

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11030/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 174/2021

M. Harish

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-5 Virugambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Muthamizh Selvakumar, R. Manimaran, S. Marishankar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.5.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 395 IPC in Crime No. 174/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 1.5.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused came in a motor bike and snatched the purse from the defacto complainant which contains cash Rs.500/-, ATM card and Driving licence and fled away from the spot. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 8 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and number of previous cases pending against the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11059/2021

in

G-5 Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No. 147/2021

Nagavalli

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-5 Secretariat Colony Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 6(b) & 24(1) of COTPA Act 2003 and sec. 328 of IPC in Crime No. 147/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and she has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on her only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 23.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that when the police conducted raid, this petitioner was found in possession of banned tobacco products weighing about 5 Kg for sale. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases of similar nature.
5. No one was hospitalized after consuming the contraband. The petitioner is in custody from 23.6.2021. According to CPP, the property involved in this case has been recovered. Considering the above facts, gender of the accused and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to :

1. The XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Central Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11059/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11151/2021

in

H.5, New Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.1053/2021

Subash

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 397, 506(ii) IPC and sec. 3 of TNPPDL Act in Crime No.1053/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10748, 10909 and 11060/2021 of 2021. The petitioner is in custody from 19.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 6 accused involved in this case. This petitioner along with other accused armed with deadly weapon threatened the public as if they are the area rowdies and damaged the vehicles parked in the road and at

knife point robbed Rs.230/ from the defacto complainant. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having one previous case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days. Considering the duration of custody, the fact that the petitioner is having only one previous case and co-accused were already granted bail, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 6th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 11229/2021

in

R.6, Kumaran Nagar P.S. Cr.No.380/2021

Yuvaraj

.. 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, upon hearing M/s. M. Arun, V. Nepolion, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.380/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. As per FIR, except the allegation that the petitioner dragged the defacto complainant into the Auto, no overt act is stated against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody from 22.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, they assaulted him and dragged him into the Auto and robbed Rs.16,500/- from him and also assaulted him. He seriously objects granting of bail stating that the petitioner was arrested

recently. Earlier petition of this petitioner was dismissed on 28.6.2021 and that there is no change in circumstance and objects the grant of bail.

5. Petitioner was arrested only on 22.6.2021. No change in circumstance was reported after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11230/2021

in

N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Cr.No. 625/2021

Madhan @ Erupen Madhan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 625/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 21.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.600/- from him at knife point. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is habitual offender and having 8 previous cases.

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

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July, 2021

Cr.L.M.P.No. 11233/2021

in

W-18, All Women P.S. MKB Nagar Cr.No. 10/2021

Gopinath

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-18 MKB Nagar All Women Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 376 IPC in Crime No. 10/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the victim is aged about 52 and she is a close relative of the accused/petitioner. Victim is the mother-in-law of this petitioner's brother. There was civil dispute between the parties. So, false case has been given against the petitioner as if there was commission of sexual offence. The petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of rape. Investigation is at initial stage and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner was arrested only on 17.6.2021. Medical examination of the victim as well as the petitioner is to be conducted. Investigation is at initial stage. No such document produced to show that there was civil dispute between the parties as alleged by the counsel for the petitioner. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11236/2021

in

H-1 Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 1212/2021

Karuna @ Kosu Karuna

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-1 Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested under P.T. Warrant on 9.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 224 IPC in Crime No. 1212/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was formally arrested in this case on 9.6.2021 under P.T. Warrant. Originally he was arrested on 31.5.2021 in Crime No. 674/2021 for the alleged offence u/s.392 IPC on the file of H3 Tondiarpet Police Station, Chennai. He is in custody from 9.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. This petitioner was originally arrested on 31.5.2021 in Crime No. 674/2021 on the file of H-3 Tondiarpet Police Station. When the police arrested the accused and taken him along with another accused for medical check up to Stanley hospital, he escaped from the police custody. Hence, the present case was registered. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the conduct of the petitioner that he escaped from the custody of the police when he was bring to hospital for medical check-up and the antecedents of the petitioner , this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11237/2021

in

F-2 Egmore P.S. Crime No. 363/2021

Rajasekar

.. 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, upon hearing M/s. G. Moses, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 465, 468, 471 and 420 IPC in Crime No.363/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is withdrawing this bail application as against the petitioner herein.

5. In view of the representation made by the counsel for the petitioner, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 11239 & 11241/2021

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 204/2021

1. K. Kagil

2. M. Jayavarma Pandi @ Lottai Pandy

.. Petitioners/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11239/2021

G. Madankumar

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11241/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant
in both the petitions

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. V Manimaran, Counsel for the petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.11239/2021, M/s. J. Balamurugan, R. Jayaganesh, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 11241/2021 and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.11239/2021, who were arrested on 16.6.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 11241/2021 was arrested on 20.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No. 204/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that these petitioners name not mentioned in the FIR. They are innocent of the offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody for more than two weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused robbed Rs.1200/- and a cell phone from the defacto complainant at knife point. He

further submits that except the present 2 cases, the petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.11239/2021 are having one previous case. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. According to counsel for the petitioners, the accused Madhan Kumar has one previous case. However, according to CPP, Madhan Kumar has no previous case. On perusal of the FIR, these petitioners' name not mentioned and there is no specific overtact attributed against them. The petitioners are in custody for more than two weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

(c) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 am. until further orders.

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

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

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11240/2021

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 543/2021

1. K. Kagil
2. M. Jayavarma Pandi @ Lottai Pandi .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. V Manimaran, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No. 543/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner are innocent of the offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1000/- and a cell phone from him at knife point. He further submits that except the present 2 cases, the petitioners also having one previous case. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than three weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

(c) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 am. until further orders.

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

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

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11240/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

Cr.L.M.P.No. 11235/2021

in

K-9 Thiru-vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Cr.No. 473/2021

Prem Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 427, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.473/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 onwards. There was quarrel between the petitioner and his estranged wife. An exaggerated complaint has been given against the petitioner by his estranged wife and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. The wife of the petitioner had a narrow escape and objects granting bail. He further submits that this petitioner is having 5 previous cases.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears no injury has been caused. There are chances for exaggeration of complaint. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021. Considering the duration of custody and chances for exaggeration of complaint, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the condition.

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

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

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

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

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

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11235/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 11234/2021

in

K-9 Thiru-vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Cr.No. 474/2021

Prem Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

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

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.474/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no such occurrence taken place as alleged in the complaint. There was a wordy quarrel between the petitioner and his estranged wife. For which crime no. 473/2021 was registered on the file of the respondent police. Deliberately, this case was registered as if the occurrence took place within an hour of occurrence in Crime No.473/2021. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is having 5 previous cases and also submits that CCTV footage is also available to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence and objects the grant of bail.

5. Though it is submitted by the prosecution that CCTV footage is available to connect the petitioner with the alleged occurrence, the CCTV footage is not produced.

Further the wordings in the FIR goes to probablize the chances for falsification of case against the petitioner since he is having some previous cases. The petitioner is in custody for more than three weeks. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the condition.

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

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

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

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

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

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11234/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11243/2021

in

V.1, Villivakkam P.S. Crime No.292/2021

Deena

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.T.Vinoth Kumar and Sonai Bothi Rajan and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.5.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Crime No.292/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners are innocent. Petitioner is working in a Mechanic Shop. He is no way connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused committed theft of newly bought two-wheeler(without number plate) belonging to the defacto complainant, which was parked in front of his house. He further submits that the petitioner is having one previous case and his earlier petition was dismissed on 23.6.2021 and there is no change of circumstance. Thus, seriously objects granting bail.
5. It is a case of 379 IPC. The petitioner committed theft of brand new two-wheeler. He is also involved in yet another case of similar nature. Earlier petition was dismissed only on 23.6.2021. No change of circumstance was brought to the knowledge of this court. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11244/2021

in

F.2, Egmore P.S. Crime No.363/2021

Raja Sekar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s. J. Rajkumar and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.5.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 465, 468, 471, 420 of IPC in Crime No.363/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner introduced himself as an Advocate to the defacto complainant and under the guise of securing a job in the Court, received a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- from him and also issued bogus appointment order for the post of Examiner in the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Chennai by forging the signature of the Judicial Officer and seal of the Hon'ble High Court. He further submits that the petitioner is having another similar case in Cr.No.201/2021 in Coimbatore District. Petitioner is a habitual offender of committing such offence and cheated innocent people under the guise of securing job in Southern Railways and swindled their money and in connection with oral complaints are receiving from several persons and it is to be unearthed.

He further submits that investigation is pending and the other accused who involved in commission of said offence are yet to be secured and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is case of cheating. The petitioner issued bogus appointment order for the post of Examiner in the Court by forging the signature of the Judicial Officer and seal of the Hon'ble High Court. According to learned CPP, he is a habitual offender of committing similar offence and one such case in Cr.No.201/2021 is pending against him and there are several complaints pending. Considering the grave nature of offence and the fact that investigation is pending, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11246/2021

in

R.1, Mambalam P.S. Cr.No.606/2021

1. Mahesh @ Dappa Mahesh
2. Sathish @ Saman Sathish

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Venkatesa Perumal, R. Girija, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 26.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 336, 427, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.606/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that this petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. Since the petitioners are having previous cases, they have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are in custody from 26.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and his brother and demanded Rs.10,000/- from the defacto complainant, that on his refusal, they assaulted his brother and when the defacto complainant tried to prevent him, the accused at knife point robbed Rs.1500/- from the

defacto complainant and pushed him. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the Mahesh is having 4 previous cases and Sathish is having 8 previous cases.

5. Petitioners were arrested only on 26.6.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. According to learned CPP, both the petitioners are having previous cases. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedents and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos.11215 and 11216 of 2021

in

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

S. Vinith .. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.11215/2021.

M. Manikandan .. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.11216/2021.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H.6, R.K. Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

Both the petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K. Manikanda Raj, K. Prabhakaran, Tamilzhanban. N, Counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.147, 148, 294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC and Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act in Crime No.162/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They were not at all present in the scene of occurrence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was granted bail by the Court below. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused armed with deadly weapon made nuisance in the area, where the defacto complainant is residing and when the defacto complainant questioned them, the accused

assaulted him and damaged the Auto belonged to the defacto complainant parked in front of his house and also another Auto parked in the road. He further submits that the damage is more than Rs.10,000/-. Manikandan is having one previous case. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC and Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act, other offences are bailable. The alleged assault is with hands. No deadly weapon was used. No serious injury was inflicted. According to learned CPP, Manikandan alone is having one previous case. Arrested accused was already granted bail by the Court below. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, however on condition to deposit Rs.5,000/- each, towards damage caused.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall deposit a sum of Rs.5000/- each to the credit of the crime No.162/2021 before the said court and the final order in respect of the amount will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court.

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

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

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

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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].

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, H.6, R.K. Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11215 and 11216 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11242/2021

in

P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.796/2021

Manimaran @ Thotti Mani

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
P.1, Pulianthope Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Ramesh Babu, R. Sampath, K. Dinesh Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.796/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 21.6.2021 for more than 17 days. It is an exaggerated case. Petitioner and the victim are friends. There was only a wordy quarrel and hence, prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC. Victim was seriously injury and objects granting bail.
5. On perusal of the FIR, it appears that the petitioner/accused demanded money from his friend(defacto complainant) for taking alcohol and on his refusal, the petitioner has chosen to assault his own friend, victim in this case. The Accident Register Copy produced by the CPP would go to show a laceration measuring 6 x 2 x 2 cm on the (L) neck exposing Internal Jugular Vein and Platysma branch. Prima facie, the injury is with deadly weapon on the vital part of the body. It appears the petitioner is also having previous case.

Considering the nature of injury inflicted, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 6th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11231/2021

in

V.5, Thirumangalam P.S. Cr.No.115/2021

Pongavanam @ asha

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V.5, Thirumangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C. Jagan and S. Ajith, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 174 Cr.P.C., @ 302 IPC in Cr.No.115/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a woman. She is noway connected with the offence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. She is sufficiently in custody for more than 50 days and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the case was originally registered u/s.174 Cr.P.C., and subsequently altered into Sec.302 IPC. This petitioner along with one Raja/co-accused had committed the death of the deceased Kumar @ Shine. Investigation is over. Charge Sheet is likely to be filed and thus objects granting bail considering the gravity of offence.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that the case was registered u/s.174 Cr.P.C. on 5.5.2021 on the death of Kumar @ Shine in a construction site. The present petitioner and other accused/Raja are co-workers. From the statements recorded from the accused, it appears that Raja had some affair with the present petitioner. She is the wife of one Iyyanar. The deceased was also interested in her and thus there was a quarrel between Raja and the deceased Kumar, over which, the deceased was done to death by Raja by strangulating him with towel. At that time, it is stated as if the present petitioner caught hold of the legs of the deceased. This was a prosecution theory. There are possibilities of implicating the petitioner also as an accused. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that investigation is over. The accused is in custody for more than 2 months. Considering the duration of custody and gender and the fact that investigation is over, 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 her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XIII 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.

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

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

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

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11231/2021