

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21301/2021**

**in**

**D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 305/2021**

Vinoth

.. Petitioner/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. M. Rajavelu, R. Raghavel, S. Sarala, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was formally arrested on 12.11.2021 under PT Warrant for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 325, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 305/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was originally arrested on 28.10.2021 in another crime no. 407/2021 and in this case, he was formally arrested under PT Warrant on 12.11.2021. Injured sustained simple injury. Co-accused were already granted bail and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner along with other accused demanded money from the defacto complainant to buy drug tablets. On his refusal, they attacked the complainant using hands and caused injury to him.
5. According to CPP, it is a case of 307 IPC. This petitioner is a habitual offender and having 14 previous cases. However, according to him, victim sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient and that co-accused were already granted bail by this court.

6. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he was formally arrested on 12.11.2021. He was originally arrested on 28.10.2021 in another crime number. Injury appears to be simple in nature. 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.

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 II 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.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:17:09 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 21301/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21302/2021**

**in**

**E-1 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 1128/2021**

Vasikaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Ganesh Pandian, A. Shabanal, M. Mohamad Yusuff, M. Nandagopal, C. Prabakar, K.N. Paridhi Arasu, U. Mohamed Siddque deen, S. Selva Dass, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1128/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is aged 18 years. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 6.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed his chain worth Rs.3000/-.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 2 previous cases.

6. The petitioner is in custody for the past one month. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 2 previous cases. However, considering the age 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 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 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.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date: 2021.12.07  
15:17:16 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 21302/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21686/2021**

**in**

**K-2 Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No. 668/2021**

Manishkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. U. Yuvaraj, M. Elayakumar, A. Vinothkumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 668/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 22.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.2500/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

6. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past two weeks. Considering 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 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 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.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:17:24 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai. (Now admitted at Govt. Stanley hospital (Convict Ward).

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 21686/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21759/2021**

**in**

**AWPS, Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 7/2021**

Deepan Chakravarthy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station,  
Washermenpet,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 417, 376 and 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 7/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner and defacto complainant loved each other. But, the parent of the defacto complainant refused to marry her to this petitioner since he is not in equal status of their family and he is not belonging to their caste. Hence, this petitioner's family performed his marriage with another girl in the month of May. Thereafter, this complaint has been lodged against him. The petitioner is in custody from 18.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner had sexual relationship with the defacto complainant on several occasions under false promise that he will marry her. Thereafter, refused to marry her. Subsequently, married another girl. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, it is a case of 376 IPC. The arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Investigation is not yet completed and objects the grant of bail.

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

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:17:31 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21775/2021**

**in**

**R-3 Ashok Nagar P.S. Crime No. 491/2021**

Kannan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-3 Ashok Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. Venugopal, Ck. Karthikeyan, V. Senthil, A. Prema, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 506(ii) and 307 IPC in Crime No. 491/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Since this petitioner is friend of A1, he has been falsely implicated in this case. This petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. He is in custody for the past 10 days and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the victim indiscriminately using deadly weapons and caused grievous injury to him.

5. The photograph produced by the learned CPP would go to show the serious nature of injury sustained by the victim. The petitioner is in custody only 10 days. Investigation is at budding stage. Considering the short duration of custody, nature of

injury sustained by the victim and stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date: 2021.12.07  
15:17:39 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

vv

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21915/2021**

**in**

**K-9 Thiru Vi Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 1161/2021**

Gokulakrishnan

.. 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. K. Yuvaraj, M. Gurumoorthy, D. Yuvarajan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1161/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is aged 20 years. This petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 22.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.2500/- from him at knife point.
5. According to CPP, this petitioner has no bad antecedents.
6. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. No previous case is reported against him. Considering the age 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 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.

(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.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date: 2021.12.07  
15:17:47 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 21915/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21918/2021**

**in**

**TIW-Adyar P.S. Crime No. 474/2021**

T. Hariharasudhan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
TIW-Adyar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. I.S. Samuel, V. Ramachandramoorthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 279, 338, 308 of IPC and 185 of M.V. Act 1988 in Crime No. 474/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner drove the vehicle in a normal speed. Due to negligence act of the victim, the accident had occurred. The victim sustained only simple injury and he was discharged from the hospital. This petitioner is in custody from 29.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, it is a case of drunken driving. This petitioner drove his vehicle in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and dashed against the defacto complainant's bike. Due to which, the complainant sustained injury. He further submits that arrest of the petitioner is very recent one and investigation is at budding stage. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

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

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:17:54 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21925/2021**

**in**

**R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 1036/2021**

Muthukumar

.. 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. S. Palanivel, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1036/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. In fact, the defacto complainant himself waylaid the petitioner on 22.10.2021 in a drunken state and assaulted him. When the petitioner questioned him on the next day, there was a mishap. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 24.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, due to previous motive, this petitioner along with others attacked the complainant using deadly weapons and caused multiple injuries all over his body.

5. Learned CPP produced the A.R. copy for perusal. On perusal of the same, it would go to show that the defacto complainant sustained following injuries. (1) Multiple laceration left and right wrist frontal skull fracture (2) Left Ulna fracture – K Wire fixation, Left ulna artery/ulna nerve repair/tendon repair. The above said injuries would go to show the severe nature of injury sustained by the victim. According to CPP, the petitioner was arrested only on 24.11.2021. Investigation is at budding stage. Considering the nature of injuries inflicted, stage of the investigation and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR

Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:18:02 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21928/2021**

**in**

**D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 502/2021**

Harish

.. Petitioner/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. M. Rajavelu, S. Sarala, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.502/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 11.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that, this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him for consuming alcohol. On his refusal, the accused forcibly snatched Rs.500/- from him at knife point.
5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 5 previous cases.

6. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past 56 days. 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 II 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.

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:18:10 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 21928/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.20801/2021**

**in**

**K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.not known of 2021**

K. Kalai Selvan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

1. State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,  
K.10, Koyambedu Police Station,  
Chennai – 600 107.

..Respondent/Complainant.

2. Karuppiah @ Annamalai

3. Selvam @ Selvaraj

.. Defacto Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T.S. Kani, P. Karunakaran, M.K. Sadhana, 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. 420 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, petition enquiry was conducted and closed. As on date no case is pending against the petitioner. Hence, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:18:18 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21872/2021**

**in**

**W.1, AWPS-Thousand Lights Cr.No.not known of 2021**

A. Nevil

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W-1, AWPS Thousand Lights  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Dinesh, T. Kanchana, T. Bilal Hushain, 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. 498, 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, petition enquiry was conducted and closed. As on date no case is pending against the petitioner. Hence, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:18:25  
+0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.21873/2021**

**in**

**B.1, North Beach P.S. Cr.No.1584/2021**

1. N. Feroze Ibrahim @ Feroze Khan
2. Sella Kani @ H. Mohamed Mohideen
3. Vickey @ Vigenesh @ Vignesh Chakkravarthy .. Petitioners/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. N. Prabhakaran, K. Sarathkumar, N. Nallamuniappan, 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. 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.1584/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner and the defacto complainant are doing business at Burma Bazaar. There was a wordy quarrel. Due to business rivalry an exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. Petty quarrel between the parties. No deadly weapon has been used in the assault. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. 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 VII 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. for two weeks.

[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.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:18:34 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, B1, North Beach P.S. Chennai.

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.21873/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.21499, 21500, 21501 and 21502/2021**

in

**V-5, Thirumangalam P.S. Crime No.685/2021**

M.Akash	.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.21499/2021 / Accused
C.Sathish	.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.21500/2021 / Accused
M.Prakash	.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.21501/2021 / Accused
M.Appu @ Madhavan	.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.21502/2021 / Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

For petitioners in all the petitions – M/s.S.Kingston Jerold and H.Radha Krishnan

For respondent – City Public Prosecutor.

These petitions coming on this day for hearing, upon hearing the above said counsels, this court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 506(ii) of IPC altered to 294(b), 324, 302 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.685/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. The injured fell down and sustained injuries. He died after 10 days. The murder is not intended. No offence u/s 302 IPC is made out. Further, the petitioners are young boys and aged about 20. They are in custody for three weeks and prays for bail.

3. On perusal of the records, it appears, admittedly there was a quarrel between two groups near V.R.Mahal. According to the petitioners, there was no intention to commit murder. However, due to the assault, the deceased sustained injuries and succumbed to the injuries after 10 days. Even 302 IPC is not made out and 302(ii) IPC has been attracted. A valuable life has been lost. Earlier petitions were dismissed on 23.11.2021. There is no change of circumstances. Considering the death of a young boy, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

4. Petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally  
signed by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:18:41  
+0530

SS

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21929/2021**

in

**G-1, Vepery P.S. Crime No.893/2021**

P.Sivakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-1, Vepery Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.K.A.Mariappan and G.M.Ananthakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 80, 81 and 87 of Juvenile Justice (Care & Protection) Act, 2015 in Crime No.893/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner intended to adopt a child since he had no issues after 13 years of marriage. So, he ventured upon taking a child on adoption with the consent of the natural mother. The petitioner had not dealt with child. Due to affection, he tried to adopt the child before the adoption proceedings. He has been arrested and in custody for 10 days and prays for bail.

3. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the petitioner and his wife had no issues even after 13 years of marriage. So, there are chances for taking a child for adoption. Taking advantage of their need, the other accused exploited the situation and handed over the child to the petitioner's family, which came to light later on. Anyhow, there is a bonafide intention on the part of the petitioner to adopt a child. He is not dealt with the child for any other purpose. It is submitted that he is not aware of the new adoption procedure. He is of the bonafide belief that the consent of the mother is enough. Considering such representation and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

4. 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 II 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. R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date: 2021.12.07  
15:18:49 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copy to :

1. The learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Ponneri.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.21929/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21924/2021**

in

**K-11, CMBT P.S. Crime No.580/2021**

Jayakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-11, C.M.B.T. Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 392 of IPC in Crime No.580/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's father died on 6.12.2021 and he has to attend the funeral and seeks for bail. He also produced the copy of death report.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP has not raised any objection.

4. Considering the reason that the petitioner's father died and he has to attend the funeral, this court is inclined to grant bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a own bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) before the Superintendent of Central Prison, Puzhal and on further condition that

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

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

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

(d) 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today. R  
SELVAKUMAR

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
15:18:56 +0530

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.21924/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21919/2021**

in

**T.P.Chathiram P.S. Crime No.298/2021**

V.Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 28.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 385, 507, 509, 506(ii), 354(c) of IPC and Sec.4 of Tamilnadu Prohibition of Women Harassment Act, 2002 and u/s 67 of Information Technology Act in Crime No.298/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. In fact somebody calling from foreign mobile number +1 (567) 303-3369 sending the obscene photographs of the defacto complainant's daughter and demanding money. The petitioner happens to be the family friend of defacto complainant, he had been asked to intervene in this matter. In fact, he had contacted the unknown person to resolve the issue. However, the prosecution falsely fixed the present petitioner in this crime. In fact, he had forwarded the message received by him from the unknown person to the defacto complainant. Without proper examination of facts, the prosecution arrested the petitioner. He is in custody for about 10 days and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submitted the C.D. and submits that the petitioner alone sent the messages from the above said number by using his Laptop and mobile phone. During the course of investigation, it came to light that he is the real culprit.

Though he is the family friend of the defacto complainant, he sent the obscene photos of the defacto complainant's daughter to the defacto complainant stating that he is having so many clippings of her daughter, he would upload the same in the internet, to avoid the same, he demanded huge money etc.

4. On perusal of the C.D., there is a confession, IP address and IMEI number linking the accused with the crime. He came to India for a short term. In fact, he is settled at U.S.A. It appears there was some money transaction between the petitioner and defacto complainant and motive as well. However, the modesty of the unmarried woman was put into gambling. We cannot suspect the defacto complainant to involve in such a crime falsely. He is in custody only for 10 days. Considering the short duration of custody and chances for absconding, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Digitally signed  
by R  
SELVAKUMAR  
Date:  
2021.12.07  
17:30:13 +0530

ss

**Principal Sessions Judge.**