

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.11684/2022

in

CCB Crime No.112/2022

Suresh Kumar @ Daniel

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120 B r/w. 34 of IPC in Crime No.112/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been arrayed as A10 in this case. Petitioner is only an employee of the GPR Resources Pvt. Ltd., Using the petitioner's name and his ID proof, the accused have started a company without his knowledge. The petitioner is noway connected with the transactions of the said company. He has been made as a scape goat. Petitioner is not a beneficiary of the crime proceeds. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2022 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 17 accused involved in this case. This petitioner, the Director of M/s. Revolv International Pvt. Ltd., has been arrayed as A10. A9 is M/s. GPR Resources Pvt. Ltd., A12 is M/s. Revolv International

Pvt. Ltd., and A13 is M/s. Zapo Tribros International Pvt. Ltd.,. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant company, M/s. VPC Freight Forwarders Pvt., Ltd., is providing freight forwarding services. A6/Gokulnath, representative of the company GPR Resources Pvt. Ltd., approached the defacto complainant company for providing their services and on a meeting with the Director and other delegatories of the company, they have agreed to make payment after the service is provided for each shipment. Initially, the defacto complainant provided export related services and thereafter, they were asked to provide import related services. A9, M/s. GPR Resources company requested the defacto complainant to engage the service of M/s. Revolv International Pvt. Ltd.,(A12) for the export shipping orders and for the import orders to engage M/s. Zapo Tribros International Pvt. Ltd.,(A15). Initially, the amount paid in advance to A12 and A15 companies were received from A9 company. Having trust over the transactions of the said companies, the defacto complainant invested huge amount by way of export and import orders, there was a huge outstanding amount to the tune of Rs.2,02,42,538/- from the GPR company and the cheques issued by them were also dishonoured. On verification it came to light that the office of the A9 company found locked and A12 and A15 companies are fake companies created only for carrying out this fraud. The shipment documents provided to the defacto complainant are fake and forged documents and there was no shipment of cargo and they fraudulently made the defacto complainant to pay huge money and swindled the same. This petitioner and other accused associated with the above said companies have colluded together to defraud the defacto company and cheated them. Apart from the GPR Resources company, the other sister companies are also involved in the similar scam. Based on the complaint, FIR has been registered. Learned CPP further submits that this petitioner, Director of A12 company is one of the main accused. He is also involved in yet another case of similar nature. So far 12 complaints have been received. Investigation is pending and other accused involved in the scam are yet to be identified and secured. Thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a grave case of forgery and cheating. The petitioner is the Director of A12 company, which is a non-existing company. This petitioner along with other accused colluded with each other defrauded the defacto complainant and made them to invest huge

amount by way of import and export bookings for no shipment of cargo based on the forged documents furnished by the accused. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is also involved in another case of similar nature. Investigation is pending and the co-accused are yet to be secured and the documents related to this crime are yet to be collected. Considering the grave nature of offence, the quantum of amount involved in this case, the allegation against the petitioner and the stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.11794/2022

in

E.3, Teynampet P.S. Crime No.234/2022

B. Saruhasan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Ashok Kumar, P. Parthiban, A.L. Nagarajan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.234/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 3.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's petty shop and demanded money under threat, that on his refusal, the accused had robbed Rs.600/- from him at knife point. Investigation is pending and amount has not yet been recovered. He further submits that the petitioner is having 4 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 13 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody and

only 4 previous cases are reported against the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on 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 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 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11794/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.11804/2022

in

N.1, Royapuram P.S., Crime No.299/2022

Dilibabu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N.1, Royapuram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC in Crime No.299/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is an Auto Driver. On the date of occurrence, some persons hired his auto to drop them to their destination. Later he came to know that the persons who travelled in his auto have committed the offence. This petitioner is noway related to the said persons. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 15.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused attacked the deceased with knife and murdered him. The petitioner is having previous cases. He further submits that the petitioner has been detained under Act 14 of

1982 vide order dated 13.7.2022 in BCDFGISSSV No.196/2022 and thus seriously objects grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been detained under Act 14 of 1982 and objection of learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.11919/2022

in

K.3, Aminjikai P.S. Crime No.257/2022

Ajith @ Chappa Ajith

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K.3, Aminjikai Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 302 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.257/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. This petitioner was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. The entire sequence of crime recorded in the CCTV footage on the spot of the crime has been retrieved by the respondent police and the role of the petitioner is nowhere to be found. The motive is between the deceased and A1. A1 to A4 alone attacked the deceased with deadly weapon. This petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. Based on the confession statement of co-accused, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Even as per the prosecution, the only allegation against this petitioner is that he informed the movements of the deceased to other accused. A9 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, Madras and A6 was granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 18.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to business rivalry, this petitioner/A5, along with other accused hatched a criminal conspiracy to eliminate the victim. In continuation of that, they chased the victim in a two wheeler and brutally attacked him using deadly weapons and caused multiple grievous injuries all over his body and due to which, the victim died in the hospital. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, it is a preplanned murder. This petitioner/A5 informed the other accused about the movement of the victim and facilitated them to commit murder. The murder was took place at 1.30 p.m. in the broad day light. 4 knives, Car which is used to escape from the spot were recovered. A9 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court as he provided the car to the accused. A6 was granted bail by this court on medical grounds. As far as this petitioner is concerned, based on the information given by him, the deceased was murdered. Investigation is at crucial stage. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more and also there is every possibilities of tampering of the witnesses. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

6. It is a preplanned murder due to business rivalry. The investigation reveals that this petitioner had full knowledge about the murder to be committed by the other accused and he informed about the every movement of the victim and facilitated the other accused to commit the murder. Investigation is still going on. Considering the gravity of offence, role played by this petitioner in the alleged crime, the stage of the investigation and the objection raised by learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this juncture.

7. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.12027/2022

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.225/2022

1. Saran
2. Mandai Dinesh @ Dinesh
3. Hari Hara Sudhan

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N. Selvarajan, M. Jaikumar, L. Vinothkumar, P. Kamaraj, T. Lavanya, S.H. Vazhavan Karthikeyan, P.S. Mercy Gnammal, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for respondent, and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 26.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Sections 294(b), 341 307, 448 of IPC in Crime No.225/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. There exists enmity between one Pettai Suresh and the defacto complainant. The petitioners have no motive. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 26.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners attacked the defacto complainant with knife and caused grievous injuries. The victim was admitted to the hospital and after taking in-patient treatment for 8 days, he was discharged. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 7 previous cases and he has

been detained under Act 14 of 1982 vide order dated 14.7.2022 in BCDFGISSSV No.199/2022. 2nd petitioner is having 6 previous cases and the 3rd petitioner is having 2 previous cases.

5. The petitioners have been in custody for the past 20 days. However, considering the bad antecedents of the petitioners 1 and 2 and the fact that the 1st petitioner has been detained under Act 14 of 1982, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners 1 and 2 at present. As far as the 3rd petitioners is concerned, considering the fact that injured has been discharged from the hospital, only two previous cases has been reported against him and also considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 3rd petitioner alone on condition.

6. Accordingly, the 3rd petitioner alone 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 3rd petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the 3rd petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 3rd 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 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]**.

(f) If the 3rd petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as the petitioners 1 and 2 are concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12027/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.12028/2022

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.226/2022

1. Saran

2. Mandai Dinesh @ Dinesh

Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K.10, Koyambedu Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N. Selvarajan, M. Jaikumar, L. Vinothkumar, P. Kamaraj, T. Lavanya, S.H. Vazhavan Karthikeyan, P.S. Mercy Gnammal, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for respondent, and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 26.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Sections 294(b), 341, 323, 336, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.226/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 26.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused had assaulted him and robbed Rs.1,500/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 7 previous cases and he has been detained under Act 14 of 1982 vide order dated 14.7.2022 in BCDFGISSSV No.199/2022. 2nd petitioner is having 6 previous cases. Thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the bad antecedents of the petitioners 1 and 2 and the fact that the 1st petitioner has been detained under Act 14 of 1982, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12105/2022

in

P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.434/2022

Karthick

.. Petitioner/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 in the presence of M/s. B. Jawahar, C. Jagan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.434/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were already enlarged on bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 30.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner is A2. This petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused have robbed Rs.400/- from him at knife point and assaulted him. Investigation is pending and amount is not yet recovered. He further submits that the petitioner is having 2 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 16 days. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 2 previous cases. However, considering the fact that co-accused were already enlarged on bail and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12105/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.Nos.12106 and 12113 of 2022

in

H.6, R.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No.416/2022

Venkat @ Venkatachalapathy

.. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.12106/2022

Shaif Ali

.. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.12113/2022

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

Both the petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Karthick, S. Raj, S. Divakar, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12106/22 and of M/s. M.M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, M. Mohamadhu Ajar, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.12113/22 and the CPP for respondent, and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 11.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.416/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. This is a case in counter. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 11.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant with knife and

wooden log. The victim sustained injuries on the face, forehead, right eye and leg and was admitted to the hospital. After 3 days in-patient treatment, he was discharged. This is a case in counter. It is a recent occurrence. The petitioners were arrested recently. Investigation is pending and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners were arrested only on 11.7.2022. Considering the nature of offence, the injury inflicted on the victim, the period of treatment undergone by him, short duration of custody and the fact that investigation is pending, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

6. Hence, both the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12107/2022

in

R.4, Pondy Bazaar PS.,(TIW) Crime No.159/2022

Prakash

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R.4, Pondy Bazaar Police Station,(TIW)
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.7.2022 for the offences punishable under Section 279, 308, 338 of IPC and Sec.185 of MV Act in Crime No.159/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner drove his vehicle in a minimum speed. It was only an accident. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody from 10.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner, under the influence of alcohol drove his Car in a rash and negligent manner and hit the pedestrian. The victim sustained grievous injuries on the forehead, jaw and hip and she is taking treatment as in-patient. Investigation is pending and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of drunken driving. The petitioner under the influence of alcohol drove his Car in a rash and negligent manner and the caused the accident. The victim sustained grievous injuries and she is still in hospital. According to learned CPP,

investigation is pending. Considering the nature of offence, the fact that the patient is still in hospital, short duration of custody and pending investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.12110/2022

in

N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.133/2022

Madhan Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Devaraj, K. Subash, S. Kaviarasu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.6.2022 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b) and 307 of IPC in Crime No.133/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The defacto complainant is the mother-in-law of the petitioner. There exists dispute between the petitioner and his wife. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 24.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on the date of occurrence, this petitioner picked quarrel with his wife and abused her and when it was questioned by the defacto complainant, the accused assaulted her with broken bottle. The victim sustained injury on the face, right side chest and on her back. She admitted to the hospital and later discharged. He further submits that the petitioner is having 9 previous cases and if he is

released on bail, he will again indulge in similar offences and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedents of the petitioner and the objection raised by learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12111/2022

in

K.9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar P.S., Crime No.436/2022

Krishna Gandhi @ Somu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police(L&O)
K.9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 28.5.2022 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 498(A), 354, 509, 506(i) and 306 r/w.511 IPC @ 294(b), 498(A), 354, 509, 506(i), 306 IPC in Crime No.436/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Petitioner and the defacto complainant are brothers. Due to property dispute there occurred wordy quarrel between them. The petitioner is not responsible for the suicide committed by the wife of the defacto complainant. No abetment caused by the petitioner. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner is in custody from 28.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on the date of occurrence, the petitioner/accused quarrelled with his brother, the defacto complainant herein and his wife(deceased) demanding partition of the property and abused her in filthy language outraging her modesty. Due to which, she poured kerosene and set fire on her. Initially, the case was registered u/s. 294(b), 498(A), 354, 509, 506(i) and 306 r/w.511 IPC and

after her demise, the case has been altered into Sec.294(b), 498A, 354, 509, 506(i) IPC and 306 IPC. The petitioner alone abetted her to commit suicide. Investigation is pending. Earlier petition was dismissed on 30.6.2022 and there is no change of circumstance. He seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of 306 IPC. The victim committed suicide by self immolation. The allegation against the petitioner is that he had abused the victim by outraging her modesty and abetted her to commit suicide. Considering the nature of offence, the overt act as against the petitioner, the fact that a valuable life has been lost and pending investigation and no change of circumstance, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.11929/2022

in

F.3, Nungambakkam P.S. Crime No.164/2022

P. Rajesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F.3, Nungambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 5.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 420, 381 of IPC in Crime No.164/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was working as a Salesman in the Departmental Store run by the defacto complainant for more than 10 years. Since he was not given expected salary, the petitioner decided to left the job in the year 2021. Immediately, this false case has been foisted against the petitioner. The petitioner has studied upto 8th standard alone and he has no knowledge to manipulate the accounts. Since the respondent police continuously harassed the petitioner under the guise of enquiry, the petitioner approached the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in CrI.O.P.No.22388/2021, wherein on 29.11.2021, it was ordered to complete the enquiry within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy application. Thereafter, the petitioner appeared before the respondent police for enquiry, but there was no progress. Whiles on 29.5.2022, the respondent police registered the case and arrested the petitioner on 5.6.2022. The petitioner

is innocent and he is noway connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner was working in the Departmental Store run by the defacto complainant since 2013 and used to make the bill and delivered the goods to the customer. After gaining the trust of the owner, the petitioner used to manipulate the bills raised for purchase of goods and thereby started to swindle the amount. During 2.10.2021, when one of the customer tried to exchange one of the products purchased under a bill, it came to light that the petitioner had indulged in altering the bills and committed forgery. From 2013 to 2021, the petitioner had committed the offence and on verification of the bank statement, it was found that the amount swindled by the petitioner were deposited in his bank account. The total amount cheated by the petitioner comes to Rs.45 lakhs. Based on the complaint, case has been registered. He further submits that investigation is pending. Till date no amount has been recovered. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility of his abscondence and tampering of evidence. Hence, objects granting bail.

5. It is a grave case of cheating. The allegation against the petitioner is that he had manipulated the bills raised for the purchase of goods by the customers and cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.45,00,000/-. According to learned CPP, till date no amount has been recovered and investigation is pending. Under these circumstances, considering the nature of offence, the quantum of amount involved in this case and the fact that investigation is at initial stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.11936/2022

in

CCB, Cr.No.113/2022

Angel

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Job Racket Wing, Team - 28,
Central Crime Branch,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Vivek, H. Manoj Kumar, T. Karunamoorthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 406, 420 of IPC in Crime No.113/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. She was an employee of the Safemoon World and worked only for a period of two months. The amount received from the client was handed over to A1/Barathi. The petitioner has no relationship with A1. She was only an employee. There was no partnership between them. A1 alone had committed the offence, who is absconding now. This petitioner has no knowledge about the fraud committed by A1. Without arresting the real accused, the respondent police arrested this petitioner for no fault of her. The petitioner is not the beneficiary of the crime proceeds. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is a woman, aged 23 years. She is in custody from 3.6.2022 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A2 along with A1 were running a company under the name and style of Safemoon World, unregistered manpower agency. When the defacto complainant contacted the phone number given in the advertisement, A1 assured him to secure a hotel job in Russia and advised him to contact the Chennai office. This petitioner, who is in the Chennai office was approached by the defacto complainant, where she had received a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- and passport and other documents from the defacto complainant. However, neither secured the job nor returned the amount. Based on the complaint, case has been registered. Learned CPP further submits that this petitioner alone received the amount by way of cash and through google pay account of this petitioner and issued the receipt. She having full knowledge about the fraudulent act actively participated in the crime. During investigation it came to light, 50 persons have been victimized at the hands of the accused and 15 passports of the victims were recovered. The total amount cheated is more than Rs.1 Crore. So far 11 complaints were received. Investigation is pending. Absconding accused are yet to be secured and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of job racketing. The allegation against the petitioner is that she along with other accused under the guise of securing job in Russia lured the aspirants to part with their money and cheated them including the defacto complainant. More than 50 job aspirants have been cheated and the amount cheated is more than Rs.1 Crore. According to learned CPP, so far 11 complaints have been received, investigation is pending and documents related to the crime are to be collected and the absconding accused are to be secured. Considering the grave nature of offence, the quantum of amount involved in this case, the fact that investigation is pending, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 15th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.11926/2022

in

CCB, Crime No.108/2022

V. Sadasivam

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Team XVII, Anti Land Grabbing wing,
Central Crime Branch - 1,
Greater Chennai City, Vepery,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. Selvarajan, V. Kennedy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w. 120B of IPC in Crime No.108/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent. He is doing real estate business. The petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. There is no overt act against him. The named accused in the FIR alone encroached the property and created bogus deeds. This petitioner only acted as a mediator to sell the property by introducing the purchasers and had collected charges from the purchasers. This petitioner is noway connected with the fraudulent act committed by the named accused. The property claimed by the defacto complainant is nothing to do with Plot No.40 relating to the sale by the purchasers introduced by this petitioner. The boundaries and extent of the properties are different. The dispute is civil in nature. Without conducting any enquiry, the respondent police hurriedly implicated the petitioner in this case and arrested him. The

petitioner has no bad antecedent. He is in custody from 30.6.2022 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 10 accused involved in this case. This petitioner/A7 along with other accused colluded with each other created forged documents in respect of the property owned by the defacto complainant at Madipakkam Village measuring an extent of 3274 sq.ft. and sold the same to A5 and A6 for the sale consideration of Rs.50 lakhs. In the above said transaction, this petitioner has received Rs.12 lakhs towards his share. During investigation it came to light that the purchasers have obtained Rs.70 lakhs from the State Bank of India on the security of the forged documents of the property. Investigation is pending. A7 to A10 alone were arrested. Other accused are yet to be secured. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility of tampering of evidence and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the FIR, the property situated at Madipakkam Village, measuring an extent of 3274 sq.ft. belongs to one Mrs. Thiripurasundari, the defacto complainant herein. Taking advantage of the fact that the property is kept vacant, the accused colluded with each other tried to grab the property and by way of impersonation created fake Sale Deed in favour of A1/Rangasamy, who in turn created fake Settlement Deed in favour of A2/Harikrishnan and based on which, created a Power of Attorney Deed in favour of A3/Narayanamurthy and divide the property in to two parts and sold the same to A5 and A6 through this petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he only acted as a mediator for sale of the property. Whereas, this petitioner having full knowledge about the fraudulent act sold the property to A5 and A6 for unlawful gain. According to learned CPP, this petitioner has received a sum of Rs.12 lakhs towards his share. On perusal of the order copy of the Court below, it has been observed that the petitioner has gained Rs.12 lakhs from each purchaser. During investigation it came to light that this petitioner is the brain behind the crime and he in collusion with other accused/Vasudevan and Selvam created forged documents by way of impersonation and he is the person who could identify the impersonators(A1 and A2), who are yet to be secured. From the above facts, it cannot be said that the petitioner has no knowledge about the fraudulent transactions. Further it appears that the purchasers have obtained a loan of Rs.70 lakhs

from the Bank on the security of the forged documents of the property. Considering the grave nature of offence, the allegation against the petitioner, the fact that investigation is at initial stage and the other accused are yet to be secured, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk