

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20938/2021

in

D-4 Zam Bazaar P.S. Crime No. 434/2021

V. Anandan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-4 Zam Bazaar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.434/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. Victim was discharged from the hospital three days back. He is in custody from 9.11.2021 and prays for granting bail. She is the wife of A1 Jeevarathinam. He had some intimacy with the defacto complainant.

4. According to CPP, due to previous enmity, this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant using deadly weapon and caused grievous injury to him. Due to which, the victim was admitted to hospital and he had taken more than 25 days inpatient treatment and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the duration of treatment undergone by the victim, 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: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21408/2021

in

P-3 Vyasarpadi P.S. Crime No. 903/2021

A. Vengiyan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-3 Vyasarpadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Madan, S. 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 5.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.903/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. All the other accused were enlarged on bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody from 5.11.2021 and hence 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.2,000/- at knife point from him. He further submits that this petitioner a history sheeter and he is having 7 previous cases. If he is released on bail, he will again indulge in similar offence and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past one month. It is reported that co-accused were

already granted bail. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21408/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21587/2021

in

B-1 North Beach P.S. Crime No. 1555/2021

Kumaravel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 427, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1555/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. The real fact is that this petitioner along with other accused purchased a mobile phone from the defacto complainant's shop. Thereafter they found some fault in the phone. So, they went to defacto complainant's shop for exchange of the phone. For which, exaggerated complaint has been lodged. The petitioners are in custody from 11.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused went to the defacto complainant's mobile shop and asked the complainant to buy a cell phone for sale. When the complainant demanded bill and ID proof, the accused attacked the complainant using knife and also caused damage to one Dell laptop, Apple

I-pad and show case glass worth about Rs.75,000/- and escaped from the spot. He further submits that A5 and A6 still absconding and objects the grant of bail.

5. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. He is in custody for more than three weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 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 VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21587/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21682/2021

in

K-9 Thiru Vi Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 1084/2021

Ayyanar

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. M. Jayaseelan, J. Sasilie, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148 and 302 IPC in Crime No. 1084/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 27.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of 302 IPC. Due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused taken the victim in their motor cycle. when the defacto complainant and other followed them, finally, they found the victim in the Thiru vi ka Nagar Corporation school ground with multiple cut injuries on his head, hand and forehead and he was taken to hospital for treatment. There, the doctor declared that he was brought dead. He further submits that investigation is still going on.

If the petitioner is released on bail, he will tamper the witnesses and there is every possibility of his absconding. Hence, he seriously objects the granting of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. A valuable life has been lost. This petitioner was arrested only on 27.10.2021. Investigation is at crucial stage. In the said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner 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: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 21755/2021

in

Crime No. 156/2021

P. Prithiviraj

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB-I , Greater Chennai Police, Vepery,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N. Saravana Kumar, D. Velmurugan, R. Issac Johnson, 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 11.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 420, 465, 468 r/w 34 IPC in Crime No. 156/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than three months. He was detained under Act 14/1982 and now the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board in G.O.Rt. No. 5833 dated 29.11.2021. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. Therefore, he may be released on bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner and the prime accused had created bogus identity cards as if they were P.A. to the General Manager, Southern Railway Recruitment and Assistant Commissioner Railways. But using the same, they have collected money from several job aspirants under the guise of providing employment in the Railways.

Likewise they have cheated several persons. The amount cheated runs to more than one Crore.

5. Learned CPP submits that the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board.

6. Considering the fact that the detention order as against the petitioner has been revoked by the Advisory Board and the duress period of the petitioner, 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 exclusive trial of CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate, for exclusive trial of CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No.21755/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 21758/2021

in

PRC No. 134/2021

(on the file of X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 426/2021

Azar @ Azarudeen

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. U. Yuvaraj, M. Elayakumar, A. Vinothkumar, 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 20.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC in PRC No. 134/2021 on the file of X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore in Crime No. 426/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than six months. Only on suspicion, this petitioner was arrested in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Investigation is completed and charge sheet has been filed in PRC No. 134/2021. Hence, he prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused murdered the deceased.

5. Learned CPP submits that investigation is completed and charge sheet has been filed in this case.

6. The petitioner is in custody for more than six months. Charge sheet has been filed in this case. Considering the above fact 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 21758/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 21864/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 883/2021

M. Karthick @ Karthickraja

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. J. Senthamilarasu, V. Selvam, 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 15.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 427, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 883/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody from 15.9.2021. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. No such occurrence has happened as alleged by the prosecution and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused damaged the front glass of the Eicher load vehicle of the defacto complainant and also attacked the defacto complainant using knife and caused injury on his hands.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a notorious rowdy element and he is having 22 previous cases. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

6. Occurrence took place on 14.9.2021. This petitioner was arrested on 15.9.2021. He is in custody for the past 2 1/2 months. Considering the long 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 21864/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21865/2021

in

CCB-1, Vepery Crime No. 84/2021

Kulanthaivel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 406, 420, 465, 468 r/w 34 IPC in Crime No. 84/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of statement given by one Madanagopal. A1 was detained under Act 14/1982. Since, this petitioner is the father in law of the prime accused, he was arrested in this case. He has no role in the alleged offence. He is in custody from 8.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP filed a written objection and stated that the present petitioner and the prime accused Madanagopal joined together and lured innocent job aspirants to part with their money under the guise of getting employment in TNEB, Secretariat etc., Apart from that, they also issued bogus appointment orders. The

investigation reveals that so far 20 complaints were received and the accused collected huge amount from the innocent job aspirants and they have cheated several Crores of rupees from the victims and also many agents involved in this offence. Investigation is not yet get a shape and seriously objects granting of bail.

6. Considering the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and 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, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate, for CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 21865/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 21866/2021

in

K-4, Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No.702/2021

Vijay Varma

.. 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. N. Vinayakamoorthy, C. Balaji, M. Dinesh and G. Jeevitha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who was arrested on 15.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.702/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 15.11.2021 . He has not committed any offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is an ex-employee of ICICI Bank and he used to identify the inactive accounts and if there is any balance in the inactive account, with the aid of his relative managed to withdraw funds from the accounts and while doing so, they have been caught red handed and seriously objects granting bail.

4. On perusal of the C.D. and other connected records, it appears that this petitioner along with other accused identified the account of one Balasubramanian and gave a requisition on the forged letterhead demanding for cheque-book and after getting the cheque-book, they have withdrawn Rs.2 lakhs from the said account. In view of the SMS

received by the customer, he had complained to the Bank and the petitioner's involvement in the crime came to light. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed only on 30.11.2021. No change in circumstance was reported. They were in custody for a short duration. There are chances for similar withdrawal of money from other accounts and it has to be traced only during the course of investigation. Since the investigation is at an early stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 21869/2021

in

P-2 Otteri P.S. Crime No. 1564/2021

Abdul Mukaram

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-2 Otteri Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

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

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 30.11.2021 and prays for bail.

3. The case of the prosecution is that his petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1000/- from him at knife point.

4. According to CPP, the arrest of the petitioner is very recent and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence 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: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21505/2021

in

G-7 Chetpet P.S. Crime No. 355/2021

P. Sudhireswaran

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-7 Chetpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Babu, 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. 379 IPC in Crime No.355/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. Co-accused were already granted bail. The property involved in this case has been recovered from the co-accused. Nothing has been recovered from this petitioner. Hence, he prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. According to CPP, this petitioner along with another accused came in a two wheeler and snatched the gold chain weighing 1 sovereign from the defacto complainant and escaped from the spot.
5. It is a case of 379 IPC. Granting of anticipatory bail in such a case, will send wrong signal to the society. Now, chain snatching are rises in the City. Considering the nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 6th day of December 2021

CrI.M.P.No.21597/2021

in

D.3, Ice House P.S. Cr.No.564/2021

1. Jayakumar
2. Deepan
3. Kumaresan
4. Ganesh @ Ganesan

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D.3, Ice House Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Karthick, S. Raj, A.G. Abdul Kareem, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.564/2021 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. Wordy quarrel between the parties over parking of vehicles. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Arrested accused were already enlarged on bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Dispute over parking of vehicles without giving way for other vehicles, which culminated into clash between two groups. According to learned CPP, some of the accused are yet to be secured. However, injured has been discharged from the hospital. Arrested accused were already enlarged on bail. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

5. 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute 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 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 10.30 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

Copy to :

1. The learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, D.3, Ice House P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21597/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.21782/2021

in

J.4, Kotturpuram P.S. Cr.No.not known of 2021

N. Krishnan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J.4, Kotturpuram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b0, 505(1)(b), 506(i) of IPC in Crime No. not known of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. According to learned CPP, there is no complaint or FIR pending against the petitioner. Hence the apprehension of the petitioner is unfounded and thus petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.21783/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.1784/2021

Nethaji @ Nethaji Raja

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.1784/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that dispute between A1 and the defacto complainant under the influence of alcohol. This petitioner is nothing to do with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Victim sustained only simple injury. A1 was already enlarged on bail by the Court below in Crl.M.P.No.24545/2021. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Quarrel between the parties under the influence of alcohol. According to learned CPP, the victim sustained injury on the head and 8 sutures were made. However, on perusal of the FIR, the overt act against this petitioner is that he kicked the victim. The victim was treated as out-patient. Arrested accused was already enlarged on bail. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for two weeks.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21783/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.21784/2021

in

P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.1132/2020

Parthiban

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P.6, Kodungaiyur Police Station
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 328 and 273 of IPC in Crime No.1132/2020 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. Based on the confession statement of the co-accused, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Arrested accused were already enlarged on bail by this court in the year 2020 itself. Hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products and at the time of search made by the police, 1668 Kg of banned tobacco products were found in an auto. While other persons were arrested by the police, this petitioner managed to escape from the place and till date he is absconding. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Huge quantity(1668 Kg) of banned tobacco products were seized from the accused. The offence of selling banned tobacco products is on the rise in the City and several persons were arrested and remanded to custody. Though the present occurrence is of the year 2020, co-accused were granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Granting anticipatory bail in such cases may encourage other persons to involve in similar offence. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.21785/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.20297/2021

in

F.4, Thousand Lights P.S. Cr.No.349/2021

H. Mohamed Yusuf

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police(crime),
F.4, Thousand Lights Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Panchatsaram, 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.20297/2021, dt:16.11.2021.
2. Heard both sides.
3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.20297/2021 on 16.11.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall 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 16 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.21786/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.18761/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.16505/2021

in

CCB, Cr.No.123/2021

1. V. Kanagaraj Kumar
2. K. Kavitha

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State by
The Inspector of Police,
Chennai Crime Branch,
Team No.17A, Vepery, CCB-II,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Ambigapathi and L. Magesh, Counsel for the petitioners 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.18761/2021, dt:25.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16505/2021 on 22.9.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Subsequently, the same was modified to appear before the respondent police once in a week on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders vide Crl.M.P.No.18761/2021, dated 25.10.2021.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the modified condition for 4 weeks. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21788/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.19724/2021

in

K.7, ICF P.S. Cr.No.207/2021

Rithick Anand

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. S.K. Masthan, L. Manivannan, 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.19724/2021, dt:8.11.2021.
2. Heard both sides.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19724/2021 on 8.11.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall 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 17 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

CrI.M.P.No.21790/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.20013/2021

in

CCB-I, Cr.No.102/2019

Elangovan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Team 1 Police Station, Vepery,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Vijay, I. Pandiarajan, U. Yuvaraj 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 CrI.M.P.No.20013/2021, dt:11.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.20013/2021 on 11.11.2021 for the offence u/s. 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w. 34 IPC with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall 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 15 days.

5. Considering the nature of offence and period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition however with a direction to appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.21791/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.17877/2021

in

E.1, Mylapore P.S. Cr.No.1044/2021

Kanimozhi

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. M. Rajavelu, S. Sarala, 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.17877/2021, dt:8.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.17877/2021 on 8.10.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall 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 47 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 6th day of December 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21792/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.19627/2021

in

R.8, Vadapalani P.S. Cr.No.625/2021

1. M. Sekar

2. S. Karuppu Samy

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. S.Mohanasundararajan, K.A. Dhanasekaran, E. Navalán, Counsel for the petitioners 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.19627/2021, dt:2.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19627/2021 on 2.11.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall 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 22 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

Crl.M.P.No.21789/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.18656/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.15070/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11597/2021

in

EOW-II, Cr.No.14/2021

1. Kasthuri
2. S. Priya
3. A. Sampath Kumar

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State by
The Inspector of Police,
EOW-II, Head Quarters Police Station,
Guindy,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of learned CPP for the respondent and no representation for the petitioners and their counsel M/s. M. Balaji, K. Easwar, P. Kumar, S. Gugappriya and upon hearing CPP, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18656/2021, dt:26.10.2021.

2. Heard learned CPP. No representation for the petitioners.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11597/2021 on 16.7.2021 for the alleged offence u/s. 420, 409 r/w. 34 of IPC with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Subsequently, on petition, the said condition was modified to appear before the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at

10.30 a.m. on alternate working days until further orders vide CrI.M.P.No.15070/2021 dated 9.9.2021. Again the said condition was modified by this court to appear before the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate once in a week on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders vide CrI.M.P.No.18656/2021 dated 26.10.2021.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the modified condition for 3 weeks. However, considering the nature of offence, this court is inclined to relax the condition with direction to appear before the respondent police as and when required.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21685/2021
in
CCB-I, Crime No.140/2021**

Mohammed Iqbal

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Bank Fraud Investigation, Team XII,
Vepery, Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Saravanan, S. Aravind Raj, M.M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, 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 25.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 120-B, 409, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC r/w. 34 IPC in Crime No.140/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is not an employee of M/s. IV Support Technologies Pvt. Ltd., He only introduced one Haul Hassan and others to 2nd accused, who in turn arranged the loan by collecting their Adhar Card and Pan Card. The petitioner has no role in the alleged loan transaction. He has been falsely roped into this case. The petitioner is in custody from 25.11.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of bank fraud. There were transfer of funds from the account of the prime accused to the petitioner. Investigation is pending and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The case has been registered at the instance of the Legal Manager, HSBC Bank. The modus operandi of the case is that the prime accused herein, under the guise of running I.T. companies obtained the KYC particulars of the job aspirants and used the same for opening bank account and availed credit facilities and credit cards and misappropriated the funds to the tune of Rs.1.5 Crore by using the KYC particulars of the innocent job seekers. Petitioner/Mohammed Iqbal is one of the main accused named in the FIR. The role played by the petitioner herein under the scam is yet to be unearthed. Investigation is still pending. Co-accused bail petitions also dismissed by this court. Under such circumstances, considering the grave nature of offence and the amount involved in this case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 6th day of December 2021**

CrI.M.P.No.21694/2021

And

CrI.M.P.No.21856/2021

(intervene petition)

in

R.4, P.S. Crime No.443/2021

1. Narotam T.S.
2. T.V. Prasad

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
R.4, Soundarapandianar Angadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Bageerathan, R. Raghaev, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and of M/s. K. Manikandan, M. Ramanathan, R. Nizam Mydeen, G. Anuradha, K. Arulmurugan, Counsel for the intervener and upon hearing them, this court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 19.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Sections 294(b), 406, 420, 506(i) IPC in Crime No.443/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. More particularly, the 2nd petitioner is aged about 66, having all sorts of medical ailments. He had no role at all in the alleged fraud of collecting Rs.50 lakh under the guise of getting MLA seat for Arani Assembly Constituency for the defacto complainant. Even in the FIR, no allegations is levelled

against the 2nd petitioner. In the earlier occasion, the petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. But without any submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the Hon'ble High Court recorded as if the petitioners assured to deposit Rs.20 lakh into the Court and since the condition was made by the Hon'ble High Court without their consent, the petitioners were not able to deposit the amount of Rs.20 lakh as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.No.13308/2021. Now, the present petitioners were arrested and they were in custody for more than 2 weeks and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP and the counsel appearing for the intervener submits that the petitioners assured the defacto complainant to get MLA Seat for Arani Assembly Constituency and they have managed to obtain Rs.50 lakh for procuring such seat from BJP party. But in fact that has not been done. The defacto complainant's sister was assured a seat to contest Thiruvannamalai Constituency, that too had been rejected for want of B-Form. So, it is a case of cheating. The prosecution verified the particulars about the source of gathering money of Rs.50 lakh by the defacto complainant, stay at GRT hotel by the petitioners and the call details and only after satisfying the genuineness of the complaint, arrest was made. Further, the petitioners not obeyed the condition imposed by the Hon'ble High Court and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the records, it appears, the 1st petitioner is the Private Secretary to Mr. Kishen Reddy, Union Minister of State/Home Affairs. The 2nd petitioner is the father of the 1st petitioner. They both managed to misuse their positions and extracted Rs.50 lakh from the defacto complainant for getting a seat to contest Arani Assembly Constituency. On perusal of the Case Diary, there are ample evidence to show the stay of petitioners at GRT hotel, call details and for the source of the defacto complainant to part with Rs.50 lakh, the arrest is made. Having made representation before the Hon'ble High Court by giving assurance to deposit Rs.20 lakh for anticipatory bail, the petitioners neither surrendered nor deposited the amount as assured by them, which resulted in arrest. Considering the earlier order of the Hon'ble High Court and sufficiency of evidence available in the Case Diary for the allegations made against the petitioners and the amount

involved and their duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 21683 & 21752/2021

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 1094/2021

Appu

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.21683/2021

C. Saravanan

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.21752/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.A. Rajesh Kanna, V. Tamilselvan, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.21683/2021 and of M/s.V. Suresh, T. Palani, C. Hariram, M. Thirulokachandar, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 21752/2021 and of CPP for the respondent, and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 21683/2021, who was arrested on 20.11.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 21752/2021 was arrested on 24.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 353, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1094/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in

Crl.O.P.No.22791/2021 dated 30.11.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past two weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners and other accused obstructed the HR and CE officials from taking possession of the property belongs to Arulmighu Marga Sahaya Easwarar Temple, Maduravoyal. While lock and seal the premises, these petitioners along with others wantonly obstructed the defacto complainant and other officials from discharging their official duty and they poured kerosene on the officials and tried to set fire on them and thus made an attempt to commit murder and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.22791/2021 four co-accused were granted anticipatory bail. The present petitioners are in custody for nearly two weeks. No injury has been caused. As relied by the Hon'ble High Court, investigation is almost completed. Considering the above facts, 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.

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police on every Tuesday and Saturday at 10.30 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 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

Copies to:

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

vv

Crl.M.P.Nos. 21683 & 21752/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 6th day of December, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21689/2021

in

CCB Crime No. 40/2021

M. Vinotha

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. Franklin, S. Karthick, S. Ramachandran, S. Valarmathi, 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 17.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 408, 420 r/w 34 and 109 IPC in Crime No. 40/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is a relative of A1. According to the prosecution, A1 misappropriated some funds from the defacto complainant's shop and invested the same in the name of the petitioner and others. Though there are some Sale deeds in the name of the petitioner, the petitioner have not committed any offence u/s.420 IPC. The petitioner is a woman. She is in custody from 17.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that the defacto complainant Pandi lodged a complaint stating that A1 is the brother in law of this petitioner. He was an employee in the defacto complainant's wholesale grocery shop. Taking advantage of that, he has misappropriated funds to the tune of Rs.1.50 Crores. Though there are some amount

invested in the name of the petitioner, she cannot be charged for the offence u/s.408 or 420 IPC. Utmost, she may be a receiver of crime proceeds. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. Considering the above facts, gender of the petitioner and 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 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 Metropolitan Magistrate, for exclusive trial of CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate, for exclusive trial of CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison(for women), Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 21689 /2021