

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11013/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 885/2021

Ponnarasan

.. 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. K. Suresh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 336, 341, 392, 397, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 885/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him with an ulterior motive. The petitioner is in custody from 23.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A6 along with five other accused came in a two wheeler and demanded money from the complainant when he was unloading the goods from his vehicle. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.1800/- from the defacto complainant at knife point and also caused damage to the side mirrors of the defacto complainant's goods vehicle . He further submits that A1 and this

petitioner alone arrested. Other accused are at large. This petitioner is having one previous case and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the conduct of the petitioner, co-accused are still at large and that investigation is not yet completed, 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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11232/2021

in

D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 343/2021

Prasad

.. 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, upon hearing M/s. C. Vimal Kumar, S. Devan, K. Ganesan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 452, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 343/2021 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 sudden provocation, this petitioner attacked the complainant. There is no motive for the attack. Victim was discharged from the hospital on the same day. This petitioner's wife is on family way and she has been admitted in hospital for delivery. Except, this petitioner, no one has to take care of her. This petitioner is in custody from 3.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity between this petitioner and the defacto complainant, this petitioner along with other accused trespassed into the defacto complainant's house at midnight 2.30 p.m. and attacked him with knife. Due to which, the complainant sustained cut injury on his neck, shoulder, left hand fingers and back side and admitted to hospital for treatment. He further submits that

arrest of the petitioner is very recent one and that investigation is at an early stage and objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it appears that on earlier occasion, this petitioner and the defacto complainant jointly consumed liquor. At that time, the defacto complainant abused this petitioner's wife and mother in filthy language. Over which, this petitioner developed enmity against him and with intention to eliminate the complainant, entered into the complainant's house on 3.7.2021, at midnight 2.30 p.m. and attacked him using knife and caused multiple cut injuries on his neck, shoulder, fingers and backside of the body. Victim was taken to hospital and he has been given treatment and also sutures were made. The petitioner was arrested only on 3.7.2021. Investigation is at budding stage. In the above said circumstances, 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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11290/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 693/2021

1. M. Karthick@ Karthickraja
2. J. Aadhi @ Aadhitya

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. J. Senthamilarasu, V. Selvam, 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), 341, 397, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 693/2021 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 these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 29.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money for consuming liquor. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.1200/- from his shirt pocket at knife point. He further submits that the petitioners were arrested only recently. The 1st petitioner is having 12 previous cases and

the 2nd petitioner is having 3 previous cases. Except those cases, today, they have moved two bail applications. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the antecedents of the petitioners and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to them 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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11291/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 694/2021

1. M. Karthick@ Karthickraja
2. J. Aadhi @ Aadhitya

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. J. Senthamilarasu, V. Selvam, 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), 341, 397, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 694/2021 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 these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 29.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant's auto and demanded money from him. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.750/- from his shirt pocket at knife point. He further submits that the petitioners were arrested only recently. The 1st petitioner is having 12 previous cases and the

2nd petitioner is having 3 previous cases. Except those cases, today, they have moved two bail applications. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the antecedents of the petitioners and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to them 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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11343/2021

in

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

Sankar

.. 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. Raja, A. Rajagopalan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.6.2021 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. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 7.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody for the past one month 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. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 7.7.2021. 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. 11343/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11345/2021

in

V-1 Villivakkam P.S. Crime No. 640/2021

1. Then Raj
2. Ram Prabhakar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 5.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 24(1) of COTP Act r/w 328 IPC in Crime No. 640/2021 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 these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 5.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during vehicle checkup, the police found that these petitioners were found in possession of banned tobacco products (240 packets) for sale. He further submits that each petitioner is having 5 previous cases and seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, possession of banned tobacco products with the petitioners at the time of search made by the police, antecedents of the petitioners and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to them 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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11348/2021

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 909/2021

Jakki @ Vijay

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K. Anand, S. Ambedkar, Y. David Girubakaran, 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 294(b), 394, 506(ii) r/w 397 IPC in Crime No. 909/2021 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 by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose since he is having some previous cases. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 3.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused demanded money from the defacto complainant for consuming liquor. On his refusal, the accused attacked him with knife on his head and robbed Rs.900/- from him at knife point. According to CPP, the petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 6

previous cases. If he is released on bail, again he will indulge in similar nature of crime and objects the grant of bail.

5. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 3.7.2021 on the ground that he is having more previous cases. Within four days, again, this bail application is filed. No change in circumstances was reported after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Considering the above facts and antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11349/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 725/2021

Muthu @ M. Surya

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-5 MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 725/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has no specific overt act in the alleged occurrence. As per the FIR, this petitioner kicked the complainant using legs. He has not used any deadly weapon. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail. The petitioner is in custody for the past one month and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 4 accused involved in this case and this petitioner is A4. There was wordy quarrel between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. In the melee, all the accused joined together and attacked the defacto complainant using knife and caused injury on his head and hand. Injured was admitted to hospital and he had taken 3 days inpatient treatment and thereafter discharged.

5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. Injured was discharged from the hospital after 3 days treatment. As per the FIR, the overtact attributed as against this petitioner is that he kicked the defacto complainant using legs. He did not use any deadly weapon. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021. Considering the overtact as against the petitioner and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(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. 11349/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11350/2021

in

P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 753/2021

1. Ajay
2. Sanjay
3. Saranraj @ Chinnapaiyan

.. 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. S. Muralidharan, U. Yuvaraj, M. Elayakumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The 1st petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 and 2nd and 3rd petitioners, who were arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section Sec.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.753/2021 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 petitioners 1 and 2 are sons and 3rd petitioner is the son-in-law of one Lodangu Mari. Since Lodangu Mari is having some previous cases, deliberately, the police registered this false case and remanded the petitioners to custody. He further submits that Lodangu Mari was arrested in this case. In order to secure him alone, these petitioners were implicated in this case. They are in custody for more than 15 days and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners voluntarily without any reasonable cause, assaulted the victim and caused severe injury on his head and these petitioners are having one previous case and objects granting bail.

5. According to counsel for the petitioners, in order to secure Lodangu Mari, who is the father of the 1st and 2nd petitioners and father-in-law of the 3rd petitioner herein, the respondent police falsely implicated these petitioners in this case. It is reported that now, the prime accused Lodangu Mari was arrested in this case. The petitioners are in custody for more than 15 days. Considering all the above facts, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11350/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11354/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 394/2021

Thanika @ Thanikaivel

.. 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. 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 7.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 427, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 394/2021 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 by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose since he is having some previous cases. No such occurrence had occurred as narrated in the FIR. As per Covid-19 guidelines, no shops are permitted to be open after 9.00 p.m. Whereas, as per the FIR occurrence took place at 10.00 p.m. That itself would go to show the falsity of the case. The petitioner is in custody from 28.6.2021. But, in the petition due to typographical error, it was wrongly typed as 7.7.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that on 19.6.2021, at about 10.00 p.m. this petitioner along with two other accused demanded money from the defacto complainant who was selling food items in his push cart at road side. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.1200/- from him at knife point also hurled cool drinks bottles on the road from nearby shop. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 21 previous cases at his credit. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of crime and seriously objects the grant of bail.

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

6. Hence, 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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11355/2021

in

K-8 Arumbakkam P.S. Crime No. 866/2021

S. Arokia Rooban

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-8 Arumbakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing 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 24.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 307 and 302 IPC in Crime No. 866/2021 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 and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He was not staying in the Gold Guest House. This petitioner received a phone call from his brother-in-law who stayed with his friends in the said guest house stating that his adjacent room persons are quarrelling with them and they threatening to kill his brother-in-law and his friends. This petitioner went to the scene of occurrence. Before, he went there, quarrel was over. Only because he was also present in the CCTV footage. Therefore, he was implicated in this case. He has no previous motive. This petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 24.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that there was a clash between two groups who stayed in the adjacent rooms in the Gold Guest House. In pursuance of the same, when the defacto complainant and his friends came out of the guest house, this petitioner and his friends started to attack the defacto complainant and his friends. In the melee, the accused attacked one Badrish(now deceased) with hallow block stone on the head and he died in the hospital due to the head injury. Learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that it is a recent arrest and investigation is at the budding stage.

5. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner went to the scene of occurrence as per his brother-in-law's request and before that the quarrel was over. Because of his presence in the scene of occurrence, based on the CCTV footage, he has been implicated in this case. Which is the subject matter to be decided at the time of trial. Prima facie, death has been caused due to the assault made by the accused and his friends. It is a case of 302 IPC. A valuable life has been lost. The petitioner was arrested only on 24.6.2021. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that investigation is at budding stage, 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
Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.11197/2021

in

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

Gnanaprakash @ Bra

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-5, Marina Beach 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.D.Umashankar and R.Vasanthi 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), 323, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.575/2021 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 three other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.150/- from him at knife point. The petitioner is having two previous cases and thus, seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of 397 IPC. The petitioner is having two previous cases according to prosecution. Considering the nature of case and antecedents, 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

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11248/2021

in

H-5, New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

1. M.Jayachandran

2. R.Anandraja

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.Mohan, E.Venkatesan and M.Premkumar 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), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, petition was enquired and closed.

4. Considering the representation of the CPP, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.11300/2021

in

R-7, K.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No.397/2021

Dhina

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Balasubramanian, K.Boopathy, S.V.Badriah and N.Varuni 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, 341 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.397/2021 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 the defacto complainant's wife's relative. There was matrimonial dispute between the defacto complainant and his wife. Due to which, the present complaint has been given against the petitioner. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. He apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is the relative of defacto complainant's wife. There was misunderstanding between the defacto complainant and his wife. On the occurrence day, the petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant with knife and caused injuries to him. The injured was admitted in the hospital for five days and discharged. The petitioner is having one previous case.

5. Matrimonial dispute between defacto complainant and his wife. The present petitioner is the relative of the wife. There was quarrel over the dispute, in which the defacto complainant was alleged to have been assaulted. The injured was discharged from the hospital. Considering the above aspects, this court is 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 XXIII 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R-7, K.K.Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11300/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11301/2021

in

R-6, Kumaran Nagar P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

R.M.Sriram

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-6, Kumaran Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.Vittaldev Priya, A.Santhosh Kumar and M.Kavitha 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), 506(ii) and 441 of IPC in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, matter was compromised in the police station and petition was closed.
4. Considering the representation of CPP, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.11302/2021

in

P-5, M.K.B.Nagar P.S. Crime No.870/2021

1. Devi

2. Murugan

.. Petitioners/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.B.Kalaiarasan and R.Surendar Kumar 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 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.870/2021 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 there was matrimonial dispute between 1st petitioner and defacto complainant's son. The 2nd petitioner is the brother of the 1st petitioner. The petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged. They apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the 1st petitioner married the defacto complainant's son and later due to misunderstanding they have separated. The defacto complainant's son married another girl. Due to the said enmity, during the death procession of 1st petitioner's mother, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant and her son.

5. There was matrimonial dispute between the defacto complainant's son and 1st petitioner. There are chances for exaggeration. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the same, 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 V 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P-5, M.K.B.Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11302/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11303/2021

in

W-18, A.W. P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

D.Dhinakaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.K.Bommuraj, V.Karthick and S.Raj 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 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, no case and no F.I.R. is pending against the petitioner before the respondent police.
4. Considering the representation of CPP, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today.

ss

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No.11305/2021

in

W-10, A.W. P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

Mohamed Ashik

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-10, All Women Police Station,
Flower Bazaar,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.N.Md.Imran Khan and K.Velayutha Raja 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), 506(i) of IPC and u/s 4 of Tamil Nadu Women Harassment Act in Crime No.Not known/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. According to CPP, F.I.R. has been registered in Cr.No.5/2021.

4. Considering the representation of CPP, this petition is dismissed with liberty to file fresh petition with crime number.

Delivered by me today.

ss

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.11310/2021

in

K-10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.602/2021

K.Hemanathan

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.D.Gopi Krishnan, J.Tamil Kudimagan, U.Yuvaraj and A.Vinoth Kumar 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 147, 148, 427 of IPC r/w Section 3 of TNPPDL Act in Crime No.602/2021 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 four others went to the house of the defacto complainant and damaged his Royal Enfield two-wheeler and Honda City Car and also one Auto belonged to his neighbour. The occurrence was captured in the CCTV camera and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Three vehicles were damaged by the petitioner and others. According to the complaint, CCTV footage is available for the occurrence. Considering the nature of offence and damage caused to the vehicles, 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

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11306/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.8229/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.4466/2021

in

Crime No.314/2020

Mani @ Deivasigamani

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.P.K.Murali and N.Loganathan and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8229/2021, dt: 27.4.2021.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.4466/2021, dated 26.3.2021 for the offences u/s 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w 34 and 109 of IPC with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.8229/2021, dated 27.4.2021, the above condition was modified and the petitioner was directed to appear before the respondent police once in a week, on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 3.5.2021 to 5.7.2021.

5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 10 weeks after modification. Considering the nature of case and the number of weeks complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed. The petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent police as and when required.

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11307/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.10831/2021

in

Crime No.645/2021

1. Murugan

2. Mani @ Manikandan

.. Petitioners/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.R.Muthukumar, R.Lingakumar and J.Sakthivel and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10831/2021, dt: 21.6.2021.

2. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10831/2021, dated 21.6.2021 for the offences u/s 188, 269, 273, 328 of IPC and Sec.24(1) of COTP Act with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition for 12 days.

5. The petitioners have complied the condition for 12 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed.

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

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11308/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.6367/2021

in

Crime No.32/2021

Anusukumar

.. 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 the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Suresh, G.Vinodhkumar and V.Saravanan and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.6367/2021, dt: 8.4.2021.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.6367/2021, dated 8.4.2021 for the offences u/s 304(B) IPC with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for 87 days.

5. The petitioner has complied the condition for 87 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

6. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed.

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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11285/2021

in

J-7, Velachery P.S. Crime No.772/2021

Murugan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-7, Velachery Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s.T.V.G.Kartheeban, T.Vivekandan, R.M.Gokulakrishnan, R.Vinithra and M.Jayanthi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 436, 506(i) IPC r/w 3(1) of TNPPDL Act, 1992 and Sec.4 of TNPHW Act, 2002 in Crime No.772/2021 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 a Driver. The petitioner and defacto complainant had illegal affair. Thereafter, she developed affair with another person. When it came to the knowledge of the petitioner, he made an attempt to commit suicide and sustained injuries. He also filed medical records to show the injuries. However, as per the medical records, there is no injury to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner tried to sexually abuse the defacto complainant and there was quarrel between them. Due to said dispute, the petitioner set fire to the defacto complainant's house and caused damage to the tune of Rs.65,000/- The petitioner was arrested recently and thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner was arrested only on 27.6.2021. Considering the damage caused to the defacto complainant's house and 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
Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.**

CrI.M.P.No.11195/2021

and

CrI.M.P.No.11356/2021

(Intervene Petition)

in

V-4, Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No.635/2021

1. Johnson
2. J.Bhuvaneshwari

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V-4, Rajamangalam 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.Sambamurthy, V.Pichaimuthu, Muthukumar and P.Gomathi and CPP for respondent and M/s.K.Purushothaman and V.Manopriya, Counsel for the intervener, 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), 342, 324 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.635/2021 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 defacto complainant sexually abused the daughter of the 2nd petitioner, over which, there was a complaint under the POCSO Act. He has been arrested and remanded to custody. As a counter-blast, this case has been given. There was no such occurrence as alleged in the complaint. The defacto complainant was a tenant under the 2nd petitioner. There was some dispute over repayment of advance amount. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the intervener and CPP submit that there was an occurrence, in which the defacto complainant has been assaulted and threatened and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the records submitted by the petitioner and intervener, it appears on 25.6.2021, a case was registered against the defacto complainant Pandian at the instance of the 2nd petitioner herein as if he sexually abused her minor daughter. Even in the said complaint, it has been stated that when she tried to catch-hold of the defacto complainant Pandian with the help of Johnson while he tried to escape, he sustained injury by falling down etc. It appears as per the said complaint, Pandian @ Sellaru Pandian was arrested and now he is in custody in Saidapet Jail. This complaint was lodged on 24.6.2021 at 12.30 p.m. before Rajamangalam Police Station. There are chances of lodging complaint as a counter-blast to the complaint filed by the 2nd petitioner against defacto complainant in Cr.No.4/2021 before All Women Police Station, Villivakkam. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Being a close relatives of the victim minor girl, there are chances for exercising force over the defacto complainant. 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 XIII 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 XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11195/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11146/2021

in

C-2, Elephant Gate P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

Parasmal Lunawat

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C-2, Elephant Gate Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.J.Nissar Ahmed and M.G.Nithieshwaran 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 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.Not known/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 an Auto Financier. The defacto complainant obtained finance from him and there is default in repayment of EMI. Due to the said motive, a false complaint has been given as if the petitioner is threatening the defacto complainant. He apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant got finance from the petitioner for nearly six Autos. There was some amount to be paid. In 2018, one of the Auto financed by the petitioner met with an accident. At that time, it came to light that the insurance policy provided by the petitioner on receiving premium amount is a bogus one. In connection with that he has given a complaint for issuing bogus policy. Without appearing for enquiry, the petitioner filed the present petition for anticipatory bail. Preliminary investigation is going on. So far, no case has been registered and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., no complaint has been given by the defacto complainant attracting Sec.506(ii) IPC. On the other hand, the complaint has been given about the fraudulent issuance of bogus insurance policy by the Financier, the petitioner herein. Since preliminary investigation is not yet completed and the role of the petitioner has not been ascertained, 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**

Thursday, the 8th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11296/2021

in

V-4, Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No.617/2021

Sam Prakash

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 395, 458 and 511 of IPC in Crime No.617/2021 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 no way connected with the occurrence. No doubt, there was an occurrence of dacoity in the defacto complainant's house on 19.6.2021. As per the complaint, about five persons entered into the house and committed the offence by tying down the defacto complainant. On the other hand, 10 persons were roped as accused and the petitioner was also arrested and remanded to custody. He is not an identified accused. He is a Law Student, doing his B.L. and he has been falsely implicated in this case due to enmity of the defacto complainant's father Krishnan with the petitioner and prays for bail. He also filed the copy of the Law College Identity Card for perusal of the court.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 395 IPC. The accused all conspired together and planned to commit dacoity in the defacto complainant's house. Five persons entered into the house by wearing mask to conceal their identity. When the defacto complainant, aged about 16, a minor girl, was alone, she has been tied to the chair and her mouth was closed by cello-tape. Thereafter, the persons came to the house searched for the amount. Having smelt the arrival of some other persons, they escaped with the looted amount. As such, the complaint was lodged. Though the present petitioner not entered into the house, he is the brain behind the crime. The petitioner and others hatched a plan to commit dacoity in the house of the defacto complainant. By watching the movement of the adult members and availability of sufficient amount in the house, they entered into action. The petitioner controlled the entire episode by keeping himself away. From the confession of the other accused, it came to light that the petitioner and others are behind the crime. So, all of them were roped in this case. He also submits the C.D. for perusal.

5. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was some enmity between the petitioner and defacto complainant's father Krishnan, no material has been placed. As per the complaint, the defacto complainant's father Krishnan owning 52 Shops at Raghavendra Vegetable Market, Villivakkam. It does not mean that there was some problem with the petitioner. There is no reasonable story put forward before the court to conclude as if there was enmity between the defacto complainant's father and petitioner and he unnecessarily roped the petitioner into the case. Investigation is at the budding stage. Considering the gravity of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

6. Petition dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge