Venkatakrisnan and A.Arikrishnan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 506(i) and 420 of IPC in Crime No.1296/2021 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 in custody for about three weeks. In fact, the petitioner is no way connected with the alleged cheating. The defacto complainant parted with money to one Thahira. When the defacto complainant came to Thahira's place for getting back the money, it is alleged that the petitioner was also present and abused the defacto complainant. Even as per the complaint, there was no cheating committed by the petitioner, thus, he prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 420 IPC and objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the complaint, the allegation against the present petitioner A2/Rajesh is that he was present along with Thahira with whom the defacto complainant paid the money and abused the defacto complainant in obscene words. So, prima facie, no allegation is made against the petitioner as if he had received the money from the defacto

complainant. Considering the duration of custody and allegation levelled against the petitioner, 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 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 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.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.14723/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.12695 and 12696 of 2021**

in

**R.10, MGR Nagar P.S. Crime No.not known of 2021**

D.Krishnamoorthy

..Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12695/2021

Dharmalingam Ganesan

..Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.12696/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police(crime),  
R.10, MGR Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Shujath, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 403 and 406 r/w 120-B of IPC in Crime No.not known of 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. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was some money dispute. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12695/2021 is close relative. As per the complaint, the original document of the defacto complainant's property is with the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12695/2021 and he refusing to return the document. But, in fact, there was a loan transaction by depositing the title deed by the defacto complainant's family with some third party, over which, thee was a dispute. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12695/2021 is close relative, was deliberately implicated in this case. Further,

the dispute is civil in nature. The petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.12696/2021 with whom there was some financial arrangements. He too has been falsely implicated as if the defacto complainant signed blank stamp papers at the time of settlement deed in the year 2012. The petitioners apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On perusal of the complaint and other records, it appears the allegation made by the defacto complainant Govindammal is that one Dharmalingam and Chandran had obtained signatures in the stamp papers without paying any amount. They have only paid the expenses of registration and now, they are demanding Rs.5 lakhs for returning the original document. On perusal of the C.D., it appears there was an unregistered mortgage deed in favour of one Chandran, executed by defacto complainant Govindammal and her major children. So, prima facie, the dispute is civil in nature. Under such circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. 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 XXIII 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R-10, M.G.R. Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Cri.M.P.No.12695 and 12696 / 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.14741/2021**

**in**

**CCB Crime No.351/2019**

S.Devaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Central Crime Branch, Team XVIII,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 465, 467, 468, 471, 420 of IPC in Cr.No.351/2019 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 only an attesor. He is in custody from 24.7.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is not a simple attesor. he had identified the impersonator as genuine person and aided execution of document transferring the property.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears that the property was originally owned by defacto complainant Vasantha. The document has been created in the year 2019 by impersonating Vasantha before the S.R.O. Sembium on 12.6.2019. The General Power of Attorney was brought into existence. In such impersonated document, the petitioner is an Attestor. Prima facie, there is every chance for the involvement of the petitioner in such impersonation. Considering the nature of role played by the petitioner in the deal, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

SS

**Principal Sessions Judge**