

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December , 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21303/2021**

**in**

**K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 1160/2021**

1. Hari @ Hariharan

2. Aravind @ Mittai Aravind

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. P. Prasanna Kumar, S. Rajesh, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 13.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1160/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 13.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners along with others went to defacto complainant's fast food shop and purchased food items for Rs.900/- without paying money. When the defacto complainant demanded money, they refused to pay money and further they also robbed Rs.3000/- from his shirt pocket.

5. According to CPP, the petitioners are habitual offenders. The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 9 previous cases and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 5 previous cases. If the petitioners are released on bail, again they will indulge in similar nature of crime. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioners and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to them at present.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21407/2021**

**in**

**F-5 Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No. 796/2021**

Sangeetha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F-5 Choolaimedu Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 342, 427, 323, 376, 384, 354(c), 506(ii) IPC r/w sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act in Crime No.796/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. She is the wife of A1 Jeevarathinam. He had some intimacy with the defacto complainant. This petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. Sec.376 IPC does not attract as against this petitioner. She has been falsely implicated in this case. She is having two children . The petitioner is in custody from 9.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, A1 had some intimacy with the complainant. Even after marriage, he compelled her for sexual relationship. In order to escape from his torture, she had complained to his wife/the present petitioner herein. She too demanded money and obtained her signatures in the stamp papers.

6. Sec. 376 IPC does not attract as against the petitioner herein. Since, she is the wife of prime accused, the prosecution arrested her on the allegation that she too demanded money from the complainant. This petitioner was arrested on 9.11.2021 and she is in custody for the past three weeks. Considering the above facts, gender of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

7. 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 XVII 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 in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 21407/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21494/2021**

**in**

**C.C.No. 1811/2015**

(on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

**in**

**K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 1330/2014**

Kolanjinathan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.11.2021 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 354(b) and 506(i) IPC in C.C.No. 1811/2015 on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crime No.1330/2014 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 25.11.2021. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 2.9.2021. Due to corona death in his family, he could not appear before the trial court. This petitioner voluntarily surrendered before the trial court and also filed a memo to recall the P.W.7 I.O. The trial judge dismissed the memo filed by this petitioner and remanded him to judicial custody. His

absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that now, the case is pending for examination of I.O. Cross. The petitioner was arrested only on 25.11.2021. If the petitioner is released on bail, again, there is every possibility of his abscondence. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the stage of the case and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21498/2021**

**in**

**R-1 Mambalam P.S. Crime No. 287/2020**

Manikandan @ Balaji @ Saiko

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-1 Mambalam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Sriram, E. Mutharasu, A. Dhanwanthi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 427, 392, 397, 336, 506(ii) and 149 IPC in Crime No. 287/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence. Due to previous enmity between the 1<sup>st</sup> accused and other local people, the defacto complainant falsely implicated this petitioner also in this case. Occurrence took place in the year 2020 and co-accused were already released on bail. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. He is in custody from 27.11.2021 and prays for bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant's son, who went to medical shop for buying medicines and

demanded money from him for consuming alcohol. On his refusal, the accused joined together and attacked the victim using wooden log and hands and caused injury to him.

5. According to CPP, occurrence took place on 30.5.2020. This petitioner evaded the arrest for the past 1 ½ years. Now, only the police is able to arrest him. He was arrested only on 27.11.2021 and seriously objects the grant of bail.

6. Though, occurrence took place on 30.5.2020 and all the co-accused were released on bail, this petitioner evaded the arrest for the past 1 ½ years. Now only the police is able to arrest him. He was arrested only on 27.11.2021. Considering the short duration of custody and the attitude of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.20386/2021**

**in**

**V.1, Villivakkam P.S. Cr.No.not known of 2021**

1. D. Jayaraman  
2. D. Srinivasan

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
V.1, Villivakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P.A. Delhi Babu, M. Anandan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, 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.406, 420 of IPC in Crime No. not known of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. According to learned CPP, the case has been registered in Cr.No.871/2021. Recording the same, this petition is dismissed with liberty to file a fresh petition with crime number and proper section.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21249/2021**

**in**

**CCB, LG-I. Cr.No.122/2021**

1. V. Srinath  
2. N. Karthikeyan

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCB LG-I, Team – 15,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Nagarajan, C.R. Ezhilkumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, 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.419, 465, 467, 468, 471, 109 r/w. 34 of IPC in Crime No.122/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. According to the prosecution, the petitioners are only witnesses. As far as this case is concerned, they have been arrayed as witnesses only and hence, the apprehension of arrest by the petitioners is unfounded. Recording the same, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21250/2021**

**in**

**H.6, R.K. Nagar P.S., Cr.No.162/2021**

M. Manikandan @ Mani

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. K. Manikandan Raj, A.K. Raja, S. Mohammed Aadhif, X. Kishore Raj, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, 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.147, 148, 294(b), 323, 506(ii) of IPC and Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act in Crime No.162/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. According to learned CPP, already the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.11216/2021 dated 6.7.2021. Hence, the 2<sup>nd</sup> petition before this court is not maintainable. Recording the same, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21422/2021**

**in**

**P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.3104/2021**

B. Arun @ Arun Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Kannan, C. Murugan, V. Muthupandi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, 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. 341, 294(b), 324, 323, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.3104/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Wordy quarrel between the parties due to previous enmity. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Dispute due to previous enmity. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of two weeks.

[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, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.21422/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21424/2021**

**in**

**V.1, Villivakkam P.S. Cr.No.858/2021**

Naveen Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
V.1, Villivakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T. Vinoth Kumar, Murali Daran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, 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), 332 of IPC and Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act in Cr.No.858/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with two other accused who came in a two wheeler in the opposite direction fell in front of the MTC bus due to their rash driving and they abused the Driver and Conductor(defacto complainant) of the bus in filthy language and damaged the front and rear glass of the bus by throwing stones. They have also attacked the Driver and caused injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an exaggerated complaint has been given. In fact, the petitioner sustained injuries and treated in the hospital and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail. He also furnished the medical records of the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of destruction of public property and the damage is worth about Rs.24,000/-.

6. It is a case of road accident. On perusal of the medical records furnished, the petitioner sustained injuries and treated in the hospital. However, considering the value of the damage caused, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition to deposit Rs.10,000/- into Court.

7. 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 this order, before the learned XIII 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 deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) to the credit of the crime No.858/2021 before the said court and the final order in respect of the amount will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court.

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

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

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

[f] 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].

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, V.1, Villivakkam P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21424/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21255/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8599/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.51/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.14/2020**

**in**

**R.R.No.25/2020**

**(on the file of the DGGI Chennai Zonal Unit)**

K. Baranidharan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

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

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Durai Kannan, R. Vijayalakshmi, B.M. Goshinraj, Counsel for the petitioner and of SPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8599/2021, dt:19.5.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail u/s.167(2) of Cr.P.C. by the trial Court in Crl.M.P.No.14/2020 on 2.2.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent office and sign daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders. Subsequently, the said condition was modified by this court to appear before the respondent office and sign twice a week on Monday and Thursday at 10.00 a.m. until further orders vide Order dated 19.4.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.51/2021. Subsequently, the said

condition was modified to appear before the respondent office on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of every month until further orders vide order dated 19.5.2021 in CrI.M.P.No.8599/2021.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been regularly signed before the respondent agency on the first working day of every month. It is represented that on the same day, they have to sign before the E.O. Court also. The petitioner has been complying the condition from June 2021. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21425/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.18199/2021**

**in**

**P.5, MKB Nagar P.S. Cr.No.1106/2021**

Aravind

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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 in the presence of Mr. B. Jawahar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18199/2021, dt:20.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18199/2021 on 20.10.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 35 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21426/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.16804/2021**

**in**

**K.8, Arumbakkam P.S. Cr.No.1012/2021**

Auto Sasi @ Sasikumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.8, Arumbakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Sivakumar, S.K. Masthan, K. Sujan Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16804/2021, dt:27.9.2021.
2. Heard both sides.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16804/2021 on 27.9.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for more than a month till 25.11.2021. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21427/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.15460/2021**

**in**

**J.1, Saidapet P.S. Cr.No.578/2021**

Nirosha

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,  
J.1, Saidapet Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Santhosh, S. Balasubramaniam, J. Jayakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.15460/2021, dt:14.9.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.15460/2021 on 14.9.2021 for the offence u/s. 302 IPC with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 39 days. However, considering the nature of offence, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows:

“The petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police once in a week on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders”. Accordingly petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21428/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.19320/2021**

**in**

**B.1, North Beach P.S. Cr.No.1492/2021**

Solomonraj

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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 in the presence of M/s. S. Apunu, D. Sugumar, R. Kamesh, K. Subburaj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19320/2021, dt:1.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19320/2021 on 1.11.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 10.11.2021 to 21.11.2021 and thereafter failed to comply the condition. It is represented by learned counsel for the petitioner that subsequently, he fell ill. Any how, considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21429/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.19831/2021**

**in**

**J.2, Adyar Traffic Investigation Wing, Cr.No.405/AM3/2021**

Kumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

J.2, Adyar Traffic Investigation Wing

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. William Shakespeare, V. Ravi, A. Gurumoorthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19831/2021, dt:9.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19831/2021 on 9.11.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 18 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21430/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.18044/2021**

**in**

**R.7, K.K. Nagar P.S. Cr.No.495/2021**

Monish

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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 in the presence of M/s. J. William Shakespeare, V. Ravi, A. Gurumoorthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18044/2021, dt:8.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18044/2021 on 8.10.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 43 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21431/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.19727/2021**

**in**

**F.4, Thousandlights P.S. Cr.No.342/2021**

Vasanth @ Mathew

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

.. Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B.M, Santharam, M. Elumalai, A. Umar Farook Ali, S. Vijyakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seeks modification of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19727/2021, dt:10.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19727/2021, dated 10.11.2021 for the offence u/s.341, 294(b), 323, 392, 336, 397, 506(ii) of IPC with direction to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has not complied the condition even for a single day. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is afraid of appearing before the respondent police, as they threatened him to foist false cases against him. Hence prays for modification to appear before the concerned Magistrate instead of respondent police. Considering the said representation, this court is

inclined to modify the condition directing the petitioner to appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Chengalpet daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders instead of respondent police. Accordingly petition is allowed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. Learned Judicial Magistrate No.I,  
Chengalpet.
2. The Inspector of Police,  
F.4, Thousand Lights P.S. Chennai.

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21432/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.20731/2021**

**in**

**E.1, Mylapore P.S. Cr.No.1054/2021**

Bharath @ Sottai Bharath

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

.. Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Rajavelu, S. Sarala, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks modification of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.20731/2021, dt:19.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.20731/2021, dated 19.11.2021 for the offence u/s.341, 294(b), 336, 397, 506(ii) of IPC with direction to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was released on bail on 23.11.2021 and when he appeared before the respondent police to comply the condition, he was made to wait and also threatened by the police. As such, the petitioner afraid that the respondent would foist false cases against him and hence prays for modification to appear before the concerned Magistrate instead of respondent police. Considering the said representation, this court is inclined to modify the condition directing the petitioner to

appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Chengalpet daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders instead of respondent police. Accordingly petition is allowed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. Learned Judicial Magistrate No.I,  
Chengalpet.
2. The Inspector of Police,  
E.1, Mylapore P.S. Chennai.

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December , 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 16916/2021**

and

CrI.M.P.No. 19947/2021

(intervene petition)

in

**CCB-EDF-TeamII Crime No. 148/2021**

M. Mohammed Naseruddin

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch, EDF Team-II  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Kannan, J. Prakash, S. Suganya, V. Muthupandi, E. Bhuvanewari, Counsel for the petitioner and of M/s. Law Vision, N. Vijaya Basker, V. Katturani, Counsel for the intervenor and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC in Crime No.148/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the Managing Director of the company V-3 Elite Forte Private Limited and doing business in Cashewnuts. He had purchased cashew nuts in bulk i.e., one Tone and 180 Kg from the defacto complainant by paying advance of Rs.5 lakhs on 8.11.2020. In turn he sold the same to M/s, Green Land Trading at Kerala. Since, there was default in payment by the purchaser, this petitioner is not able to pay the money to the defacto complainant. The dispute is purely civil in nature and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the counsel appearing for the intervenor submits that he bonafidely believed the petitioner and supplied one Ton and 180 Kg of cashew nuts worth about Rs.68,02,000/-. The cashew nuts were purchased from the local agriculturiers and sold the same to the petitioner. The defacto complainant received Rs.5 lakhs as advance out of Rs.68 lakhs and balance amount is to be paid by the petitioner. He deliberately cheated the defacto complainant. Though the matter has been referred to mediation for settlement, the petitioner has not made any payment before the mediation and seriously objects granting of anticipatory bail.

5. The purchase of cashew nuts and making partial payment for the same is an admitted fact. The only contention raised by the petitioner is , the dispute is civil in nature. Thus, this court inclined to refer the matter to mediation. Even before the mediation, this petitioner has not preferred to pay any amount to the defacto complainant. So, it is sufficient to hold that there was intention to cheat the defacto complainant at the time of inception. Considering involvement of huge amount, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.19632/2021**

in

**E.O.W. P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021**

A.Anbarasu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Economical Offence Wing II/CID  
Old SIDCO Corporate Office,  
Thiru.Vi.Ka.Industrial Estate,  
Guindy,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.M.Murali Vinodh and P.Krishnamurthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

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

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police. There was some financial transaction between the petitioner and defacto complainant. An exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submitted by way of reply that the earlier anticipatory bail application in CrI.M.P.No.3673/2020 was dismissed by this court. Without disclosing the same, the present petition has been filed and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

4. On perusal of the records relating to CrI.M.P.No.3673/2020, it appears the present petitioner, for the very same complaint, moved this court for anticipatory bail in unknown crime number. The matter has been referred to Mediation for settlement. Before mediation also the petitioner not turned up and mediation failed. After a lapse of more than a year, the present anticipatory bail petition has been filed for the very same complaint. The petitioner

has not come to the court with clean hands. Dismissal of the earlier petition was not disclosed. Further, the CPP has produced a letter copy addressed to Superintendent of Police by the Investigating Officer stating that the petition enquiry was closed since the matter is civil in nature. Hence, the 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.**

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21321/2021**

in

**CCD-1 P.S. Crime No.46/2021**

1. Devaraj Singh
2. Shrawan Singh

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCD-1, Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.R.Thamaraiselvan, S.Venkatesan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 17.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 419, 420 of IPC and Sec.66C and 66D of I.T. Act, 2008 in Crime No.46/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are brothers of one Dilip Singh. He had created a domine in the name of Madras Travels and Tours Pvt. Ltd. and lured the innocent customers to part with their money by depositing the same in Bank account mentioned in the website. The petitioners are no way connected with the offence. The said Dilip Singh is in Tailand. He is the prime accused. The petitioners opened the bank account as instructed by their brother. They have not known the cheating by the prime accused. Further, the petitioners are in custody from 17.11.2021 and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP filed written objection stating that the accused have created false Website and bank account was linked to that Website. The customers bonafidely believed that the Website belongs to Madras Travels and Tours Pvt. Ltd. and deposited money for travelling. In fact, the amount went to the account of the petitioners and others. It is a Online fraud and seriously objects granting bail.

4. From the objection filed by the prosecution it appears the amounts were transferred to the accounts of the present petitioners. Prima facie they would have had knowledge about the credit of the amount into their account. Without probing the source of such deposits, they continued to enjoy the funds by operating the bank account. The innocence pleaded by the petitioners appears to be not genuine. The petitioners are native of Gujarat. Chances for absconding is more. Prime accused / their brother not yet arrested. Considering all those circumstances and initial stage of investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21423/2021**

**in**

**H.5, New Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.2337/2021**

1. Loganathan  
2. Tamil Selvam

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H.5, New Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Karthick, S. Raj, A.G. Abdul Kareem, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, 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. 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC @ Sec.294(b), 323, 324, 315, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.2337/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is the father of A1 and 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is his brother. There exists matrimonial dispute between A1 and his wife, defacto complainant herein. On the date of occurrence there was a wordy quarrel between the parties. It is a case and counter case in Cr.No.2338/2021. In fact, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner sustained severe injuries and admitted to hospital. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Counter case accused were already granted anticipatory bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.20395/2021 on 17.11.2021. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is the wife of A1 and she was pregnant at the time of occurrence. These petitioners along with A1 went to the house of the defacto complainant and asked her to return to matrimonial home. When she refused, the accused assaulted her due to which she underwent an abortion and suffered loss of pregnancy. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Matrimonial dispute between husband and wife. As per FIR, A1/husband assaulted the defacto complainant on the stomach, due to which she suffered a miscarriage of foetus. The present petitioners are in-laws of the defacto complainant. It is a case and counter case. 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner also sustained injury and admitted to the hospital. Already accused in the counter case were granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the above facts, 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 this order, before the learned XV 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, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, H.5, New Washermenpet P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21423/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21131/2021**

**And**

**Crl.M.P.No.21580/2021**

**(intervene petition)**

**in**

**CCB, Cr.No.82/2021**

Deepak

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P.S. Alagiri, S. Madhusudanan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and of M/s. G.V. Sridharan, R. Karthikeyan, V. Jayalakshmi, Counsel for the intervener and upon hearing them, 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.408, 420, 477-A of IPC in Crime No.82/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an employee of the defacto complainant. He had not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint. The buyers who make payments through Google Pay are routed through the savings account of the petitioner and in fact every amount has been accounted properly. Since there was some family dispute, the petitioner happened to be a close relative, a false case has been foisted and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP as well the counsel appearing for the intervener submits that the complainant is having business in the name of M/s. Madurai Sundar Tyres Private Ltd., The petitioner is looking after the Chennai branch as Branch Manager. While discharging his duties as Branch Manager, he had transferred the funds to his saving account through Google Pay. The amount involved is nearly Rs.1,70,00,000/-. There are ample evidence to connect the accused in the offence of said misappropriation and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears, there was a bank account with City Union Bank by the petitioner. To his account there are several payments by the customers right from the year 2017 onwards. He had not chosen to appear before the respondent police inspite of service of notice u/s. 41(A) Cr.PC., Considering the gravity of offence and the availability of evidence against the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk