

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July 2021

Cr.L.M.P.No. 11012/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.298/2021

Vicky @ Vigneshwaran

.. 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, upon hearing M/s. C. Jagan, P. Raji, S. Ramkamal, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 7.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324 and 307 IPC in Crime No. 298/2021 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 due to previous enmity, false case has been given against the petitioner. He is a law abiding person. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody for the past one month days and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity between the petitioner and the defacto complainant, the petitioner's relative one Vishnu assaulted the defacto complainant's sister's 2nd son Selva. When it was questioned by the defacto complainant, the accused abused him in filthy language and also assaulted him with knife. Due to which he sustained head injury and admitted to Government Stanley hospital. However, according to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the past one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody and the fact that injured was discharged from the hospital, 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.

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No.11012/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July 2021

Cr.L.M.P.No. 11024/2021

in

E-3 Teynampet P.S. Cr.No. 251/2021

1. Manikandan @ Vandu Mani
2. Arun Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-3 Teynampet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. B. Mohanraj, K. Kanagaraj, A Chitra, D. Sakthivel, R. Kalaikumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 436 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 251/2021 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 petitioners are innocent. No such occurrence has happened as alleged by the prosecution. Wordy quarrel arose between the petitioners and the defacto complainant when both the petitioners are under the influence of alcohol. Victim sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioners are in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners picked up quarrel with the defacto complainant and attacked him with knife and also caused damage to the defacto complainant's vehicle. The complainant sustained injury on his mouth. He further

submits that the 1st petitioner is having 8 previous cases. Whereas, the 2nd petitioner has no bad antecedents and victim sustained simple injury.

5. As per the FIR allegations no offence u/s.436 IPC is made out. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. The petitioners are in custody for the past 20 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody and the nature of injury inflicted, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(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 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 11024/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11153/2021

in

H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 1052/2021

1. Sathish @ Manga Sathish

2. Thoufiq

.. Petitioners/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. V. Karthik, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 4.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC and u/s.3 of TNPPDL Act 1992 in Crime No. 1052/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that an exaggerated complaint has been given. There was clash between two groups. Subsequently they were compromised and now they were in talking terms. Except the present petitioners, other co-accused were granted bail by this court on 24.6.2021. These petitioners are in custody from 4.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that there was a gang war between two groups. On 4.6.2021, at about 4.20 p.m. due to previous motive, these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him using knife. In the clash between two groups, vehicles belongs to third parties were damaged.

5. According to CPP, the petitioner Sathish @ Manga Sathish is having 11 previous cases and cancellation of bail petition is pending against the petitioner Sathish. Now, he was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No. 183/2021 dated 6.7.2021. The 2nd petitioner Thoufiq is having 5 previous cases. The petitioners are rowdy elements. If they are released on bail, they will again indulge in similar nature of crime and objects the grant of bail.

6. It is a case and counter case. There was a quarrel between two rowdy groups. In which not only the defacto complainants were injured, but also the vehicles parked nearby were damaged. According to CPP, the petitioner Sathish @ Manga Sathish was detained under Act 14/1982 and he is having 11 previous cases. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the 1st petitioner. As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, though he is having 5 previous cases, he is in custody for more than one month. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 24.6.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody and the damage caused to the vehicle, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner alone subject to the following conditions.

7. Accordingly, the 2nd 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 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 2nd petitioner shall also deposit a sum of Rs.2,500/- to the credit of the crime no. 1052/2021 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 2nd petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(d) the 2nd petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(e) the 2nd 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 2nd petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2nd 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 2nd petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

(8) As far as the 1st petitioner Sathish @ Manga Sathish is concerned, this petition is dismissed since he was detained under Act 14/1982.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11153/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11154/2021

in

H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 1051/2021

1. Sathish @ Manga Sathish

2. Thoufiq

.. Petitioners/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. V. Karthik, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 4.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC and u/s.3 of TNPPDL Act 1992 in Crime No. 1051/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that an exaggerated complaint has been given. There was clash between two groups. Subsequently they were compromised and now they were in talking terms. Except the present petitioners, other co-accused were granted bail by this court on 24.6.2021. These petitioners are in custody from 4.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that there was a gang war between two groups. On 4.6.2021, at about 4.45 p.m. due to previous motive, these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him using knife. In the clash between two groups, vehicles belongs to third parties were damaged.

5. According to CPP, the petitioner Sathish @ Manga Sathish is having 11 previous cases and cancellation of bail petition is pending against the petitioner Sathish. Now,

he was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No. 183/2021 dated 6.7.2021. The 2nd petitioner Thoufiq is having 5 previous cases. The petitioners are rowdy elements. If they are released on bail, they will again indulge in similar nature of crime and objects the grant of bail.

6. It is a case and counter case. There was a quarrel between two rowdy groups. In which not only the defacto complainants were injured, but also the vehicles parked nearby were damaged. According to CPP, the petitioner Sathish @ Manga Sathish was detained under Act 14/1982 and he is having 11 previous cases. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the 1st petitioner. As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, though he is having 5 previous cases, he is in custody for more than one month. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 24.6.2021. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody and the damage caused to the vehicle, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner alone subject to the following conditions.

7. Accordingly, the 2nd 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 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 2nd petitioner shall also deposit a sum of Rs.2,500/- to the credit of the crime no. 1051/2021 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 2nd petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(d) the 2nd petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(e) the 2nd 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 2nd petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2nd 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 2nd petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

(8) As far as the 1st petitioner Sathish @ Manga Sathish is concerned, this petition is dismissed since he was detained under Act 14/1982.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11154/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July , 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos. 11280 & 11292/2021

in

D-5 Marina P.S. Crime No. 575/2021

1. Ajith @ Ajithkumar
2. Somu @ Somanathan

.. Petitioners/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021

Vishal

.. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11292/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-5 Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant
in both the petition

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. D. Gopi Krishnan, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, Counsel for the petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021,

M/s. S. Periasamy, M. Kalaiyaran, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11292/2021 and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 575/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that false case has been foisted on the petitioners only for statistical purpose. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioners are in custody from 22.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with othe accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.150/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the arrest of the petitioners is very recent one. The 1st petitioner Ajith in

Crl.M.P.No. 11280/2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11292/2021 Vishal are habitual offenders. Ajith is having 8 previous cases and Vishal is having 9 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. Since the petitioners Ajith and Vishal are having several previous cases, this court is not inclined to grant bail to them at present. However, the petitioner Somu @ Somanathan is concerned, no previous case is reported as against him. He is in custody for the past two weeks. He is aged 20 years. Hence, considering his age and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 viz., Somu @ Somanathan alone subject to the following conditions.

6. Accordingly, the 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their 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 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(e) the 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 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 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 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 2nd petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11280/2021 thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

(7) As far as the petitioners Ajithkumar and Vishal are concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Madurantagam.

v v

Crl.M.P.Nos.11280 & 11292/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11281/2021

in

K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 309/2021

Eli @ Dinesh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 309/2021 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 there was money transaction between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. For which the petitioner taken the motor cycle from the defacto complainant. There is no theft as alleged in the complaint. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody for more than three weeks and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that CCTV footage is also available to connect the petitioner with the crime.
5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for more than three weeks. The petitioner is aged about 20 years. Considering the age of the petitioner, duration of custody and the alleged money transaction between the parties, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(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.11281/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July , 2021

CrI.M.P.Nos. 11283 & 11284/2021

in

D-5 Marina P.S. Crime No. 570/2021

1. Geedhan
2. Johnson
3. Karthick
4. Akbar Ali @ Abu

.. Petitioners/Accused
in CrI.M.P.No.11283/2021

Rajesh @ Kili

.. Petitioner/Accused
in CrI.M.P.No.11284/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-5 Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant
in both the petition

The above petitions are 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 petitioners in both the petitions and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.11283/2021 were arrested on 22.6.2021 and the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11284/2021 was arrested on 28.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 285 @ 147, 148 IPC and Sec. 3 of Explosive Substances Act in Crime No. 570/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent. There was some explosion of the petrol bomb in the playground, for which the petitioners are no way responsible. Nobody was injured. The petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.11283/2021 are in custody from 22.6.2021 and the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11284/2021 is in custody from 28.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that near Nadukuppam Volleyball play ground some petrol bomb was made and thrown in a playground. During the course of investigation, it came to light the present petitioners indulged in making of the bomb and throwing the same. He further submits that the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11284/2021 is having 4 previous cases and other accused has no bad antecedents.

5. It is reported by the CPP that no one sustained injury. Except the petitioner Rajesh @ Kili, other petitioners have no bad antecedents. Considering the age of the petitioners, duration of custody and the fact that nobody was injured, this court is inclined to grant bail to all the petitioners subject to the following conditions.

6. Accordingly, all 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 II 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 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.

(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 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

Copies to :

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Madurantagam.

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11286/2021

in

P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 832/2021

1. Gokulakrishnan (Gokul)
2. Vignesh (Vicky)

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 29.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 832/2021 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 petitioners are innocent. These petitioners were not present at the scene of occurrence. They have been wrongly implicated in this case. The petitioners have no bad antecedents. They are daily wage earners. The petitioners are in custody from 29.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a retaliation attack. On 28.6.2021, quarrel arose between the petitioners and the defacto complainant which ended in assault. For which, these petitioners pre-planned to attack the defacto complainant. The complainant sustained injury and he was admitted in hospital for 3 days as inpatient. Arrest

of the petitioners is very recent one. Investigation is at initial stage. Hence, objects the granting of bail.

5. It is a retaliation attack. Victim had taken 3 days inpatient treatment. The petitioners were arrested only on 29.6.2021. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners 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**

Wednesday, the 7th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 11287/2021

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 199/2021

Prakash @ Gundu Surya

.. Petitioner/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. D. Rathinam, M.K. Bhoopathy Rajan, S. Elankumaran, K. Parimala, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 302 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 199/2021 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 he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner is in custody from 26.5.2021 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 and his associates attacked the victim with deadly weapons. Due to which, the victim died on the spot. He further submits that the name of the petitioner is wrongly mentioned in the petition. Investigation is not yet completed and objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. Investigation is yet to get shape. Considering the gravity of offence, short duration of custody and mistake in the name 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**

Wednesday, the 7th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11289/2021

in

B-2 Esplanade P.S. Crime No. 393/2021

Kuppathuraja

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
B.2, Esplanade Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Nithiyavel, S. Radhakrishnan, 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 307 IPC in Crime No.393/2021 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. Petitioner and the defacto complainant are relatives. Both were intoxicated at the time of occurrence. Since the defacto complainant attacked the petitioner's son, in order to protect his son, this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant. There was no pre-planned attack. He is a physically challenged person. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that during the quarrel between the petitioner and the defacto complainant, this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant with screw driver on his chest.

5. Learned CPP objects granting bail stating that injured was admitted in hospital for 5 days.

6. It is a petty quarrel. Over which, assault was made on the petitioner's son. To protect his son, this petitioner attacked the complainant. No pre-planned intention to do away the complainant. Now, injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody for more than three weeks. Considering the nature of incident and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11289/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11293/2021

in

K-1, Sembium P.S. Crime No.808/2021

Muthu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.D.Prasanna Kumar, A.Divya Bharathi and Ashwini Raman, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.808/2021 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 has nothing to do with the alleged offence. The petitioner was already arrested and released on bail in the previous case. At present he is not involving in any criminal activities. He is in custody from 18.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded Rs.10,000/- from him. On his refusal, they assaulted him with hands and at knife point, they robbed Rs.1,400/- from him. The petitioner is having six previous cases and seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is having six previous cases. As far as this case is concerned, he is in custody from 18.6.2021. Considering the nature of case and antecedents, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11295/2021

in

F-2, Egmore P.S. Crime No.517/2021

1. Araiyaadi @ Shanmugam
2. Suresh

.. Petitioners/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.M.Hussaini Basha, I.Gowri Shankar and Shaik Abu Thahir, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 5.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a) and 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No.517/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1st petitioner is 100 per cent disable person. He was not involved in any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. They are in custody from 5.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the date of arrest is only on 5.7.2021. They are in custody for the past two days. The petitioners were found in possession of 58 quarters bottles. 1st petitioner is having three previous cases and 2nd petitioner is having four previous cases on their credit and objects granting bail.

5. Considering the previous cases and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11297/2021

in

K-2, Aynavaram P.S. Crime No.350/2021

Joseph

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-2, Aynavaram Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 384 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.350/2021 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 has been granted on bail in the previous cases on 15.6.2021 and after furnishing sureties, he was released only on 17.6.2021. Deliberately, this false case has been registered against the petitioner and on the next day, he was arrested by the police wantonly in order to detain him forever.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner robbed Rs.600/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. He is having five previous cases.

5. Considering the representation of the petitioner and sequence of events and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No. 11297/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11298/2021

in

K-10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.544/2021

Manikandan

.. Petitioner/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.G.Ruthra Kumar, S.Yogaraj and G.Renalds Shinto, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 392 of IPC in Crime No.544/2021 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. He is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner along with another accused came in a motor-cycle and snatched cellphone from the defacto complainant.

5. It is a case of snatching of mobile phone by coming in a motor-cycle. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from A1 the property has been recovered and A2, the present petitioner has no connection in the offence. As per the prosecution, two persons came in a motor-cycle and snatched mobile phone. This sort of cases are in the rise. There are possibilities of CCTV footage. Considering the same, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11299/2021

in

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

B.Vignesh

.. 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.G.Ruthra Kumar, S.Yogaraj and G.Renalds Shinto, 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 offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 397, 506(ii) IPC and sec. 3 of TNPPDL Act, 1992 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 the petitioner is innocent. He is no way 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.10748/2021 on 21.6.2021 and Crl.M.P.No.10909/2021, on 24.6.2021 and Crl.M.P.No.11060/2021 on 5.7.2021. 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.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 19 days. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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 Investigating Officer as and when required.

(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.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11299/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.11247/2021

in

P-5, M.K.B.Nagar P.S. Crime No.246/2021

N.Karthik @ Vettu Karthick

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-5, M.K.B.Nagar 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.S.Angamuthu, S.Jayaprakash and A.Shanthi and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.246/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and 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. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with another accused robbed Rs.450/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. The petitioner is having one previous case. The earlier petition was dismissed on 21.6.2021 and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of 397 IPC. The petitioner is having one previous case. Earlier petition was dismissed only on 21.6.2021 and no change of circumstances. Considering the same, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11249/2021

in

P-6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No.871/2021

D.Duglus Prince

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Prabudoss and T.N.Lakshmi Narasimhan and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.871/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the motor-cycle driven by the defacto complainant dashed against the petitioner, over which there was a quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner and others waylaid the defacto complainant and others when they entered their area and assaulted them with knife.

5. No bad antecedents reported. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of case, this court inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the 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. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11249/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11250/2021

in

P-2, Otteri P.S. Crime No.860/2021

1. Sarala.R.
2. Divakar.R.
3. Naren Sri.S

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.V.Kumar and N.Thandayuthabani and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.860/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. Both are relatives. Due to previous enmity, the exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and stones.

5. The alleged weapon used is stone. Dispute between relatives. There are chances for exaggeration. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 X 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 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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-2, Otteri Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11250/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.11253 and 11254 / 2021

in

Crl.M.P.Nos.10670 and 10669/2021

in

CCB Crime No.108/2021

Shivkumar

.. Petitioner in

Crl.M.P.No.11253/2021 / Accused

Sunitha

.. Petitioner in

Crl.M.P.No.11254/2021 / Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB-1 P.S.,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.B.Ganesha Moorthy, A.Regan and B.Gubendran and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.Nos.10670 and 10669/2021, dt: 16.6.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.Nos.10670 and 10669/2021, dated 16.6.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. According to the petitioners' counsel, the 1st petitioner is a lady. The petitioners have complied the condition from 25.6.2021. Investigation is almost completed and prays for relaxation of the condition.
5. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition only for 12 days and seriously objects the petition.

6. It is a grave case of cheating. However, anticipatory bail has been granted. The petitioners have complied the condition only for 12 days. Considering the gravity of offence, this court is not inclined to relax the condition at the earlier stage.

7. The petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11294/2021

in

N-2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.627/2021

1. K.Sarath Kumar

2. V.Vinoth

.. Petitioners/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.D.Jayasekar and R.Vijay, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.627/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the defacto complainant used to canvass with the wife of the 1st petitioner. There was a wordy quarrel between them over the said conduct of the defacto complainant. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners were arrested on 22.6.2021. They are in custody for more than 15 days and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that suspecting the conduct of the defacto complainant, with an intent to murder him, he has been assaulted by the petitioners with knife. It is a case of 307 IPC. The 2nd petitioner is having five previous cases and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the complaint and other records, it appears the dispute is over contacting the 1st petitioner's wife by the defacto complainant through mobile during night hours. So, there are chances for the assault due to the conduct of the defacto complainant. Similarly, chances for exaggeration in the hands of the defacto complainant. The A.R. copy

available in the C.D. would go to show a deep cut injury on the palm and laceration on the occipital region. Anyhow, the petitioners are in custody for about 15 days. The defacto complainant invited trouble due to his own conduct of contacting the 1st petitioner's wife through mobile. There are chances for implicating the 2nd petitioner unnecessarily. Considering the duration of custody and nature of injury inflicted, this court is inclined to grant bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing 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 learned XVI 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 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 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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No. 11294/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Wednesday, the 7th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11184/2021

in

R-7, K.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No.393/2021

S.Sarath @ Sarath Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 452, 294(b), 324, 307 of IPC in Crime No.393/2021 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 was arrested on 22.6.2021. There was a wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that since the defacto complainant and others objected consuming alcohol in the Hostel of Surya Hospital, the petitioner voluntarily caused hurt with deadly weapon on three persons and objects granting bail.
5. The petitioner is no way connected with the said Hostel. The injured are the inmates of the Hostel. Since they objected consuming alcohol in the premises of the Hostel, it appears the petitioner assaulted three persons. All of them sustained injuries. The injuries sustained by Manoj Shetti and Pappu Mandal, prima facie, appears to be severe in nature. Except the reasons stated so, no other motive behind the complaint. Considering the number of persons injured and the nature of offence and the reason for assault, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

ss