

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13529/2022

in

CCB, Team XVII Crime No. 24/2022

Kamalakannan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Team XVII,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 3.8.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Kannabiran, S. Selvarajan, S. Gurumoorthy, 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 under PT Warrant on 30.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w 34 and 109 IPC in Crime No. 24/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. This petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. Only based on the confession statement of co-accused, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. This petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He was originally arrested in another crime number and in this case he was formally arrested in this case under PT Warrant on 30.5.2022. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, totally 16 accused involved in this case and this petitioner is the prime accused. He along with other accused jointly created a false settlement deed by impersonating the original owner and registered a false settlement deed at Thiruvottiyur SRO. Based on the false settlement deed the accused Sindhu impersonated

as Radha and executed a settlement deed in favour of Prabu by mentioning that he was Radha's husband. But, actually, the accused Sindhu is not Radha and Prabu is not husband of accused Sindhu. Based on the fabricated settlement deed, a general power of attorney was registered in favour of accused Kumar and thereafter it was entrusted in ICICI bank, Arcot branch, Vadapalani and obtained Rs.2 Crores as loan and among that amount accused Sameer Kottakal Ummer got wrongful gain a sum of Rs.1 Crore, accused Ramesh Babu got Rs.25 lakhs and accused Naushad got Rs.12 lakhs. Originally, the property belongs to the defacto complainant Dr. Vijaya Murali. This petitioner is the brain behind the entire episode. He operated the other accused behind the screen and committed this offence to get wrongful gain. This petitioner also involved in several cheating cases and bank fraud cases. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the detention order No. 31/2022 dated 3.3.2022. The detention order is not yet revoked. This petitioner is a habitual offender and involved in 7 previous cases and out of which 3 cases are similar nature. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order and that the petitioner is accused in several other cases, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this juncture.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 13528/2022

in

C.C.No.3558/2020

(on the file of learned Magistrate for exclusive trial CCB and CBCID Cases Egmore,
Chennai)

in

EDF-III, Team XXI-A Crime No. 482/2018

Kamalakannan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
EDF-III, Team – XXI-A,
Central Crime Branch, Egmore,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 3.8.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Kannabiran, S. Selvarajan, S. Gurumoorthy, 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 under PT Warrant on 23.3.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 419, 464, 465, 467, 468, 420 r/w 120(B) IPC in Crime No. 482/2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused one Kumar was released on bail by the lower court on 24.6.2022. The allegation against the petitioner is that the friend of the petitioner furnished forgery document for his release. He was originally arrested in another crime number and in this case he was formally arrested in this case under P.T. Warrant on 23.3.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, totally 11 accused involved in this case and this petitioner is arrayed as A1. In this case, this petitioner along with other accused cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.1,86,62,500/-. The release deed document executed by this petitioner is a fabricated one. In fact the document which was produced by this petitioner through his friend is already a fabricated one and in this regard, a case was already registered against one T.S. Rajasekar, who produced the document in Crime No. 313/2011 on the file of the CCB, Chennai. They have cheated the court by producing the fabricated document. This petitioner was granted bail by the lower court in Crl.M.P.No.7246/2018 dated 26.12.2018 and the Hon'ble High Court cancelled the bail granted to this petitioner in Crime No. 313/2011 in Crl.O.P.No.9030/2019 dated 27.6.2019. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the detention order No. 31/2022 dated 3.3.2022. The detention order is not yet revoked. This petitioner is a habitual offender and involved in 7 previous cases, out of which 3 cases are similar nature. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order and that the petitioner is accused in several other cases, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this juncture.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13277/2022

in

Crime No. 70/2022

(on the file of Inspector of Police, CCD-I, Chennai City, Chennai)

Vinodh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Department (CCD-I),
Chennai City,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Vinodh Kumar, S. Suresh, A. Rawther Naina Mohamed, 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 7.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 354D, 384 of IPC and sec. 67 of IT (Amendment) Act 2008 in Crime No.70/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that false case has been foisted on him with an ulterior motive. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner has been in custody from 7.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner and the defacto complainant are school mates. After the marriage, the defacto complainant had no contacts with the petitioner. In the year 2017, again they revived their friendship and exchanged their phone numbers and they used to talk over video call in mobile phone. At one point of time, this petitioner take the intimate photo of the defacto complainant when she was in night dress during video call and sent the same to the defacto complainant mobile phone and

immediately deleted the same. After some time, she received a message demanding Rs.35 lakhs from the petitioner. Except this petitioner two other accused also involved in this case. Hence, the complaint.

5. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No. 230/2022 dated 30.7.2022.

6. Considering the gravity of offence, overtact attributed against the petitioner and the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this juncture.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13511/2022

in

J-6 Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No. 186/2022

Thiyagarajan @ Thiyagu

.. 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. S. Balasubramaniam, S. Dhana Sekar, P. Bharathy, A.K. Mathy, 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 26.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 186/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that false case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner has been in custody from 26.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.465/- and a cell phone from him at knife point.

5. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No. 165/2022 dated 22.6.2022. It is further submitted by the CPP that the petitioner is a habitual offender and he also involved in several other cases of similar nature.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order and that the petitioner is accused in several other cases, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this juncture.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13522/2022

and

Crl.M.P.No. 13857/2022

(intervene petition)

in

K-4 Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No. 22/2022

Arun Bala Singh

.. 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 of M/s. R. Aranganathan, S. Easakkimuthu, Counsel for the petitioner and of M/s. AM. Asokan, S. John Josh, S. Sathish Kumar and S. Sarathkumar, Counsel for the intervenor and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 408 IPC in Crime No. 22/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that false complaint has been lodged against this petitioner alleging that this petitioner absconded with money and jewels of the defacto complainant. This petitioner had borrowed loan of Rs.4 lakhs for his daughter's marriage from the defacto complainant and deposit his original title deed as security. After that the said loan amount was deducted from his monthly salary. All of a sudden his employer has filed a vexatious civil suit in O.S.No.940/2021 before the III Additional District Judge, Coimbatore for recovery of entire money. This petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. Without proper enquiry, the

respondent police arrested the petitioner. He is in custody from 11.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The counsel appearing for the intervenor and the learned CPP submits that M/s. R. Gold Exchange is a registered company having its head office at 923A, Cross Cut Road, Coimbatore and is having more than 25 branches all over Tamil Nadu and 4 branches are functioning exclusively at Chennai. This petitioner was working as employee under the defacto complainant for the past 8 years in several branches of the defacto complainant. This petitioner joined as an appraiser in Anna Nagar branch and collects the amount from the customers and handed over to his owner. On 20.9.2021, this petitioner had sent a message to the defacto complainant through his Whatsapp No. 8883534849 stating that Rs.7,00,000/- was available on hand. Furthermore, 27.780 gram weight of gold has also been received by one of the customer and the same was also sent to the defacto complainant through Whatsapp. Thereafter, this petitioner had absconded with the above said cash Rs.7 lakhs and 27.780 gram weight gold. Hence, complaint has been lodged before the K-4 Anna Nagar police station. This petitioner being the employee under the defacto complainant committed breach of trust and committed theft of cash and gold jewels and absconded. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for the intervenor, CCTV footage is also available to connect the petitioner with the alleged crime. The cheated amount is not yet recovered. Investigation is still going on. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibilities of his abscondence. Hence, prays for the dismissal of the petition.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he being the employee under the defacto complainant absconded with cash Rs.7 lakhs and gold ornaments weighing 27.780 gram and committed breach of trust. The cash involved, and the value of the gold ornaments involved in this case is very huge and the same is not yet recovered. Investigation is not yet completed. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 13527/2022

in

S.C.No. 179/2022

(on the file of Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chennai)

in

W-6 All Women P.S. Ayanavaram Crime No. 21/2019

V. Loganathan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-6 All Women Police Station,
Ayanavaram,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.P. Jagadeeswaran, B. Ramprasad, C. Thirukumar, S. Jayakumar, 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 25.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 376 IPC in Crime No. 21/2019 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was remanded by this court to judicial custody on 25.7.2022 for not furnishing the sureties as stated in the CrI.M.P.No. 12561/2022 dated 19.7.2022 for the alleged offence 376 IPC. The petitioners family members has not come forward to furnish the sureties for the petitioner on stipulated time before this court. Hence, the petitioner is unable to furnish sufficient sureties before this court on 25.7.2022. Now, the petitioner is ready to furnish sureties as directed by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 25.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. Learned CPP does not raise any serious objection.

5. NBW issued in this case was already recalled on 19.7.2022. This petitioner has not furnish sufficient sureties as directed by this court. Hence, on 25.7.2022, this petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody. Now, the petitioner submits that he is ready to produce sufficient sureties. Considering the above facts, 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 Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, 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 said Court daily twice at 10.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders.

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

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond during trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above 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 Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13527/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 13530/2022

in

K-7 ICF P.S. Crime No. 58/2022

Saravanan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The 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. A.E. Shanmugasundaram, T Ravikumar, 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 29.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 380, 414 r/w 34 IPC in Crime No. 58/2022 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. The prime accused Kokila is known to this petitioner through auto trip for treating her pet animals in Veterinary hospital at Vepery, Chennai. She regularly used to pay Rs.700/- per trip from her house to veterinary hospital. Based on the acquaintance, in August 2021 she requested financial help to extend her poultry form Rs.1,50,000/- as a hand loan through her husband Ruban, further she allure the petitioner to pay good interest along with entire loan amount in short tenure. Believing her words, this petitioner arranged amount from his mother and she took two monthly chits amount Rs.2 lakhs from the peititoner's mother. Whereas, she always defaulted in paying the chit. This petitioner is not at all involved in alleged offence. At any point of time he has not received any stolen

articles from the accused Kokila. The petitioner is in custody from 29.6.2022. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused break open the defacto complainant's house and stolen away 57 sovereigns of gold ornaments and cash Rs.25,000/-. According to CPP, one diamond necklace and cash Rs.2,68,000/- recovered. Investigation is not yet completed. This petitioner is also having one previous case. If he is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of house breaking. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with another accused committed theft of 57 sovereigns of gold ornaments and cash Rs.25,000/- from the defacto complainant's house when she went out. According to CPP, investigation is not yet completed. Considering the nature of offence, objection raised by the CPP and the stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August , 2022**

Crl.M.P.No. 13658/2022

in

K-6 T.P. Chathiram P.S. Crime No. 142/2022

1. Vignesh Kumar @ Kulla
2. Sathish Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-6 T.P. Chathiram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, A. Rajeshkumar, A. Radhiga, 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 17.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 336, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.142/2022 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 of the offence. They were not at all present at the scene of occurrence. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 17.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1000/- from him at knife point. He further submits that each petitioner is having two previous cases including one murder case and that investigation is pending. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 19 days. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this

time. According to CPP, each petitioner is having 2 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

7. 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 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 petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13658/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 13661/2022

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 513/2022

B. Nandakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-1 Sembium Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Y. Dhanasekar, V. Muthupandi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 306 IPC in Crime No. 513/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is not responsible for the suicide committed by his wife. There is no dowry demand as alleged. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He has two children and he only take care of them. The petitioner is in custody from 25.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to family dispute wordy quarrel arose. During that time, this petitioner and his family members humiliated the victim in respect of the genuinity of jewels and also tortured her. Unable to bear the torture, she committed suicide on 23.7.2022. Since the death occurred within 7 years of the marriage, RDO enquiry is to be conducted. Postmortem reported is awaited. Investigation is at an early stage. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every chance for tampering the witnesses. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the accusation made against the petitioner, gravity of offence, stage of the investigation and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 13752/2022

in

F-2 Egmore P.S. Crime No. 308/2022

Vicky @ Vignesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-2 Egmore Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Jaisankar, D. Manoj Kumar, D. Karthick, R. Ram Kumar, S. Pavithra, 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 20.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(A) of NDPS Act and sec. 332 and 352 IPC in Crime No. 308/2022 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 has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody from 20.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner/A1 along with another accused indulged in selling ganja and during search they were found in possession of 4 packets of Ganja. When the police tried to catch the accused, he pushed down them and escaped from the spot. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 4 previous cases. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. A2 is still absconding. Investigation is at early stage. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

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

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13848/2022

in

N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.142/2022

Dhilip 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 in the presence of M/s. M. Nithiyavel, G. Kameshwaran, 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 6.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 307 of IPC in Crime No.142/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. As per FIR, the only allegation against the petitioner is that he assaulted the victim with hands. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 13.7.2022. The petitioner is in custody from 6.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 6 accused. This petitioner is A4. Due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him with knife. The victim sustained injury on the head and was

treated as in-patient for 2 days. This petitioner is having 1 previous cases. However, he submits that the injured has been discharged from the hospital.

5. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 13.7.2022. The petitioner is in custody for the past 28 days. According to learned CPP, the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is having only one previous case. No serious objection was raised by learned CPP. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on 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 10.00 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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above 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. Learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13848/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13851/2022

in

E-1 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 301/2022

1. Murugan

2. Sathish

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Lingesan, N. Naresh, S.Y. Syed Parvez, 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 18.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 336, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 301/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are innocent. They have nothing to do with the alleged offence. Victim was discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 18.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 9 accused. These petitioners are A3 and A4. Due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant, picked up wordy quarrel with him and assaulted him using knife and wooden log and caused injury on his face and neck. The victim was admitted to hospital for treatment and after 7 days of inpatient treatment, he has been

discharged. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 2 previous cases. Whereas, the 2nd petitioner has no previous case.

5. It is reported by the CPP that victim was discharged from the hospital after 7 days of treatment. No previous case is reported against 2nd petitioner. According to CPP, the 1st petitioner is having 2 previous cases. The petitioners are in custody from 18.7.2022. Considering the above facts and 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 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 petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13851/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13852/2022

in

R-6 Kumaran Nagar P.S. Crime No. 226/2022

Karthick @ Kotta Karthick

.. 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. N.S. Amarnath, R. ganesh Babu, T. Uma Maheshwari, 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 22.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 427, 336, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 226/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is innocent of the offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner has been in custody from 22.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's grocery shop and demanded rowdy mamool from him. On his refusal, this petitioner forcibly taken Rs.750/- from cash box and also threatened him with dire consequences.

5. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No. 233/2022 dated 2.8.2022. He further submits that this petitioner is having some previous cases also.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order and that this petitioner is an accused in some other cases, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this juncture.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No.13855/2022

in

P.R.C.No.65/2016

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

Kalimuthu @ Settu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Vinoth Kumar, P. Praveen Kumar, V. Kumaresan, C. Gokul, 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 7.7.2022 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 307 IPC in P.R.C.No.65/2016 on the file of XVI Metropolitan Magistrate Court, G.T. Chennai, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a Fisherman by profession and due to his work, he was unable to appear before the committal court and NBW was issued against him on 21.10.2021 and the same was executed on 7.7.2022. Since the petitioner was admitted in the hospital, he was unable to recall the warrant. The petitioner was regular in appearing before the Court prior to the issuance of NBW. In this case A2 died and fresh summons was ordered to other accused. The petitioner, hereinafter, undertakes to appear before the court regularly. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 5 accused involved in this case. This petitioner is A5. NBW was issued on 21.10.2021 and the same was executed on 7.7.2022. The petitioner was absconding for nearly 9 months. The case is pending from 2016 and due to the absence of the accused, the case is yet to be committed to Court of Sessions. If the petitioner is released on bail, again he will abscond and cause hindrance to the proceedings. He seriously objects granting bail.

5. NBW was issued on 21.10.2021 and the same was executed on 7.7.2022 after 8 months. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was admitted in the hospital and therefore, he was unable to recall the warrant in the mean time and also produced the medical records. On perusal of the medical records, it is for the period from 27.6.2022 to 30.6.2022. For the period from 21.10.2021 to 27.6.2022, there is no explanation on the side of the petitioner as to why he has not chosen to recall the warrant. The reason stated by the petitioner is not satisfactory. The case is pending from 2016 and it is yet to be committed to the court of sessions. According to learned CPP, if the petitioner is released on bail, again he will abscond and the case proceedings would be stalled. Under these circumstances, considering the stage of the case and the conduct of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No.13286/2022

And

Crl.M.P.No.13669/2022

(intervene petition)

in

B.1, North Beach PS. Crime No.329/2018

Y. Ahamed Koya

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. Joseph Mathew and Angel Mary, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and of M/s. J. Abdul Hadi, R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, Counsel for the intervener and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 420 IPC in Crime No. 329/2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner never seen the defacto complainant. The entire transaction is between the defacto complainant and A1/Sahul, who is the son-in-law of this petitioner. The petitioner is not responsible for the misdeed committed by his son-in-law. There is no proof against the petitioner for receipt of money. A1 alone had executed the the promissory note and issued cheque and this petitioner never signed any document as guarantor. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case only to extract money from him. The petitioner is aged 73 years and he is suffering from

various ailments. He has lost 75% of his eye sight due to diabetic ailment. The occurrence is of the year 2018. A1 was already arrested and released on bail. Since the petitioner is innocent, no action was taken against him though he was very much available in the same address. Now, the respondent police are harassing the petitioner and the petitioner apprehends arrest Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. The counsel appearing for the intervenor/defacto complainant submits that A1/Shahul Hameed and his father-in-law/Ahamed Koya/this petitioner are providing the Hajj Pilgrimage and based on their representation, the defacto complainant paid Rs.23,40,000/- to the accused for arranging Yatra for himself, his wife and his relatives. Thereafter, the accused did not arrange the Hajj Pilgrimage and refused to repay the amount. When the amount was demanded by the defacto complainant the accused gave life threat to him. Complaint was lodged on 12.3.2018. But, the respondent police did not take any action. Hence, the defacto complainant approached the Hon'ble High Court and filed a petition under sec. 482 Cr.P.C. to register the case and the High Court allowed the petition on 26.3.2018 and directed the respondent to register the complaint. On 6.6.2018, the respondent registered the case in Crime No.329/2018 u/s.420 IPC. Even then, the respondent did not take any effective steps to file charge sheet. For which also, this petitioner moved before the Hon'ble High Court for direction, to direct the respondent police to file final report and the same was allowed on 20.10.2021. This petitioner did not cooperated with the investigating agency and absconded for the past 4 years. The earlier anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed on 23.4.2022. The 2nd petition filed by the petitioner was referred to mediation, wherein also the petitioner did not appear and the same was also dismissed for default on 10.6.2022. Once again the petitioner approached this court for the 3rd time and hence prays for dismissal of the petition.

5. According to CPP, the defacto complainant's friend one Mohammed Bilal introduced this petitioner along with his son in law Shakul Hameed as if they are running M/s. Sha International Haji & Umra Service, a Travel agency at Chennai and arranging Hajj Yatra for minimum charges and also inform the same to other persons, who are interested to go for Hajj Yatra. Based on the assurance given by the accused, the defacto complainant and their relatives and friends have paid Rs.21,40,000/ to the said company

bank account in the year 2017. Subsequently, the accused never arranged the Hajj Yatra and not returned the amount to them. When the defacto complainant continuously asked them about the Hajj Yatra, the accused did not give any proper explanation and also gave life threat to them. As per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court, the case has been registered. The accused is absconding for more than 4 years and he is not cooperated for the investigation. Due to which, the investigation is still pending. Totally 9 persons were affected and cheated by the petitioner. This petitioner is the prime accused. Arrest of the petitioner is necessary for completion of the investigation. A1 had issued cheque and also given the property document of this petitioner as security for the amount payable by him. However, till date no amount has been recovered. A1 was granted statutory bail. This petitioner, who moved anticipatory bail cannot claim parity with A1. Hence, he objects the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with his son-in-law/A1 under the guise of arranging Hajj Yatra received money from the defacto complainant and others and cheated them. The amount cheated is Rs.21,40,000/-. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, A1 alone had committed the offence and he only received the entire amount. This petitioner is not the beneficiary of the crime proceeds. A1 had stolen the document relating to the petitioner's property and handed over the same as security without his knowledge and thus, the petitioner will not be held liable for the misdeeds committed by A1. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that till date no amount has been recovered. Though the case has been registered during 2018, this petitioner is not co-operating with the investigating agency and investigation is still pending. A1 was granted statutory bail and it cannot be a ground for considering the anticipatory bail. On perusal of the records, in the earlier occasion, though the petition in CrI.M.P.No.8050/2022 filed by the petitioner through some other counsel was referred to Mediation, the same was dismissed as the petitioner did not appear to settle the issues. Under such circumstances, prima facie there is a case and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be necessary in this case. Considering the nature of case, the amount involved in this case and the fact that investigation is still pending, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. 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: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.13761/2022

in

J.7, Velachery P.S. Cr.No.374/2022

B. Kaliyammal

.. Petitioner/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 in the presence of M/s. R. Sasikumar, D. Devaraju, M. Shanmuganathan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.374/2022 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 noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. It is a case in counter. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Dispute between landlord and tenants. It is a case in counter. The allegation against the petitioner is that she along with A1 attacked the defacto complainant and her family members with sickle. According to learned CPP, counter case Cr.No.373/2022. As far as this case is concerned, injured have been treated as out-patient and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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

Copies to:

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13761/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.13762/2022

in

R.8, Vadapalani P.S. Cr.No.201/2022

N. Mohammed Rafiq

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R.8, Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 341, 294(b), 324, 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.201/2022 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 noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused was granted bail by the Court below. The petitioner apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. The allegation against the petitioner is that due to previous enmity, he along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant, abused him and his mother and assaulted him with hands and stones. However, learned CPP submits that the injured has been treated as out-patient and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned XVII 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 10.00 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

Copies to:

1. Learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R.8, Vadapalani Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.13762/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No.13763/2022

in

N.1, Royapuram P.S. Cr.No.382/2022

Ezhilarasan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N.1, Royapuram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 341, 294(b), 324, 323, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.382/2022 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 noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by this Court. The petitioner apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his father with hands and wooden logs. The victim sustained injury and sutures were made. However, learned CPP submits that injured have been discharged from the hospital.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his father. According to learned CPP, the injured were discharged from the hospital. No bad antecedent is reported against the petitioner.

He has not raised any serious objection. Co-accused were already granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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 this order, before the learned XVI 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 10.00 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

Copies to:

1. Learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, N.1, Royapuram Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.13763/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.13764/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.11949/2022

in

Crime No.451/2022

Muthukumarar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. P. Shanmugasundaram, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11949/2022, dt:14.7.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11949/2022 on 14.7.2022 for the offence u/s. 294(b), 448, 324, 506(ii) IPC with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition only for 8 days and immediately filed this petition. Considering the nature of offence, the number of days complied and the conduct of the petitioner, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows.

"The petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.13765/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.12124/2022

in

Crime No.451/2022

E. Balu

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. P. Shanmugasundaram, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12124/2022, dt:18.7.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12124/2022 on 18.7.2022 for the offence u/s. 294(b), 448, 324, 506(ii) IPC with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition only for 7 days and immediately filed this petition. Considering the nature of offence, the number of days complied and the conduct of the petitioner, this court is inclined to modify the condition as follows.

"The petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders". Accordingly, petition is ordered.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

nmk

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present : Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge.

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022.

Crl.M.P.No.13766/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.10653/2022

in

Crime No.516/2022

Kumaresan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.P.Shivaraj Mohan, 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.10653/2022, dt: 28.6.2022.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10653/2022, dated 28.6.2022 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 34 days.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition for 34 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.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present : Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge.

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022.

Crl.M.P.No.13767/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.12212/2022

in

Crime No.202/2022

Santhosh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Anna Square Police Station,

TIW East District,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.S.Y.Syed Parvez, P.Ramki, M.Melvin and A.Santha Kumar, 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.12212/2022, dt: 18.7.2022.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12212/2022, dated 18.7.2022 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 only for 14 days and hence, the petition may be dismissed.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition only for 14 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is not inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present : Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge.

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022.

Crl.M.P.No.13768/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.11212/2022

in

Crime No.421/2022

Raghu @ Dhanush

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P-1, Pulianthope Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.R.Prem Kumar and Jaya Kumar, 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.11212/2022, dt: 5.7.2022.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11212/2022, dated 5.7.2022 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 only for 25 days and hence, the petition may be dismissed.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition only for 25 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is not inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present : Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge.

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022.

Crl.M.P.No.13854/2022

in

R-7, K.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No.283/2022

Elanchezian

.. 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.R.Muthukumar, R.Lingakumar, S.Petchi Muthukumar and P.Muthumari, 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 22.7.2022 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.283/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence. Co-accused were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12211/2022 on 18.7.2022. The petitioner is in custody from 22.7.2022. Hence, the petitioner may be granted bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that totally 6 accused. On 26.6.2022 while playing carom board, there was a wordy quarrel arose between the co-accused and the defacto complainant's friend Magesh. Due to which, the petitioner and others assaulted the defacto complainant and his friend and caused injury to them. The victims were admitted to hospital for 15 days, the petitioner is in custody only for 13 days, hence, stongly opposed the petition.

4. While granting bail to the co-accused in Crl.M.P.No.12211/2022 on 18.7.2022, the learned CPP represented before this court that the victims were discharged from the

hospital after two days. However, now he has represented that the victim was in the hospital for 15 days. Anyhow, the victim has been discharged from the hospital. Further, the petitioner is in custody from 22.7.2022. Co-accused were released on bail by this court. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant bail.

5. 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 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.13854/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 4th day of August, 2022.

Crl.M.P.No.13290/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.20555/2022

(On the file of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

in

Crime No.96/2022

Sarbudeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-6, T.P.Chathiram 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 and A.Vinoth Kumar, 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 the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.20555/2022, dt: 21.7.2022.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted bail by the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.20555/2022 on 21.7.2022 with a condition to deposit a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- among other conditions. The petitioner is hailing from a poor family. He is not able to arrange such a huge amount to deposit before the court. His parents or relatives or family members do not possess any property in Chennai. The Hon'ble High Court, Madras has granted bail to the co-accused in Crl.O.P.No.14762/2022 on 27.6.2022 without any condition to deposit amount. Hence, the condition may be modified.

3. Learned City Public Prosecutor objects the petition stating that it is a case of cheating, hence, the trial court has imposed the condition to deposit the amount of Rs.1 lakh.

4. The bail was granted to be petitioner u/s 167(2) Cr.P.C. While granting bail, the trial court has imposed a condition to deposit a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- before the said court among other conditions. According to the petitioner, the petitioner is hailing from a poor family and hence, he is not in a position to deposit the said amount. Further, the Hon'ble High Court has granted bail to the co-accused without any condition to deposit amount and the order copy has been produced before this court. Considering the above facts and circumstances, the court is of the considered view that the condition to deposit Rs.1,00,000/- before the trial court has to be deleted.

5. Petition is allowed. The condition to deposit Rs.1,00,000/- imposed by the trial court in CrI.M.P.No.20555/2022, dated 21.7.2022 is deleted. The other conditions remain unchanged.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge