

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21691/2021**

in

**P.2, Otteri P.S. Crime No.1564/2021**

1. Babu

2. Abdul Mukram

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P.2, Otteri Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. U. Yuvaraj, M. Elayakumar, A. Vinothkumar, P. Praveenkumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 30.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1564/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1,000/- from him at knife point.

4. The petitioners were arrested only on 30.11.2021. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/Babu's son committed suicide yesterday and his death ceremony is going to be held today at 3.00 p.m. Hence, prays for granting bail to him. Learned CPP has not raised any serious objection.

5. Considering the representation of the learned counsel for the petitioner, in order to attend the death ceremony of his son, bail is granted to the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/Babu alone. In

respect of the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner/Abdul Mukram is concerned, considering the short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/Babu is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a own bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) before the Superintendent of the concerned prison, in which the petitioner has been confined and on further condition that

(a) the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(b) the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(c) the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 1<sup>st</sup> 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]**.

(e) If the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.21691/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21497/2021**

in

**D.1, Triplicane P.S. Crime No.970/2021**

Selvam @ Appalam

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 392, 397, 427, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.970/2021 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 of the offence. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. This petitioner is in custody from 17.11.2021 and prays for granting of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on refusal, the accused robbed Rs.350/- and a cellphone from him at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is 4 previous cases and thus objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21497/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21585/2021**

in

**K.2, Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No.547/2021**

Surendharan G

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.2, Ayanavaram 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, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.547/2021 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 of the offence. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail by this court. This petitioner is in custody from 3.11.2021 and prays for granting of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused came to the defacto complainant's road side tiffin stall and demanded rowdy mamool, that on his refusal, they robbed cash Rs.550/- from his shirt pocket at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is 7 previous cases and thus objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past one month. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 7 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody and the fact that co-accused was already enlarged on bail, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.21585/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21679/2021**

in

**J.6, Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No.852/2021**

P. Abhishek

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J.6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 395 IPC in Crime No.852/2021 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. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner is nothing to do with the alleged offence. Co-accused was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.22920/2021, dated 1.12.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 19.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant's son, who is a student, studying 12<sup>th</sup> Std., and demanded money, on his refusal, the accused assaulted him and snatch cash Rs.500/- and a pair of slippers from him at knife point. He objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 15 days. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. Co-accused was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court.

Considering the above facts 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.21679/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21681/2021**

in

**E.5, Foreshore Estate P.S. Cr.No.612/2021**

S. Mukilan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E.5, Foreshore Estate Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 174 Cr.P.C., @ 306 IPC in Cr.No.612/2021 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. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The deceased/Vigneshwari is the wife of the defacto complainant/Kapildev and due to some misunderstanding, they got separated. The present petitioner had live-in relationship with the deceased for the past one year. However, for the reasons best known, she had committed suicide, in which the present petitioner has been falsely implicated. The petitioner is in custody for the past 24.10.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a grave case of 306 IPC. The petitioner had live-in relationship with the deceased, during which, she committed suicide

Investigation is pending and Viscera Report is yet to be received and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 41 days. Major portion of the investigation might have been completed by this time. Hence, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk Crl.M.P.No.21681/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21684/2021**

in

**N.4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Crime No.101/2020**

Mohammed Ali @ Alibaba

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
N.4, Fishing Harbour Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.101/2020 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. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. He has been falsely implicated in this case in order to close the pending FIR. No recovery from this petitioner. This petitioner is in custody from 21.10.2021 and prays for granting of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused committed theft of defacto complainant's two wheeler and assaulted him. Property has not been recovered. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is 2 previous cases.

5. The alleged occurrence is of the year 2020. The petitioner was arrested on 21.10.2021, since then he is in custody for the past 44 days. No recovery from the petitioner as reported. Considering the above facts 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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.21684/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21688/2021**

in

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

S. Gnanaprakash

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Mohan Raj, 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 14.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 506(ii), 307 IPC and Sec.3 of Explosive Substances Act 1908 in Crime No.495/2021 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. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been treated as out-patient. All the accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner met with an accident and taking treatment. The petitioner is in custody from 14.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that there exists enmity between the accused and defacto complainant over murder of defacto complainant's brother/Manikandan. In pursuance of that on the date of occurrence, A1 along with other accused including this petitioner came to the defacto complainant's house and thrown country bomb with a view to

kill him. However, learned CPP submits that injured has been treated as out-patient and co-accused were enlarged on bail by this court.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 20 days. Already co-accused were enlarged on bail by this court. Considering the same 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.21688/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21692/2021**

in

**TIW Pandy Bazar, Cr.No.235/2021**

Ananiah Livingston

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Traffic Investigation Wing,  
Pandy Bazar,  
Chennai.

.. Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Raghu Raj, S. Kathiravan, J. Swathy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.12.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 279, 308 IPC and Sec. 185 M.V. Act in Cr.No.235/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an Architect by profession. There is no intention to cause the accident. In fact, the Car driven by the petitioner dashed against the Lorry, due to which, the petitioner himself sustained injury and Car get damaged. Nobody was injured. The petitioner is a married man and is having a child. The petitioner is in custody from 1.12.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner under the influence of alcohol drove the Car in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against the Lorry. It is a recent occurrence and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner, under the influence of alcohol, drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and caused accident. The petitioner was arrested only on 1.12.2021. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21693/2021**

**in**

**F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No.671/2021**

Nishanth

.. 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. S. Palanivel, 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 2.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 363, 365, 342 r/w 397 IPC in Crime No.671/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant under the pretext that they will drop him in his office which is on en-route of the accused. After he boarded into the car, the vehicle diverted into other route and went away from City limit and the victim was suddenly administered with sedative injunction on his right arm and thereby became unconscious. After that the accused persons stolen his mobile phone, cash ATM card and abandoned him on street and fled away. On 29.8.2021 around 4.00 a.m. he awaked and with the help of public reached home and noticed through ATM Rs.1 lakh was withdrawn from his account. Hence, the complaint was registered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-

accused were granted bail by this Court. This petitioner is in custody for more than three months and prays for granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than 3 months. According to learned CPP A1 and A2 were released on bail by this court. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. Considering the above facts 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 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.

nmk

**Crl.M.P.No. 21693/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21600/2021**

in

**CSCID, Cr.No.377/2021**

G. Sugumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Sub-Inspector of Police,  
CSCID, Chennai North.

.. Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Anantha Krishnan, 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 by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s. 6(4) of TN Scheduled Commodities (RDCS) Order 1982 and sec. 7(1)(a)(ii) of Essential Commodities Act, 1955 in Crime No.377/2021 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. He is only a driver working in a Rice Shop at Tharamani. As per FIR, it is alleged that during regular patrol, the respondent police found a person standing in front of 22 bags(each 50 Kg) of PDS Rice and he ran away after seeing the police and on verification, they fixed this petitioner into this crime. It is not possible to carry such a huge quantity by a single man and no one can stand in the occurrence place with the said rice bags, as it would cause heavy traffic congestion. Further, the police has not traced out any vehicle, which is used in the crime. Without proper investigation this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail. He also produced the petitioner's driving licence copy.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner was found in possession of 1100 Kg of PDS Rice and on seeing the police, he escaped from the scene. He further submits that earlier petition was dismissed on 9.11.2021 and there is no change of circumstance and the 2<sup>nd</sup> anticipatory bail petition before this court is not maintainable and hence prays to dismiss the petition.

5. Earlier petition was dismissed on 9.11.2021. There is no change of circumstance except furnishing copy of the Driving Licence along with this petition. The driving license alone is not helpful to prove the innocence of the petitioner. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was found in possession of PDS Rice at the time of search made by the police, however, he managed to escape from the place. According to learned CPP, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to complete the investigation and to unearth the involvement of other persons in the crime. Hence, 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**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21594/2021**

in

**D.1, Triplicane P.S. Cr.No.899/2021**

1. Ravikumar

2. Aman Kumar

3. Sanchi Mahto @ sanehimahto

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

D.1, Triplicane Police Station,

Chennai.

.. Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 28.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 420 IPC @ Sec.365, 419, 420 IPC in Cr.No.899/2021 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 and the respondent Police came to their room to apprehend some of them. There was a wordy altercation between the police and the petitioners. Thus, deliberately all the petitioners were arrayed as accused. But in fact, it is not so. The petitioners are in custody for more than a months and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of cheating. Under the guise of purchasing train tickets, having received cash and mobile phones in order to facilitate such booking, they escaped with phones and cash and during the course of

investigation, it came to light that they are involved in number of cheating cases. Nearly 18 mobile phones were recovered from the petitioners. The complainant is also a North Indian. The accused were tracked through CCTV footage and mobile network coverage. They are native of Bihar. Chances of absconding is more and thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the above said objections, in view of the fact that the petitioners are pinned on the basis of the CCTV footage and other scientific methods of investigation and higher chances for absconding, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21690/2021**

in

**K.7, ICF P.S. Cr.No.229/2021**

1. Perumal  
2. Lenin

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Sub-Inspector of Police,  
K.7, ICF Police Station,  
Chennai.

.. Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. E. Vinoth Kumar, S. Chandra Mohan, M. Samantha, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 24.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 468, 471, 420 IPC in Cr.No.229/2021 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 introduced the prime accused with the defacto complainant for getting job in Railways. In fact, the petitioners acted bonafidely. They are in custody from 24.11.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the accused were arrested only on 24.11.2021. Investigation is at the budding stage and thus objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is aged about 64, a senior citizen, an ex-government employee. As per the confession statement recorded from him, he knows the defacto complainant and one Lenin. Lenin proclaimed that he can get appointment in Railways through his friend Mohammed Ali Khan. Believing the same, the

1<sup>st</sup> petitioner introduced the defacto complainant to the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner, in turn, the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner entrusted the work with Mohammed Ali Khan. Prima facie, it appears, the petitioners stood as brokers between the prime accused and the defacto complainant. Anyhow, considering the age of the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner and the role played by him, this court is inclined to grant bail for the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/Perumal alone with condition. In respect of 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner, his role is more than that of the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner and therefore, considering the short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner at present.

6. Accordingly, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner/Perumal is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 1<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 1<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**



Copy to :

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

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.21690/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.20641/2021**

**in**

**K.4, Cr.No.313/2019**

**And**

**CrI.M.P.No.20642/2021**

**in**

**C.C.No.1792/2021**

**(on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Chennai)**

**in**

**K.4, Cr.No.418/2018**

CrI.M.P.No.20641/21

A.B.V. Aarathy

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.4, Anna Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

And

CrI.M.P.No.20642/21

A.B.V. Aarathy

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.4, Anna Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

These petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Kandaswamy, Counsel for the petitioner in both the petitions and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

## COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police,

(i) for the alleged offence u/s. 420 of IPC in Cr.No.313/2019 and

(ii) for the alleged offence u/s.420 of IPC in C.C.No.1792/2021 in Cr.No.418/2018

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 daughter of the prime accused/Padmaja. Though the petitioner had no role in the alleged cheating, since she happens to be the daughter of prime accused, she has been arrayed as an accused. Further in Cr.No.418/2018, charge sheet was also filed. In another Cr.No.313/2019 also she has been implicated falsely and thus prays for granting anticipatory bail in both the crime numbers.

4. Both the offences are of the year 2018 and 2019. Investigation is almost over. On perusal of the papers filed by the petitioner's counsel, it appears in Cr.No.418/2018, Final Report was filed before the concerned Court and the same was taken on file in C.C.No.1792/2021. It is a cheating by way of investing in the Wow Coins similar to the Bit-coin and thus greedy defacto complainant had been cheated. Anyhow, considering the gender and the possibility of roping her(petitioner), since her mother is an accused and also considering the fact that investigation is over, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in both the Cr.Nos.319/2019 and 418/2018 subject to conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, K.4, Anna Nagar P.S. Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.Nos.20641 and 20642 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.**

**CrL.M.P.No.21601/2021**

in

**K-3, Aminjikai P.S. Crime No.38/2021**

R.Nithiyananthan @ Nithiya

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-3, Aminjikai Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.J.Dhivakar, P.Thalapathi, S.M.Raghuram and M.Satham Hussain, 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 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.38/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. Co-accused was arrested and released on bail. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and others assaulted the defacto complainant with helmet. The co-accused was arrested and released on bail.

4. Arrested accused was released on bail. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of offence, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the V 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 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.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K-3, Aminijikarai Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.21601/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.21602/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.19574/2021**

**in**

**Crime No.549/2021**

S.Mahumud Basha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-4, Anna Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19574/2021, dt: 2.11.2021.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19574/2021, dated 2.11.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for 19 days.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition for 19 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is 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**

Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.21603/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.16998/2021**

**in**

**Crime No.439/2021**

Thoukith Basha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

D-3, Ice House Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence M/s.P.Thinesh and T.Sundar Babu, counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16998/2021, dt: 5.10.2021.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16998/2021, dated 5.10.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for 42 days.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition for 42 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is 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**

Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.21604/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.19583/2021**

**in**

**Crime No.635/2021**

Aravind

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J-4, Kotturpuram Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence M/s.A.Chitra, K.Kanagaraj, R.Kalaikumar and D.Sakthivel, counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19583/2021, dt: 8.11.2021.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19583/2021, dated 8.11.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for 19 days.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition for 19 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is 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**

Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.21605/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.19467/2021**

**in**

**Crime No.508/2021**

Santhosh @ Sadham Hussain

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

R-6, Kumaran Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks modification of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19467/2021, dt: 2.11.2021.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19467/2021, dated 2.11.2021 with various conditions and one such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10 a.m. until further orders. According to the petitioner's counsel, when the petitioner went to the police station for complying the condition, they did not permit him to sign and harassed him. Thus, he seeks for modification of the condition.

3. Considering the reasons stated by the petitioner, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows :

“The petitioner shall appear before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Chengaplet daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.”

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  
Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.21607/2021**

in

**CrI.M.P.No.7625/2020**

in

Cr.No.747/2020

Ganesh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.E.Paramasivan and G.Peramaiyan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks extension of time for furnishing sureties as the order passed by this court in CrI.M.P.No.7625/2020, dated 18.6.2020.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court during covid pandemic in CrI.M.P.No.7625/2020, dated 18.6.2020, on executing own bond and further condition that the petitioner shall execute two sureties for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each before the concerned trial court Judge within one week of regular functioning of the court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as there was no source of income, the petitioner went to his native place Vandavasi and his counsel did not inform him about the regular functioning of the court, thus, he could not furnish sureties.

5. Learned CPP has not raised any serious objection.

6. Bail was granted on 18.6.2020. For the past 1 ½ years the petitioner not chosen to surrender before the Magistrate and now, seeks for extension of time for furnishing sureties. Considering the reasons stated by the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant extension of

time for 10 days from today on condition to deposit Rs.3,000/- before the Mediation Center Chennai as cost.

7. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Ten days time from today is granted to furnish sureties before the Magistrate on condition that the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.3,000/- before the Mediation Center, Chennai.

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**

Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.

**Crl.M.P.No.21606/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.20633/2021**

**in**

**Crime No.1174/2021**

1. Radha @ Radhakrishnan
2. Gopal @ Hemachander
3. Mohamed Farith
4. Sabari @ Shanmugam
5. Vijayan @ Pura Vijayan

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
C-3, Seven Wells Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.P.Muthamizh Selvakumar, S.Easkimuthu and A.Muralidharan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners seek to amend the name of the petitioners 2 and 5 in the bail order passed in Crl.M.P.No.20633/2021, dt: 29.11.2021.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in the petition for bail, the name of the petitioners 2 and 5 have been mentioned as “Gopal @ Hemachander and Vijayan @ Pura Vijayan” instead of “Hemachander and Vijay” respectively, due to which the petitioners could not come out of jail, thus, prays for amendment of the name of the petitioners in the bail order.

3. The learned CPP has not raised any objection.

4. Bail was already granted. Considering the reasons stated by the petitioners, this court is inclined to order amendment of name of the petitioners 2 and 5 in the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.20633/2021.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Office is directed to amend the name of the petitioners 2 and 5 in the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.20633/2021, dated 29.11.2021.

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**

**Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.21713/2021**

**in**

**C.A.No.192/2021**

**in**

**C.C.No.1498/2011**

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

Venkatesalu

....Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

State,

Represented by

The Sub-Inspector of Police,

K-9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.K.Kannan, S.Muralidharan, R.Ravichandran and V.Muthupandi, Counsel for the petitioner and upon hearing the petitioner's side, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.

2. The Petitioner / Appellant herein is the accused in C.C.No.1498/2011 on the file of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai. On 8.11.2021 judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner was convicted u/s 381 of IPC and sentenced to undergo three years S.I. and to pay a fine of Rs.500/-, in default, to undergo one month S.I.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has fair chance of success in the appeal. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

5. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal and the submission made by the petitioner's side. Fine amount has been paid. The trial court has suspended the sentence till 7.12.2021. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Appellant / Accused was ordered to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of three years and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during

the pendency of the appeal. Considering the above facts, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence.

6. Accordingly, the sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner by the lower Court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

7. The appeal has been made over to V Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

8. The appeal is posted to 23.12.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Copy to**

The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.