

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 10904, 11006 &11103/2021

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 909/2021

Venugopal .. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.10904/2021

Samuvel .. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11006/2021

1. Jakki @ Vijay
2. Vellai @ Kugan .. Petitioners/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11103/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai. ..Respondent/Complainant
in all the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Mohammed Aseef, N. Raja, S. Kalaimani, M. Abdul Kareem, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.10904/2021, M/s. K. Anand, S. Ambedkar, Y. David Girubakaran, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 11006/2021 and 11103/2021, and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 394, 506(ii) r/w 397 IPC in Crime No. 909/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in all the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False

case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. They are in custody from 18.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that these petitioners demanded money from the defacto complainant for consuming liquor. On his refusal, the accused attacked him with knife on his head and robbed Rs.900/- from him at knife point. According to CPP, the petitioner Samuvel is having one previous cases, Jakki is having 6 previous cases and Kugan is having 2 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner Venugopal. Except Jakki @ Vijay, other accused are having one or two previous cases. Hence, considering the antecedents of the petitioner Jakki, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present. As far as other accused are concerned, they are in custody for more than two weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners Venugopal, Samuvel, and Vellai @ Kugan alone subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the above said petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 above said petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above said petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above said 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 above said petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

(7) As far as the petitioner Jakki @ Vijay is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to :

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Ponneri.

vv

CrI.M.P.Nos. 10904, 11006 and 11103/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 11009 & 11021/2021

in

V-4 Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No. 572/2021

1. Suresh

2. D. Robinson @ Robin

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No. 11009/2021

Rafiq @ Abdul Rafi

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11021/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Manoj Kumar, J. Krishna Kumar, R. Ram Kumar, S. Tamil Selvan, S. Pavithra, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11009/2021, M/s. S.Y. Syed Parvez, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 11021/2021 and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.11009/2021 were arrested on 18.6.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11021/2021 was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b),323, 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 572/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. There

was clash between two groups. The police deliberately included sec. 397 IPC and remanded the petitioners. They are in custody from 18.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.650/- from him at knife point and also gave life threat to him and escaped from the spot. According to him, the petitioner Suresh is having one murder case. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case and counter case. Counter case crime number is 571/2021. According to counsel for the petitioner, there was a clash between two groups. The police deliberately included sec. 397 IPC and remanded the petitioners. Considering the allegations made in the FIR, there are chances for exaggeration at the hands of the police. Though it is submitted by the CPP that the petitioner Suresh is having murder case, he was acquitted from that case as per the judgment produced by the counsel for the petitioner in S.C.No.382/2016 dt. 21.7.2019. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner Robinson. The petitioners are in custody for more than two weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering all the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

Copies to :

1. The XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Chengalpet.

vv

CrI.M.P.Nos. 11009 & 11021/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 11180/2021

in

S.C.No.226/2021

(On the file of the learned XXIII Additional Sessions Court, Chennai)

in

E-2, Royapettah P.S. Crime No.11/2014

Ravi @ Ravishankar @ Kalvettu Ravi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

E-2, Royapettah Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested under PT Warrant on 1.3.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 324, 307, 302, 506(ii) r/w 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.11/2014 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 was not appeared before the court when the case was pending at P.R.C. stage. Hence, the Magistrate issued N.B.W. against the petitioner on 20.2.2018 and the same was executed on 1.3.2021. Originally, he was arrested in Cr.No.29/2021 by the H-5, New Washermenpet police on 4.2.2021. Then he was remanded in this case on production through P.T. warrant. Thereafter, he was detained under Act 14/1982 and the same was revoked by the Advisory Board on 7.5.2021. At the time of arrest, his leg was fractured. After release he had undergone surgery and treatment for his leg. Though the same was informed to his counsel, he has not followed the case, thus, he was not able to recall the warrant. The petitioner is in custody from 1.3.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP strongly opposed the petition stating that the petitioner was absent for three years. After much effort, he was arrested. He is a habitual offender and having 19 previous cases. If he is released on bail, he may abscond, thus, objects granting bail.

5. The case is of the year 2014. However, the petitioner is in custody for the past 5 months. It is represented by the counsel for the petitioner that though the petitioner is having 19 previous cases, he is on bail in those cases and the same was not denied by the CPP. In this case, this petitioner was formally arrested under PT Warrant. Considering the duration of custody and present pandemic situation, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties, both the sureties must be a blood relative, each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XXIII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai and on further condition that

(b) 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.

(c) the petitioner shall appear before the said Court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(d) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness during trial.

(e) the petitioner shall not abscond during 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 Hon'ble 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.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned XXIII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Saturday, the 3rd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11182/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 359/2021

1. Maari @ Korukkupetta Mari
2. Ajith @ Thollu Ajith
3. Karthick @ Pillai Karthick
4. Mano

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-4 Basin Bridge Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 359/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous motive, these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his uncle using knife and caused cut injury on his head, hands and stomach. According to CPP, the victim was admitted in hospital for 12 days as inpatient and 8 sutures were made on his head. He

further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 35 previous cases, 2nd petitioner is having 11 previous cases, 3rd petitioner is having 15 previous cases and 4th petitioner is having 32 previous cases. All are habitual offenders. If they are released on bail, they will again indulge in similar nature of crime and seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. According to CPP, this petitioners habitual offenders and history sheeters and having several previous cases. The antecedents as against the petitioners would go to show the petitioners are rowdy elements. Considering the nature of injury sustained by the victim which involved 8 sutures on his head, antecedents of the petitioners and the objection raised by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

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**

Saturday, the 3rd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11181/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 362/2021

1. Maari @ Korukkupetta Mari
2. Ajith @ Thollu Ajith
3. Karthick @ Pillai Karthick
4. Mano

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-4 Basin Bridge Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 336, 427, 397 r/w 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 362/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused went to the defacto complainant's shop and demanded rowdy mamool from him. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.1400/- from the cash box at knife point and also gave life threat to him. He further submits that the petitioners are habitual

offenders. The 1st petitioner is having 35 previous cases, 2nd petitioner is having 11 previous cases, 3rd petitioner is having 15 previous cases and 4th petitioner is having 32 previous cases. All are habitual offenders. If they are released on bail, they will again indulge in similar nature of crime and seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. According to CPP, this petitioners habitual offenders and history sheeters and having several previous cases. The antecedents as against the petitioners would go to show the petitioners are rowdy elements. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioners and the objection raised by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

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**

Saturday, the 3rd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11183/2021

in

P-4, Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No.177/2021

Kamala @ Kamaladevi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
P-4, Basin Bridge Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.5.2021 for the offences punishable under Section Sec.147, 148, 302 of IPC in Crime No.177/2021 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 she has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner's name was not mentioned in the F.I.R. However, she has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of Sec.161 Cr.P.C. statement. The petitioner is in custody from 6.5.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a grave case of murder. Due to previous enmity, the victim was murdered by the other accused. Based on the confession of other accused, the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused. On her instigation, the other accused committed the murder. Investigation is still pending. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 18.6.2021 and that there is no change in circumstance and thus, he seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of murder. A valuable life has been lost. The petitioner was arrested on 6.5.2021. Investigation is still pending. No change in circumstance after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Considering the gravity of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

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**

Saturday, the 3rd day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11147/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 750/2021

1. Surendar @ Sure
2. Ajay @ Ajaykumar

.. Petitioners/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. A. Nirmal Kumar, R. Nesarajan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 750/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they are no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. Co-accused was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11097/2021 dated 2.7.2021. The petitioners are in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused robbed Rs.1800/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. He further submits that the petitioners are having 3 previous cases.
5. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 2.7.2021. The petitioners are in custody from 16.6.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this

time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

Copies to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11147/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: **Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**
Principal Sessions Judge
Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021
Crl.M.P.No.11185/2021

in

EDF-II, Team IV, CCB Crime No.314/2020

P. Murugan @ Sundaraganesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.P.K.Murali and N. Loganathan, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for respondent this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.3.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w. Sec.34 r/w. Sec.109 of IPC in Crime No.314/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the crime. He has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay in registering the FIR. The delay in lodging the complaint itself creates doubts on the genuineness of the complaint. No offence u/s.464, 465 and 420 IPC is made out. The defacto complainant, who is a builder should have engaged an agency for conducting due diligence to avoid such loss. Investigation is over. The petitioner is in custody from 11.3.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the disputed property in this case belongs to one Sundara Ganesh, who is in abroad. All the accused conspired together and this petitioner/A1 impersonated himself as Sundara Ganesh, sold the disputed property to the defacto complainant and received a sum of Rs.1,10,00,000/-. Learned CPP submits that

this petitioner is the main accused and after much effort, this petitioner was arrested and if he is released on bail, there is every possibility of his abscondence. Investigation is pending and other accused are yet to be secured and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. The defacto complainant has been cheated by the petitioner and others on the face of the documents, created identity proofs as well as documents created prior to Sale. With such false identity proofs, they established that they are the real owner Sundara Ganesh and executed the Sale deed in favour of the Defacto complainant. The fraud committed by the petitioner was came to the knowledge of the defacto complainant on getting information from the Power of Attorney Agent one Subramanian of genuine Sundara Ganesh only after finishing of Sale Deed. The property involved in this case is worth about more than Rs.2 Crores. It has been dealt with by the petitioner by impersonation. Defacto complainant has paid money through bank transaction for the sale. The accused gone to the extent of opening a bank account in the name of Sundara Ganesh and get the funds transferred to that account. They cheated not only the defacto complainant, but the real owner of the property also. Earlier petition was dismissed only on 21.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Considering the above circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: **Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**
Principal Sessions Judge
Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021
Crl.M.P.No.11186/2021

in

D-1, Triplicane P.S. Crime No.484/2021

1. Prochelvan
 2. Chiyam @ Vasanth
 3. Jaishankar @ Pandian
- .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.M.Hussaini Basha, I.Gowri Shankar and Shaik Abu Thahir, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for respondent this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 23.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 448 and 506(ii) of IPC @ 326 r/w 34 of IPC in Crime No.484/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there are three accused in this case. According to the defacto complainant, he was assaulted by three persons. Even as per the F.I.R., the petitioners 1 and 3 have not used any weapon, thus, offence u/s 326 IPC is not made out against them. The petitioners are in custody from 23.6.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners went to the shop of the defacto complainant and demanded Rs.300/- for each, when the defacto complainant refused for the same, they assaulted him with iron rod on his left side eye.

5. On perusal of the F.I.R. and lower court order, the assault was made with iron rod. The defacto complainant lost his vision on the left eye. The petitioners are in custody only from 23.6.2021. Considering the nature of injury inflicted and duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11187/2021

in

N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Cr.No.551/2021

Desappan @ Nandu Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Karthik, N. Lavanya, K. Hariharan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.551/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10913/2021 on 23.6.2021. 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 along with other accused robbed Rs.1,000/ from the defacto complainant at knife point. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is a history sheeter having 23 previous cases and he cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that all the other accused were granted bail by this court. However, this petitioner is a history sheet rowdy, having 23 previous cases. Learned CPP seriously objects granting bail alleging so. Earlier petition was dismissed on 25.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Considering the bad antecedents, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11188/2021

in

K.8, Arumbakkam P.S. Cr.No.866/2021

1. Athikesavan
2. Ranjith Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 20.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 307 and 302 IPC in Cr.No.866/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been arrayed as A6 and A7. There is no specific overtact by the petitioners. They are noway connected with the murder of the deceased. Petitioners are in custody from 20.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that there was a clash between two groups who stayed in the adjacent rooms in the Gold Guest House. When the defacto complainant and his friends came out of the guest house, the petitioners and his friends started to attack the defacto complainant and his friends. The deceased was attacked with

hallow block stone on the head and he died in the hospital due to the head injury. Learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that it is a recent arrest and investigation is at the budding stage.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. A valuable life has been lost. The petitioners were arrested only on 20.6.2021. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that investigation is at the budding stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, the 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
Saturday, the 3rd day of July , 2021
Crl.M.P.No.11189/2021
in
K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 470/2021

Govindaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.G.Sivakumar, S.K.Mashthan and B.M.Santharam, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 427, 392 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 470/2021 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. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused robbed Rs.1000/- from the defacto complainant at knife point and also attacked him using wooden log and caused injury on his head and back side. He further submits that this petitioner is having three previous cases.
5. According to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11099/2021 on 2.7.2021. Considering the fact that injured was discharged from the hospital and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.
6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No. 11189/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.10949/2021

in

J-7, Velachery P.S. Crime No.765/2021

1. Naresh
2. Vinothkumar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-7, Velachery 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.Saran Kumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.765/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. There is a previous enmity between A1 and the cousin of the defacto complainant regarding riding of bike in high speed. An exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there was dispute between one Sugumar, who is the cousin of defacto complainant with Bharathkumar over riding of motor-cycle with high speed. On the occurrence day, again, there was quarrel between them and on the same day at 5.30 p.m., the said Bharathkumar along with the present petitioners came to the shop of the defacto complainant and abused and assaulted the defacto complainant and his father with stone and cricket bat. Injured discharged from the hospital.

5. Dispute over riding of mother-cycle with high speed. Petty quarrel. Injured discharged from the hospital. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Arrested

accused released on bail. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police 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 Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, J-7, Velachery Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.10949/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11168/2021

in

B-1, North Beach P.S. Crime No.1731/2020

Sai Bharathy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

B-1, North Beach Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.KRS Law Firm, K.Suthan, M.Elangovan, R.Mani Muthu Velan, J.Dhanalakshmi and G.Sathish and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 294(b), 323, 379, 427, 448, 120-B and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1731/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner is not an accused in the Final Report.

4. Considering the submission of CPP, the petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

SS

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.11164/2021

in

B.1, North Beach P.S., Crime No.92/2021

Sai Bharathy

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
B.1, North Beach Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me, upon hearing M/s.KRS Law Firm, K.Suthan, M.Elangovan, R.Mani Muthu Velan, J.Dhanalakshmi and G.Sathish and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s.294(b), 427, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.92/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner and her parents are tenants under the defacto complainant. They have paid Rs.50,000/- as advance. The petitioner came to know the property belong to H.R.& C.E. Board. There was dispute between the parties and a complaint was lodged. The petitioner has not involved in any such offence. A1 and A2 were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.7596/2021 on 28.4.2021. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the accused caused damage to the property and they are in the habit of involving criminal activities with respect to the property, which has been leased out to them and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Co-accused already granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. The petitioner is the daughter of the other accused. She is aged 18, a college student, having no actual role in this occurrence. 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 VII 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 VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, B-1, North Beach Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.11164/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11165/2021

in

N-2, Kasimedu P.S., Crime No.585/2021

Santhosh @ Santhosh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s.294(b), 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.585/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is A3 and brother of A2. Co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, the petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his friends with knife and caused injury to him. Due to which, the complainant was admitted to hospital for treatment and after one day treatment, he was discharged from the hospital.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. Co-accused were released on bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Considering the nature of case and injury caused, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021.**

Cr.L.M.P.No.11166/2021

in

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

1. Sarath Kumar
2. Kaja Moideen

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-5, M.K.B.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.Saranraj and S.Saravanan and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.726/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were assaulted by the defacto complainant, for which, a case was registered in Cr.No.725/2021. The petitioners are innocent. Co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand the learned CPP submits that in connection with the occurrence, case and counter-case were registered in Cr.Nos.725 and 726/2021. In both sides, there was injury. They have attacked with deadly weapons and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a counter-case to Cr.No.725/2021. It is a case of 307 IPC. Group clash between two groups. Injury caused is with deadly weapon. Prima facie, they appear to be

unruly elements. Earlier petition was dismissed on 24.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Saturday, the 3rd day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11167/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 726/2021

S. Gunasekaran

.. 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.A.Saranraj and S.Saravanan, 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. 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.726/2021 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 there was clash between two groups, in which, the defacto complainant sustained only simple injury and he was treated as out-patient. There is no specific overtact as against this petitioner. In fact, this petitioner was attacked by the defacto complainant and he sustained severe injuries and admitted to hospital for one week and now only he was discharged. This petitioner also given a complaint in Crime No. 725/2021 and the accused persons were remanded to judicial custody. Due to vengeance, the defacto complainant lodged the present counter case with the respondent police. Co-accused were granted bail and prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that in connection with the occurrence, case and counter-case were registered in Cr.Nos.725 and 726/2021. In both

sides, there was injury. They have attacked with deadly weapons. Earlier petition was dismissed on 25.6.2021 and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It appears that two groups attacked each other with deadly weapons and sustained injuries on both sides. Prima facie, the nature of occurrence would go to show the parties are unruly elements. As far as this case is concerned, one Ferozhkhan sustained cut injuries in his right thumb. Earlier petition was dismissed on 25.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Considering the nature of injury inflicted and nature of occurrence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

SS