

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13154/2022**

**in**

**PRC No. 46/2009**

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

**in**

**K-2 Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No. 238/2009**

Prakash

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-2 Ayanavaram Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Mrs. A. Kalaichelvi, 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 13.4.2022 for execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341 and 397 IPC in PRC No. 46/2009 on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in Crime No. 238/2009 on the file of respondent police , seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that already this petitioner was arrested in another crime numbers 22/2021, 660/2021 and 404/2021 and in this case he was arrested under PT Warrant on 13.4.2022. He could not appear before the committal court on the hearing date due the demise of his father and due to his custody in other cases. Therefore, NBW was issued against him. He was regularly attended the court prior to issuance of NBW. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. This petitioner is in custody from 13.4.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 18.8.2019. In this case, this petitioner was formally arrested under P.T. Warrant on 13.4.2022. The case is of the year 2009. So far, the case could not be committed to the court of Sessions due to the absence of one or the other accused. If the petitioner is released on bail, again, he will abscond and further proceedings will be stalled. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the case records, it would go to show that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 18.8.2019 and in this case, this petitioner was produced under P.T. Warrant on 13.4.2022 and remanded to judicial custody. This petitioner was absent for more than two years. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since this petitioner's father was expired, he could not attend the court on hearing date and therefore, NBW was issued against him. But, it has not been stated in the petition. Further, for the past 2 years, this petitioner has not chosen to surrender and recall the warrant. The case is of the year 2009. Due to the absence of one or the other accused, so far the case could not be committed to the Court of Sessions. There is no valid reason stated by the petitioner for his long absence. The conduct of the petitioner does not inspire the confidence of this court that if the petitioner is released on bail, he will be available for trial. 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 today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August , 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13849/2022**

in

**CBCID Metro Wing-II Crime No. 02/2021**

A. Surulivel

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Crime Branch CID,  
Metro Wing-II  
Egmore, Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 465, 467, 468, 471 and 420 IPC in Crime No. 02/2021 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. This petitioner only introduced the job seekers to A1. He has not received any amount from the victims. A1 only received the amount. He never received any amount from the defacto complainant. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. A5 and A7 were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.No.13277 and 13587/2022 dated 15.6.2022. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioner is in custody from 6.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the complaint has been lodged by one Dharaneeswaran, Deputy Director, O/o. Advocate General of Tamil Nadu, High Court of Madras alleging that the accused persons created, forged the documents and committed cheating by issuing fake appointment orders in the name of the Office of Advocate General

of Tamil Nadu, High Court of Madras. On investigation, it was found that fake appointment orders were created and issued in the name of Registrar General of Madras High Court and the Office of Advocate General by using their signatures and seals. This petitioner is the prime accused. This petitioner entered into a criminal conspiracy with other accused and committed the offence of forgery of documents and cheated by issuing fake appointment orders for the post of Magisterial Clerk in the name of Office of the Advocate General, Tamil Nadu. Hence, the case.

5. According to CPP, it is a case of job racketing. During the course of investigation, it reveals that this petitioner had collected money around Rs.6 lakhs from each person and given Rs.4 lakhs to A1 Nagendra Kumar for fake appointment as Magisterial clerk at High Court of Madras and retained Rs.2 lakhs as commission from each person and he had collected money from several persons and swindled around Rs.80 lakhs and thereby cheated the job aspirants under the guise of getting job at High Court fraudulently. In fact, they conducted interview in the corridor of the City Civil Court and fabricated appointment orders and served them. Nearly 35 persons were cheated and totally Rs.5 Crores was swindled. The co-accused, who were released on bail by the Hon'ble High Court are also one of the victims. Hence, this petitioner cannot claim parity with them. This petitioner is also a prime accused. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. As far as this petitioner is concerned, he received commission from A1 for introducing the victims to A1. Prime accused/A1 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court on 2.8.2022 and some of the co-accused were also granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court on 15.6.2022. This petitioner is in custody from 6.5.2022. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on 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 Metropolitan Magistrate for CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, 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 twice at 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.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 Metropolitan Magistrate, for CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 13849/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13973/2022

in

J-3 Guindy P.S. Crime No. 768/2021

Tamilarasan @ Vicky @ Nondi Vicky

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Pandian, S. Dhilipan, 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 13.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 326, 367 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 768/2021 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. Wordy quarrel arose between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. For which, the defacto complainant lodged a false complaint against the petitioner with false allegations. Without proper enquiry, the police registered the case against the petitioner. A4, A5 and A6 were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. Victim already discharged from the hospital. This petitioner is in custody from 13.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, totally 10 accused. This petitioner is arrayed as A2. Occurrence took place on 19.9.2021. This petitioner was absconded for the past 10 months and after much effort, now only, the police is able to arrest him. This petitioner along with

other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant in a bike. When the defacto complaint tried to escape from the accused, he was assaulted by the accused and sustained injury on his head and admitted to hospital for treatment and later discharged from the hospital. He further submits that the petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No. 234/2022 dated 3.8.2022. This petitioner is a history sheeter, habitual offender and he is having 7 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of 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.

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**

**Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13975/2022**

**in**

**S.C No. 227/2022**

**(on the file of V Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)**

**in**

**H-3 Tondiarpet P.S. Crime No. 1222/2021**

Vijayakumar @ Radio Viji

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-3 Tondiarpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K.P. Rajendran, M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, M. Mohamadhu Ajar, 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 3.8.2022 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 195(A) and 506(ii) IPC in S.C. No. 227/2022 on the file of V Additional Sessions Court, Chennai in Crime No. 1222/2021 on the file respondent police , seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was arrested on 3.8.2022 on execution of NBW. Since this petitioner failed to inform his absence on the hearing date to his counsel, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 27.7.2022. When the petitioner was appeared before this court in another case on 3.8.2022, in S.C.No. 235/2022, he was arrested and remanded to judicial custody in this case. This petitioner was absent for only one hearing that too, due to his illness. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. He was regularly attended the court prior to issuance of NBW. This petitioner is in custody from 3.8.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 27.7.2022 and it was executed on 3.8.2022. He further submits that this petitioner was absent for one hearing only. Therefore, he does not raise any serious objection to grant bail.

5. It is represented that this petitioner was absent for one hearing only due to his illness. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 27.7.2022 and it was executed on 3.8.2022. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant bail with 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 Additional Sessions Judge, 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 at 10.30 a.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 V Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 13975/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13976/2022**

**in**

**F-2 Egmore P.S. Crime No. 304/2022**

Karthik

.. 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. M. Kaveri Selvam, V. Bhagyaraj, C. Umamaheswaran, 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 15.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No.304/2022 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. The property involved in this case has been recovered. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 2.8.2022. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 15.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A3 along with two other accused committed theft of gold chain weighing 4 grams from the defacto complainant. However, he submits that the gold chain involved in this case has been recovered and that the petitioner has no previous case.

5. It is reported that Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 2.8.2022. According to CPP, the stolen property has been recovered. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the past three weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 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 XIV 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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 13976/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13748/2022**

**in**

**EDF-III, Team -XX CCB Crime No. 90/2022**

A. Badhusha Mohaideen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Sekar, D. Pazhani, 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 12.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 408, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC in Crime No. 90/2022 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 no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The allegation against the petitioner is totally vague. He is in custody from 12.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner is working as Office Assistant in the defacto complainant's Waqf Board. He along with another accused diverted the Waqf fund from Indian Overseas Bank, Triplicane branch to their personal accounts using the cheques in which they forged the signature of the Executive Officer of Soorsha

Makkan waqf , Chennai and thus committed cheating to the tune of Rs.89 lakhs. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged the present complaint.

5. According to CPP, during investigation it came to light that this petitioner, who is working as Office Assistant in the Waqf from the year 2009, committed misappropriation of Waqf fund by way of transferring the amount to his personal account for his personal affairs using the cheques by forging the signature of the Syed Ibrahim who is the Executive Officer of Soorsha Makkan Waqf, and swindled to the tune of Rs.89 lakhs. During Audit, it was found that, this petitioner along with other accused committed the fraud and utilised the Waqf fund for his personal affairs. The cheated amount is not yet recovered. Investigation is not yet completed. A2 is still absconding. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibilities in screening the evidence and also chances for absconding is more. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail. He also produced the bank statement of this petitioner for the period from 1.12.2018 to 22.2.2022 to show the malpractice committed by this petitioner.

6. On perusal of the bank statement of this petitioner, which was maintained by the Indian Overseas Bank, Mount Road branch, it would go to show that on various occasions, from the account of Soorsha Makkan Waqf, several lakhs of amount was transferred to this petitioner's account through forged cheques. According to CPP, totally Rs.89 lakhs was swindled by the petitioner by committing forgery and utilised the same for his personal use. Investigation is at an early stage. The cheated amount is huge and the same is not yet recovered. A2 is still absconding and he is yet to be secured. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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  
Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13858/2022**

in

**K.2, Ayanavaram PS. Crime No.301/2022**

T. Rajkumar

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. S. Mohan Raj, V. Vinodha, V. Pazhanisamy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the 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), 323, 336, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.301/2022 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. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the under the influence of alcohol created nuisance by using abusive words in front of the defacto complainant's relatives' house and assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and threatened the public who came to the rescue of the defacto complainant by brandishing knife. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and he often created problem to the general public and he is having 7 previous cases. If he is granted anticipatory bail, he will again indulge in similar offence and thus objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Considering the bad antecedents and the objection made by learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13861/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8606/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.304/2022**

1. Dilliraj @ Dilli Babu
2. Leo Karthick
3. Amalan Machado

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. N. Kumar, A. Venkatesan, S Thamizselvan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8606/2022, dt:2.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8606/2022 on 2.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition for the past 31 days. Considering 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 the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13862/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.10543/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.254/2022**

G. Kannan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.11, CMBT Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S.N. Arunkumar S. Thangaraj, 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.10543/2022, dt:27.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10543/2022 on 27.6.2022 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 for the past 36 days. Considering 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 the open Court.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13863/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.10544/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.254/2022**

1. Suresh
2. Narayanmurthy
3. Saravanan

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.11, CMBT Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S.N. Arunkumar S. Thangaraj, 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.10544/2022, dt:27.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10544/2022 on 27.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition for the past 36 days. Considering 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 the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13864/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9595/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.11/2022**

B. Manivannan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W.17, All Women Police Station,  
Peravallur,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Kalaiarasan, 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.9595/2022, dt:21.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9595/2022 on 21.6.2022 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 for the past 36 days. Considering 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 the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13865/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9702/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.97/2022**

A.P. Ravi

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

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

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Chandrasekar, T.A. Raghavan, G. Anbalaghan, M. Ajmal Khan 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.9702/2022, dt:21.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9702/2022 on 21.6.2022 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 for the past 34 days. Considering 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 the open Court.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No.13291/2022  
in  
CCB-I Crime No.416/2015**

1. S. Shankar  
2. Venkataraman

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch - I,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.406, 420 r/w. 120B and Sec.506(i) IPC in Crime No.416/2015 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. The 1st petitioner is the brother of A1 in this case. A1 was running the hotel business in the name and style of 'Idli Vilas'. The 2nd petitioner/Venkataraman was working as a Cashier in the said Hotel. There was a financial transaction between A1 and the defacto complainant. These petitioners are noway connected with the said transaction. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Now, A1/Venkatesh had agreed to settle the amount in instalments, which was agreed by the defacto complainant and both of them have entered into a compromise. In the bail application moved by A1 and A5, the defacto complainant appeared before this court and submitted that she has no objection to release them on bail and also filed an affidavit to that effect and in pursuance of that, A1

and A5 were enlarged on bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for the petitioners also furnished the copy of affidavit of the defacto complainant filed before this court in the bail application filed by A1 and A5.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP filed written reply and submitted that totally 5 accused involved in this case. The petitioners herein are is A2 and A4. The accused conspired together and lured the defacto complainant to invest money to start a hotel in the name of Idli Vilas under the guise of getting more profit and believing their words, the defacto complainant had invested Rs.1,05,00,000/- by pledging her jewels and also by obtaining money from her daughter and son-in-law. After receipt of the amount, the accused have not started the business and cheated the defacto complainant. Entire amount was shared by all the accused. When the defacto complainant demanded return of amount, A1 and A3 had issued cheques, but the same were dishonoured and when it was questioned, the accused have threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences. These petitioners also the beneficiaries of the crime proceeds and they have cheated the defacto complainant along with A1. Co-accused were granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration and these petitioners who approached this court for anticipatory bail cannot claim parity with them. Admittedly, A1 had entered into compromise with the defacto complainant and so far, a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- alone had been repaid. Investigation is pending. Thus objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the records, admittedly, the mater has been compromised between the parties. A1/Venkatesh had agreed to settle the amount in instalments and entered into a an agreement with the defacto complainant and a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- has been paid by A1/Venkatesh by way of Demand Draft. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that during enquiry in the bail application filed by A1 and A5, the defacto complainant entered appearance stating that she has no objection and also filed an affidavit. He has also furnished the copy of the same. On perusal of the affidavit, it is stated that "*she will not oppose for the bail/anticipatory bail applications filed by A1/Venkatesh and other accused except Kapil Jain/A3*". Under these circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioners appears to be unnecessary. Considering the fact that the matter has been settled between A1 and the defacto complainant, the affidavit of the defacto complainant and the fact that A1

and A5 were already enlarged on bail, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police 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 petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, CCB-I, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13291/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Friday, the 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022.

**Crl.M.P.No.13974/2022**

in

**D-2, Anna Salai P.S. Crime No.150/2022**

Sangeetha @ Rosy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D-2, Anna Salai Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.P.Krishna Moorthy and A.Karthick, 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 15.6.2022 for the offences punishable under Section 174(3) Cr.P.C. altered to 302 of IPC in Crime No.150/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and she has not committed any offence as alleged. In fact, the deceased misbehaved with the petitioner. There is no intention by the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the past seven weeks. Hence, she may be released on bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that initially the case was registered u/s.174(3) Cr.P.C. During investigation it came to light that when the petitioner and other accused were consuming beer along with the deceased, the deceased tried to misbehave with the petitioner, due to which, there was quarrel between them. The petitioner and others assaulted the deceased with beer bottle and wooden log and murdered him. Thereafter, the section was altered into 302 IPC. Co-accused bail petition was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on 4.8.2022 in Crl.O.P.No.18392/2022. Investigation is pending. Hence, he strongly objects the grant of bail.

4. It is a case of murder. Initially, the case was registered under suspicious death u/s.174(3) Cr.P.C. Subsequently, during investigation it came to light the victim was

murdered by the petitioner and other accused and hence, the section was altered to 302 IPC. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner along with other accused and the deceased were consuming liquor and at that time the deceased tried to misbehave with the petitioner. There arose quarrel between them and the petitioner and other accused attacked the victim brutally using wooden log and broken beer bottle and caused grievous injuries all over his body and due to which he died. Investigation is at an early stage. If the petitioners are released on bail, there is every possibility in screening the evidence. Co-accused bail petition was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court. Considering the gravity of offence and stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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 4<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13978/2022**

**in**

C.A.No.156/2022

**in**

C.C.No.1529/2018

(on the file of the Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-IV, George Town, Chennai)

Ragahavan Naidu

...Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

M/s.Mansi Finance (Chennai) Ltd.,  
Rep. by its Manager / Authorised Agent,  
Mr.A.Ramesh,  
No.22-B, Mulla Sahib Street,  
Sowcarpet, Chennai-600079.

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.G.Vinodh Kumar and S.Suresh, Counsel for the petitioner, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners, 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.1529/2018 on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-IV, George Town, Chennai. On 6.7.2022 judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner was found guilty u/s.138 of N.I. Act and sentenced to undergo two months simple imprisonment and he was directed to pay Rs.7,50,000/- as compensation to the complainant within one month from the date of judgment.

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

4. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal and the submission made by the petitioner's counsel. The trial court suspended the sentence till 4.8.2022.

5. As per Sec.148 of N.I. Act (Amendment Act), 2018, the Appellate Court may order the Appellant to deposit such sum which shall be a minimum of Twenty percent of the fine or Compensation awarded by the Trial Court. In the above provision, it is clearly stated

that the amount shall be deposited within 60 days from the date of the Order. As already stated supra, the petitioner / appellant / accused was ordered to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of two months 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.

6. Considering the above facts and the value of the compensation amount, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence on condition to deposit 20% of the compensation amount.

7. 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 Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-IV, George Town, Chennai. Further the petitioner shall deposit 20% of the compensation amount to the credit of C.C. number on the file of the Trial Court within sixty days from the date of this Order.

8. The appeal has been made over to XX Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

9. The appeal stands posted to 22.8.2022.

Delivered by me today in open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copy to  
The Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-IV, George Town, Chennai.