

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.10914/2021

in

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

Sampathkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
PEW Anna 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.R.Sasikumar, S.Jevva, V.Manimaran and A.Tamilselvan and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(aaa), 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No.221/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner along with other accused were found in possession of 3432 bottles of brandy. The police have recovered the liquor along with four vehicles. The arrest is very recent and thus, opposed the petition.

5. Huge quantity of liquor along with four vehicles were recovered from the accused. The accused was arrested only on 17.6.2021. Considering the quantity of liquor seized and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11096/2021

in

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

Nisanth

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.R.Raghu Raj, S.Arockiaraj, A.Jagadeesh Chandra Bose, M.Mathan Raj and R.M.Srinivas and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.571/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was a wordy quarrel between the friends over not giving the motor-cycle. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The police has registered the case against both the parties u/s 397 IPC. The accused is in custody for the past 16 days. In fact, no offence u/s 397 IPC has been committed and prays for bail.

4. On perusal of F.I.R., it reads as follows :

"நாங்கள் மது அருந்துவதற்கு வாட்டர் பாட்டில் தேவைப்படவே கோபியிடம் வண்டி கேட்டோம். அவன் தரமறுத்து மேலும் இரண்டு நபர்களை வரவழைத்து எங்களை தகாத வார்த்தையால் திட்டி கையால் அடித்தார்கள். நாங்கள் சத்தம் போடவே நிஜாந்த் மறைத்து வைத்திருந்த கத்தியை எடுத்து காட்டி சத்தம் போட்டால் குத்தி கொலை செய்து விடுவேன் என மிரட்டி எனக்கு தலையில் இரத்த

காயம் ஏற்படுத்தியபோது கோபி எனது பாக்கெட்டிலிருந்து பணம்
ரூ.2000/-தை எடுத்துக் கொண்டான்."

So, the contents of the F.I.R. would go to show petty quarrel between two groups. Prima facie, offence u/s 397 IPC deliberately included in this case. Considering the fact that no bad antecedents reported and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(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 in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Chengalpet.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11096/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11101/2021

in

K-11, C.M.B.T. P.S. Crime No.309/2021

Eli @ Dinesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Nagaraj and P.Sathish and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Crime No.309/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 10.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner committed theft of two-wheeler. CCTV footage available for the occurrence, thus, he seriously objects granting bail.
5. It is a case of theft. On the basis of the CCTV footage, the accused has been implicated. There is no chance for foisting false case against the petitioner. He is in custody only for the past 20 days. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11128/2021

in

F-1, Chintadripet P.S. Crime No.457/2021

1. Sathish @ Sathish Kumar

2. Arun Kumar @ Arun

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

Inspector of Police,

F-1, Chintadripet 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.Mohan Raj and V.Vinodha and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 13.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.457/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence. The case was registered for the offences u/s 294(b), 384 and 506(ii) of IPC. When the accused was arrested, the learned Magistrate altered the section to 397 of IPC. The petitioners are in custody from 13.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners refused to pay money for tender coconut and when the defacto complainant demanded money, they abused him and robbed Rs.250/- from him at knife point. The 1st petitioner is having two previous cases and 2nd petitioner is having one previous case.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 18 days. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(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 in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11128/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11129/2021

in

P-5 M.K.B. Nagar P.S. Crime No.726/2021

Balaji

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-5 MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 324, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 726/2021 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 was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11023/2021 on 29.6.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case and counter case. Counter case crime number is 725/2021. Dispute between two groups. Both the groups attacked each other and sustained injury on both sides. The injured sustained simple injury and they have been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is involved in two previous cases.
5. It is reported that injured sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. Major portion of investigation

might have been completed by this time. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Chengalpet daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Chengalpet.
3. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.11129/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11069/2021

in

H-6, R.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No.142/2021

Ramesh.G.

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

H-6, R.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.Manikandan, K.Shahul Hameeth and R.Ganesan 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(i) of IPC in Crime No.142/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was quarrel between the relations. The petitioner has no previous case. The defacto complainant voluntarily picked up quarrel with the petitioner. Injured is discharged from the hospital. The matter is going to be settled. The petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to quarrel between the relations, the petitioner assaulted the victim with knife and caused injuries.

5. The occurrence took place on 4.4.2021. Dispute between relations, in which, the victim was assaulted with knife. Except 506(i) IPC, other offences areailable. It is alleged that the victim is discharged from the hospital and the matter is likely to be compromised. 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 as and when required.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H-6, R.K.Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11069/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11070/2021

in

J-3 Guindy P.S. Crime No. 578/2021

Mani @ Manikandan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.N.Velsankar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the 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. 269, 270, 294(b) and 506(ii) IPC and sec. 4(1)(a) of TNP Act in Crime No. 578/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. A1 was arrested and released on bail by the Magistrate. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner indulged in selling TASMALC liquor beyond the permitted time that too during lock-down period. When it was questioned by the defacto complainant, he was threatened by the petitioner and another person. He further submits that 39 liquor bottles were recovered from the accused. Earlier petition was dismissed on 25.6.2021 and no change of circumstances.
5. A public was threatened by the accused when he objected to sell the liquor beyond the permitted time, that too, during lock-down period. 39 brandy bottles were recovered

from this petitioner. Prima facie, it appears that the petitioner is a unruly element. Earlier petition was dismissed on 25.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Considering the nature of offence and conduct of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.11071/2021

in

H-6, R.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No.1044/2021

Appu @ Sarath Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-6, R.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.A.Manikandan and C.Uma Maheswaran and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 148, 294(b), 323 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.1044/2021 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 A1 assaulted the defacto complainant with hands. Since the petitioner, who is A2 in this case, was present at the scene of occurrence, he has been implicated in this case. The petitioner has not committed any offence. A3 and A4 were arrested and released on bail by the Magistrate. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, the petitioner along with other accused assaulted the defacto complainant using knife.

5. Except 506(i) IPC, other offences are bailable. There is no specific overtact against the present petition. Arrested accused already released on bail. 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 as and when required.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H-6, R.K.Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.11071/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11072/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.5710/2021

in

S.C.No.50/2015

(On the file of the learned II Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

Crime No.1047/2014

Sathish @ Sathish Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-13, Tharamani 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.P.Damodaran, M.Jegan and A.Udayachandiran 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.5710/2021, dt: 25.3.2021.
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.5710/2021, dated 25.3.2021 with condition to appear before the II Additional Sessions Court, Chennai daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 29.3.2021 to 29.6.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for about three months. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

SS

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11073/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.6470/2021

in

Crime No.117/2021

Sororngom Lungleng @ Sororngam Lungleng
Vs.

.. Petitioner/Accused

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-3, Nungambakkam 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.Praveen Alexander and Sathish Kumar 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.6470/2021, dt: 8.4.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.6470/2021, dated 8.4.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 18.4.2021 to 13.6.2021. He further submits that the petitioner is from Manipur State.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for about two months. 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. However, the petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police as and when required.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11135/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.10954/2021

in

S.C.No.124/2019

(On the file of the learned III Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

Crime No.1160/2018

1. S.Karuphia

2. C.Velraj @ Chori

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-11, C.M.B.T. Police Station, Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek to amend the Sessions Case Number in the bail order passed in Crl.M.P.No.10954/2021, dt: 24.6.2021.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in the petition for bail, the Sessions Case Number has been mentioned as “S.C.No.125/2019” instead of “S.C.No.124/2019”, due to which the petitioners could not produce surety, thus, prays for amendment of the Sessions Case Number in the bail order.

3. The learned CPP has not raised any objection.

4. Considering the reasons put forth by the petitioners, this court is inclined to order amendment of Sessions Case Number in the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.10954/2021.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Office is directed to amend the Sessions Case Number in the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.10954/2021, dated 24.6.2021.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The III Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
 2. The CPP.
 3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Chennai.
- ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11056/2021

in

V-4, Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No.586/2021

R.Vijay

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
V-4, Rajamangalam 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.P.Chandra Sekar and M.Sathyasai Eswari and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 285, 436, 427 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.586/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and defacto complainant entered into a compromise and he has paid Rs.50,000/- towards the damage of the vehicle. He is in custody for the past two weeks and prays for granting bail.
4. The learned CPP submits that the prosecution is ignorant about the said compromise.
5. The defacto complainant and his wife appeared through Video Conference with the help of the petitioner's counsel and submits that for the loss to his vehicle, he has been duly compensated. He has received Rs.50,000/- from the uncle of the petitioner. Further submits that the matter has been settled. The petitioner is in custody for the past 14 days. Considering the above settlement reported and duration of custody, age of 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 XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(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 in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11056/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11100/2021

in

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

Vineetha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
N-3, Muthialpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Johnson Samuel, M.B.Prabhu and Mohammed Aasif and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 307 of IPC in Crime No.748/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was some relationship between the petitioner and victim. The petitioner is a married woman. Having left her husband, she lived along with the injured Vignesh. There was some settlement to leave the said Vignesh by the mother of Vignesh. She also executed documents stating that she is discontinuing the relationship with Vignesh. Thereafter, she had no connection with the said Vignesh. It appears that the said Vignesh was assaulted by some other persons. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is a woman. She is in custody for the past 10 days and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. Having received some amount as a settlement, at the instance of the petitioner, the said Vignesh was assaulted with knife. Serious injury has been caused and the petitioner is the brain behind the crime. Thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the dispute arose out of the illicit relationship between the petitioner and victim. The petitioner engaged some rowdy elements and assaulted the victim. As per the A.R. entry, he has sustained a cut injury on the left side angle of mandible. With active bleeding, he has been admitted in the hospital. Considering the nature of injury and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11102/2021

in

K-8, Arumbakkam P.S. Crime No.214/2021

Prabhakaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

Inspector of Police,

K-8, Arumbakkam 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.Mohan Raj, V.Vinodha and B.Shankar and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.5.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 306 of IPC in Crime No.214/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for more than 50 days. The petitioner is no way connected with the suicide committed by the victim. The victim's mother, after divorcing her first husband, lived along with the petitioner and the deceased. There was some love affair for the deceased, who committed suicide in the absence of the petitioner as well as her mother. The petitioner has been falsely implicated as if he has scolded the victim minor girl. He is sufficiently in custody and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that as per the complaint and statement of the mother of the victim, the petitioner used to scold her in filthy language, which resulted in commission of suicide. Thus, he objects granting bail.
5. No doubt, the complaint was given by the mother of the victim, namely, Saraswathy. Even as per her complaint, she is living with the present petitioner as husband and wife. The victim was the daughter born to her through her first husband. In the complaint, it is alleged the petitioner used to scold the victim to cook and abused as “ஓத்தா தேவிடியா முண்ட வீட்டில் இருந்தா இந்த வேலையை செய்து வைக்க மாட்டியா, வீட்டில் இருக்கிறத

விட எங்கேயாவது போய், எவகிட்டியாவது காலை தூக்கி படுத்து பிழைக்க வேண்டியதுதானே. On perusal of the C.D., it appears there was a death note left by the deceased, in which it has been alleged as “என்னுடைய வாழ்க்கையில் சந்தோஜத்த விட கஜடம் தா அதிகம் SO எனக்கு வாழ பிடிக்கல . . .நா ஆசப்பட்டது கூட கிடைக்கல நா பொருள்களை சொல்லல நா சொல்றது வேற" So, it points out some love affair of the deceased, for which, the present petitioner cannot be the cause. Further, he is in custody for 50 days. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(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 in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11102/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 1st day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11123/2021

in

E-4, Abiramapuram P.S. Crime No.653/2021

Subramani @ Appu @ Bonda

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

Inspector of Police,

E-4, Abiramapuram 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.Arun, M.P.Venkatakrishnan and R.Sangavi and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 392 of IPC in Crime No.653/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused has been granted bail by the Magistrate. However, the learned Magistrate was pleased to dismiss the petitioner's bail application without any valid reason. The petitioner is not having any previous case. Further, the petitioner's wife is in the advance stage of pregnancy and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 392 IPC.
5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the complaint has been lodged as if the petitioner and two others waylaid the defacto complainant at 11 p.m., while he was proceeding to his friend's house, who happens to be a woman. The entire amount of Rs.2,000/- and the cellphone alleged to have been taken from the defacto complainant was recovered on the next day itself. There are chances of foisting case for statistical purpose. The petitioner is not having any bad antecedents or previous case. He is in custody for the past 15 days. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail.
6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(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 in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11123/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 1st day of July 2021**

CrI.M.P.No.11033/2021

&

Cr.M.P.No.11075/2021

(intervene petition)

AND

CrI.M.P.No.11034 of 2021

&

CrI.M.P.No.11074/2021

(intervene petition)

in

CCB, Cr.No.126/2021

P.K. Ramesh .. Petitioner/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.11033/2021

Maria Ramesh .. Petitioner/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.11034/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

For Petitioners : Learned Senior Counsel Mr. N.R. Elango
for M/s. Ganesh Rajan, J. Asokan, N. Gandhi,
Advocates in CrI.M.P.No.11033/2021 And
for M/s. V. Vignesh, S. Aswinraj,
Advocates in CrI.M.P.No.11034/2021

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor in both the petitions.

For Intervener : Learned Senior Counsel A.R.L. Sundaresan
for M/s. M. Mohammed Rafi, J.H. Batcha, R. Joe Anand,
S. Aishwarya, Advocates in both the intervene petitions.
(CrI.M.P.No.11074 and 11075 of 2021)

Both the petitions came on 30/6/2021 before me for hearing, upon hearing 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 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 409, 420, 465, 468 r/w.34 and 109 IPC in Cr.No.126/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the transaction between the defacto complainant and the petitioners was a business transaction by virtue of the Joint Development Agreement, dated 12.7.2018. As per the terms of the agreement, the defacto complainant advanced some amount and subsequently, he failed to make further payments as contemplated under the Joint Development Agreement. As per the Joint Development Agreement, the developer/the defacto complainant has to take necessary steps for getting CMDA approval, construction plan approval etc., In fact, after making initial payment, the defacto complainant failed to make subsequent payments, which resulted in non performance of the contract of the defacto complainant. In fact, due to the failure of the defacto complainant in making payments as promised, the property at Perumbakkam village/the subject matter of the contract was proceeded under the SARFAESI Act by the LIC Housing Finance Ltd., As per the terms of the contract there was an arbitration clause. Hence, the petitioners' company "M/s. Call Express Construction India (P) Ltd.," moved the Hon'ble High Court for appointment of an Arbitrator. In pursuance of that an Arbitrator was also appointed by the Hon'ble High Court. The appointed Arbitrator Hon'ble Justice Thiru. Paul Vasanthakumar had conducted enquiry. There was some interim orders also in the arbitration proceedings. In the arbitration proceedings, the parties mutually agreed to settle the dispute, in which, permission was granted to the petitioner's company to sell the 6 acres of land, the subject matter of the contract and to repay the amount advanced by the defacto complainant's company/Annai Builders Real Estates Pvt. Ltd., Such an order was wrongly used by the defacto complainant. They managed to make an entry in the Sub Registrar's Office as if

there was an attachment over the property, which stalled the process of alienating the property by the petitioners' company. In fact, the order of the Arbitrator is to deposit Rs.10 Crores before selling the property. That has been wrongly entered as there was attachment over the property, for which also, the petitioners' company moved the Arbitrator for clearing the said entry in the Sub-Registrar's Office. The defacto complainant's company filed an affidavit to that effect to move necessary application for removing the said entry in the encumbrance list. That being the transaction between the defacto complainant and petitioners' company, the present complaint was deliberately given in order to make over the civil dispute into a criminal dispute. Already Arbitration proceedings are pending. The default is on the part of the defacto complainant. Since the complainant have failed to make payments as per the Joint Development Agreement dated 12.7.2018, all the problems arose for the petitioners. On the basis of the false, exaggerated and twisted complaint, the petitioners were arrested in order to arm-twist them by burking the real facts and thus, he prays for granting bail. He invites this court's attention to various clauses of the Joint Development Agreement and the burden of the defacto complainant to get approval from the CMDA, RERA and other authorities.

4. On the other hand, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the defacto complainant/intervener submits that, the petitioners' company M/s. Call Express Construction India (P) Ltd., has developed the project by name called 'USHERA' at Sholinganallur. While developing the said property, they had obtained a loan from LIC Housing Finance Ltd., The property at Sholinganallur as well as the property provided under the Joint Development Agreement, namely at Perumbakkam, were given as collateral security. The project 'USHERA' was not taken off as expected and thus, they went into financial trouble. They have lured the defacto complainant to invest in the proposed project at Perumbakkam stating that the property is free from encumbrance except with the LIC Housing Finance Ltd., and made the defacto complainant to believe the prospectus of the project and in furtherance of that Joint Development Agreement was entered into. On that basis, the defacto complainant had made payments through Bank. But the petitioners' company instead of using the funds for developing the on going project and the forthcoming project, they have diverted the funds to their Sister concern

“M/s. Call Ex Australia Pvt. Ltd.,” at Australia, which was run by petitioners’ son by name Praveen Ramesh. So, with an intention to cheat the investors, the petitioners diverted the funds to Australia without getting prior approval from the Government. Further, apart from this defacto complainant, the petitioners also cheated one more person in a similar manner by showing the property covered under the Joint Development Agreement/6 Acres of land at Perumbakkam and received huge amount under another Joint Development Agreement with one Mr.Ashok Sachdev at Delhi and cheated him also. The petitioners deliberately by burking the previous Joint Development Agreement with Mr. Ashok Sachdev entered into the present Joint Development Agreement with the defacto complainant and deceived them. With reference to the terms of the contract, he submits that on the same day(12.7.2018), there was an another agreement entered into between the parties, by which entire project was taken control by the petitioners’ Sister concern/“M/s. Call Express Engineering Pvt. Ltd.,” under which, the company owned by the petitioners as the Project Executors undertook all the project works regarding design and engineer the project and handle the same from concept to finish, till handover of the site through the appointed Project Management Consultant. So, by virtue of the said agreement, entire affairs is within the scope of the petitioners themselves. Apart from that there was an arrangement of Project Management Consultant Agreement with the very same petitioners by virtue of another agreement. So, the entire implementation of the project is with the petitioners themselves under the name of their Sister concerns. So, except pumping of funds by the defacto complainant, all other work regarding the implementation of the project as per the Joint Development Agreement is only in the hands of the petitioners. The petitioners failed to take proper steps for initiating the project. So, the arguments advanced by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners as if there was default on the part of the defacto complainant is not correct. No doubt, there was an arbitration proceedings pending before the Arbitrator appointed by the Hon’ble High Court. But the petitioners clandestinely in a scheming manner without disclosing the previous Joint Development Agreement with Mr. Ashok Sachdev, they have cheated the present defacto complainant also and thus the offences are made out against the petitioners. The amount involved is more than Rs.16 Crore and seriously objects granting bail.

5. Learned CPP endorsed the arguments advanced by the learned Senior Counsel for the intervener and seriously objects granting bail.

6. The relationship between the parties and the Joint Development Agreement between the parties are admitted facts. Payments were also made through Bank transactions that was also not in serious dispute. Transfer of funds to Australian sister concern "M/s. Call Ex Australia Pvt. Ltd.," of the petitioner's son is also not denied. As per the Joint Development Agreement dated 12.7.2018, the Developer namely the defacto complainant agreed to pay Rs.15 Crore on or before 15.7.2018 and further sum of Rs.5 Crore in two instalments of Rs.2.50 Crore each on September 2018 and October 2018. Totally, Rs.20 Crore has been classified as Interest Free Refundable Security Deposit. Apart from that in consideration of the land owner providing the schedule property for development, the Developer agreed to pay Rs.60 Crore to the land owner, namely the petitioners' company M/s. Call Express Construction India (P) Ltd., (a) 50% upon completion of the Phase I ; (b) 25% upon completion of the Phase II ; (c) 25% upon completion of the Phase III.

6. On perusal of the Case Diary, there was a Project Engineering Agreement between the Developer/Annai Builders Real Estates Pvt. Ltd., and M/s. Call Express Engineering Pvt. Ltd., under the control of the present petitioners. It is a sister concern of the land owner. So, by virtue of the said agreement, project execution part was assigned in favour of sister concern of the petitioners by the Developer/defacto complainant. No document has been filed into the Court to show that there was something done in pursuance of the Joint Development Agreement and Project Engineering Agreement dated 12.7.2018. Similarly, there is no proof to show that the Developer/Annai Builders Real Estates Pvt. Ltd., had parted with the amount as per the Joint Development Agreement in full. Though the arguments advanced by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners about the Joint Development Agreement and the conditions of the Joint Development Agreement are forceful but that has been diluted by Project Engineering Agreement and Project Management Consultancy Agreement, dated 12.7.2018.

7. No doubt, prima facie, it is a civil transaction. The complaint given by Mr. Ashok Sachdev also came to be closed as further action dropped holding that the

dispute is civil in nature. The petitioners produced the Final Report filed by CCB in Cr.No.253/2019. It would go to show the complaint by Mr. Ashok Sachdev against “M/s. Call Express Construction India (P) Ltd.,” on the basis of the Joint Development Agreement, much earlier to the present Joint Development Agreement dated 12.7.2018, right back in the year 2012. After investigation, the Investigating Officer is of the view that there was a Joint Development Agreement, dated 19.6.2013 between the petitioners and the complainant(Ashok Sachdev). He has concluded as if since there was an arbitration clause in the agreement and pendency of investigation relating by Ministry of Corporate Affairs as “The matter relates to business relate dispute between an investor and promoters” and also pendency of the petition before the “National Company Law Tribunal”, he has chosen to drop further action. So, there is reason to hold that the property at Perumbakkam, the schedule mentioned property in the Joint Development Agreement was the subject matter covered under the previous Joint Development Agreement too. The same has not been disclosed to the present defacto complainant. Specifically, in the Joint Development Agreement dated 12.7.2018, the land owner in clause 7.2 stated as ***“No other party has any legal or beneficial right, claim, title, interest or demand whatsoever to or in respect of the schedule property or any part thereof except the same has been provided as collateral to LIC Housing Finance Limited(LIC HFL) for the current project of the land owner being ‘USHERA’.”***

8. It is evident that the petitioners not executed the project ‘USHERA’ properly even after getting financial assistance from Mr. Ashok Sachdev by giving this property also as security. There is element of deception at the time of entering into the agreement itself. The amount involved is running to several Crores. The accused are in custody only for the past 2 weeks. Chances for interference with investigation is there. Hence considering the gravity of offence and initial stage of investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

9. Hence, both the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge