

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11282/2021

in

K.7, ICF P.S. Cr.No.120/2021

Gopinath

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police(L&O),
K.7, ICF Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.120/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 26.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused came to the defacto complainant's Cool-drinks shop and after purchasing Maaza(2 litre bottle) and Gaaja Beedi, refused to pay money, that on demand, the accused assaulted him and at knife point robbed cash Rs.360/- from the cash box. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 4 previous cases.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 21 days. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, considering 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11282/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11391/2021

in

C.C.No.1717/2021

(on the file of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai.)

in

CCB, Crime No.174/2020

S. Natarajan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Bank Fraud Investigation Wing Team - 31
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.11.2020 for the offence punishable under Section 120-B, 409 IPC in Crime No.174/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner approached the bank for availing loan. As instructed by the Manager of the Indian Bank, Erukkancheri, on some occasions, the petitioner withdrawn some amount through ATM machine on the basis of the card handed over by the Manager with Pin. He has nothing to do with the fraud committed by A1. He has been made as scape got. Petitioner is not a beneficiary. Further, petitioner's bank account was freezed and cash

Rs.10,00,000/- has been seized by the respondent police. The petitioner is in custody from 24.11.2020. He is ready to abide by any condition and hence prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that A1/Vinoth, working as Assistant Branch Manager, Indian Bank, Erukkancherri Branch identified the inoperative Savings Accounts of the pensioners, who were not alive and make the accounts operative and issued ATM cards in the account of Perundevi and Angammal and handed over the same to the present petitioner(A2) for withdrawing the amount. For the above said accounts of Perundevi and Angammal, frequently amounts were transferred from other inoperative accounts and immediately cash was withdrawn through ATM. Further, this petitioner opened a Savings Account bearing No.6640950494 with the Indian Bank, Ennore Branch and to the said account also several amounts were transferred by the said prime accused/Vinoth. So, both of them misappropriated the amounts so transferred and withdrawn through ATM. According to learned CPP, case is pending on file in C.C.No.1717/2021 on the file of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai for examination of witnesses and the prosecution is taking steps for speedy trial. Thus, he objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner is A2. Through his bank account, prime accused transferred funds of retired pensioners by fraudulent means and encashed the same. The accused is in custody from 24.11.2020 more than 7 months. Considering the duration of custody and the role played by the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition to deposit Rs.2 lakh into the Court concerned.

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 Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on deposit of Rs.2 lakh to the credit of the Cr.No.174/2020 before the said court 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 final order in respect of the amount so deposited will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court.

(c) the petitioner shall appear before the said Court 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 Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11391/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021**

Crl.M.P.Nos.11438 and 11522 of 2021

in

K-4, Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No.552/2021

Poochi @ Velu Sadraak

.. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.11438/2021

K. Sanjay Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No.11522/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-4, Anna Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

For Petitioner : M/s. S. Mohanraj, R. Devakumar, V. Vinodha
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11438/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. S. Sathish Rajan, N. Lakshmanan & Adhitya Sathish
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11522/2021

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor in both the petitions.

Both the petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11438/21, who was arrested on 30.6.2021 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11522/21, who was arrested on 29.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 385, 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.552/2021 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 appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are no way connected with the offence. The defacto complainant has lodged the complaint stating

that he has been threatened through Whatsapp call by one Madurai Bala and others. It is based only on anonymous communication. Petitioners' name does not find a place in the FIR. The petitioner/K. Sanjay Kumar is a college student. The police falsely implicated the petitioners in this crime and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is a B.J.P. Functionary. During the lockdown, he has involved in social work. At that time, the accused demanded money from him as mamool. In fact, the petitioners and others came in a motor-cycle and demanded the money by handing over the phone call from Madurai Bala and threatened him. Initially, the case was registered u/s. 385, 506(i) of IPC and subsequently altered into sec. 147, 385, 506(i) r/w 120(B) of IPC. Investigation is at the budding stage and co-accused bail was dismissed only on 13.7.2021 and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the records, though in the complaint, the defacto complainant stated that he was threatened through phone alone, while examination, he has stated that on 8.6.2021, five persons came to his place in a Deo and Splender two-wheelers and handed over a phone for speaking to Madurai Bala. The said Madurai Bala asked through phone to handover money to the persons came there, which he has avoided. So, by virtue of statement to the police officials, the defacto complainant implicated five persons including the petitioners herein, who came over to the place of occurrence in two-wheelers. The persons actually involved in this offence are yet to be arrested and investigation is pending. Under such circumstances, this is too early to release the petitioners on bail. Co-accused bail petition was also dismissed by this court. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

6. Both the petitions are 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

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11488/2021

in

V.1, Villivakkam P.S. Cr.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. Abdul Hadi, 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 of IPC in Cr.No.640/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They are in custody from 5.7.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during vehicle check-up, the petitioners were found in possession of banned tobacco products(240 packets) for sale. He further submits that both the petitioners are having 5 previous cases and objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 12 days. According to learned CPP, both the petitioners are having 5 previous cases. However, as far as this case is concerned, property has been recovered and no one was hospitalized due to the consumption of

contraband. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, 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/- each (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Kanchipuram.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11488/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11521/2021

in

K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 161/2021

Purushothaman @ Poovarasam

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-9, Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Melvin, S.Y. Syed Parvez, P. Ramki, G. Krishna Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 302 IPC @ 120(B), 341, 302 IPC in Crime No.161/2021 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 of the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted against him with an ulterior motive. The petitioner is in custody from 22.4.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that that due to previous enmity, the accused brutally attacked the deceased with knife and murdered him. Nearly 31 cut injuries were made on the parts of the body of the deceased and thus seriously objects granting bail considering the gravity of offence.

5. It is a case of brutal murder. 31 cut injuries were inflicted on the body of the deceased. Considering the gravity of offence and the number of injuries inflicted, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11529/2021

in

P.6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Cr.No.910/2021

Kevin @ Rajesh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-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. G. Ashok Kumar, M. Chandru, P. Parthipan, J. Jayashree, J. Ram Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 354(D), 448, 323, 427, 509, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.910/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was arrested on 18.6.2021. There was a wordy quarrel between the defacto complainant's family and the petitioner, due to which this false complaint has been given. The petitioner is innocent. He is in custody for about a month and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner and others teased the defacto complainant's daughters, over which, the defacto complainant's husband questioned the petitioner. He has been chased with knife by the petitioners and others and when he bolted himself inside the house, the petitioner and others brutally knocked door with knife and also caused damage to the Borewell pipes. He objects granting bail stating that CCTV footage is available for the occurrence.

5. The petitioner is in custody for about a month. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. Though the offence appears to be grave in nature, considering the age of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties(both of them must be the blood relatives of the petitioner) each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, 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.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11529/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11534/2021

in

G-3 Kilpauk P.S. Crime No. 242/2021

Aasaithambi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-3 Kilpauk Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. Durai.Kannan, R. Vijayalakshmi, B.M. Goshinraj, E. Sadasivam, M. Senthil Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 336 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.242/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Investigation is over. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.200/- from him at knife point. He objects granting bail stating that this petitioner is having 9 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 9 previous cases. However, considering 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11534/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.Nos.11608 and 11609 of 2021

in

K-3 Aminjikai P.S. Crime No.645/2021

Ramkumar .. Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.11608/2021

1. Mohan
2. Sarath Kumar @ Bala Sarath Kumar .. Petitioners/Accused in
Crl.M.P.No11609/2021.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-3 Aminjikai Police Station,
Chennai. ..Respondent/Complainant in
both the petitions.

For Petitioner : M/s. V.Karthik, Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.11608/21

For Petitioner : M/s. M. Yasar Arafath, Advocate in Crl.M.P.No.11609/21

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor in both the petitions.

Both the petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following:

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11608/21, who was arrested on 30.6.2021 and the petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.11609/21, who were arrested on 2.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 394, 395 and 397 IPC in Crime No.645/2021 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 appearing for the petitioners submits that these petitioners are innocent of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioners have no bad antecedents. The properties involved in this case has been

recovered. Investigation is almost completed. Co-accused were granted bail by this Court on 14.7.2021 in CrI.M.P.No.11481/2021. The petitioners are in custody for more than two weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 28.6.2021, at about 10.00 p.m. when the defacto complainant and his friends playing cards at Vicky Enterprises office, these petitioners along with other accused entered into the occurrence place and assaulted the defacto complainant and robbed his jewels weighing 20 sovereign and cash Rs.25,000/- from them and escaped from the spot. He further submits that the petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.11609/21 are having each one previous case. However, according to CPP, 13 ½ sovereigns of jewels and cash Rs.8000/- has been recovered and the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11608/21(Ramkumar) has no bad antecedent.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than two weeks. According to learned CPP, the petitioners in CrI.M.P.No.11609/21 are having each one previous case. However, no previous case is reported as against the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11608/21. Further major portion of property has been recovered and co-accused were granted bail by this court. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.Nos.11608 and 11609 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11613/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.624/2021

A. Vikki @ Mittai Vikki

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 399 of IPC in Cr.No.624/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 30.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused were preparing to commit dacoity.
5. It is a case of 399 IPC. The petitioner is in custody for more than 15 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has no bad antecedent. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.
6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11613/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11614/2021

in

P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Cr.No.962/2021

1. Karthick
2. Syed Asim

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 14.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.962/2021 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 this petitioners are innocent. Only wordy quarrel. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are in custody from 14.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused consumed liquor near Mosque in the street, where defacto complainant is residing and they were warned by the defacto complainant. In order to take revenge, after 10 days, on the date of occurrence, the accused came to the defacto complainant's place and

assaulted him with wooden log and caused injuries. He further submits that the victim was admitted in the hospital for 4 days as in-patient. He seriously objects granting bail stating that it is a recent occurrence and the petitioners were arrested only on 14.7.2021.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. Petitioners were arrested only on 14.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. According to learned CPP, 1st petitioner is having 4 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 1 previous case. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedents and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11617/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.359/2021

Maari @ Korukkupetta Mari

.. 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. Johnson Samuel, M.B. Prabhu, 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 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.359/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Injured also discharged from the hospital. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. Petitioner's left hand was broken in the Jail and he needs proper treatment. He is in custody from 15.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that in connection with the earlier occurrence between the defacto complainant's friend Chandru with one Lakshmanan, on the same day, in order to take revenge, this petitioner along with other accused quarrelled with the defacto complainant and his uncle and attacked both of them with knife. The defacto complainant was admitted in the hospital as in-patient and sutures were made. He seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is a prime accused and he is having 35 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 35 previous cases. However, as far as this case is concerned, injured has already been discharged from the hospital and co-accused was granted bail. Further it is represented that the petitioner sustained fracture on the left hand. Under such circumstances, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11617/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11618/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.362/2021

Maari @ Korukkupetta Mari

.. 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. Johnson Samuel, M.B. Prabhu, 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 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.362/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. The respondent police foisted two false cases against this petitioner on the same day. Petitioner's left hand was broken in the Jail and he needs proper treatment. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. He is in custody from 15.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused came to the defacto complainant's tiffin shop and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused at knife point robbed cash Rs.1,400/- from the cash box. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 35 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 35 previous cases. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that

the petitioner sustained fracture on the left hand and he needs proper treatment. Under such circumstances, considering the duration of custody and co-accused was granted bail by this court, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11618/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11616/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No.177/2021

Renuka @ Renuka Devi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
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. P. Parthipan, S.Arunraj, J. Ramkumar, counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who were arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section Sec.147, 148, 302 of IPC in Crime No.177/2021 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. There was dispute between the deceased and her husband/Ruban. Over which, a false complaint has been lodged against Ruban and his family members. The petitioner is not at all present in the scene of occurrence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. One of the similarly placed accused/Kamaladevi was granted bail by this court. This petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. It is a case of brutal murder due to previous enmity. One Supriya was done to death by the petitioner and others. It is a preplanned murder due to vengeance over suspicious relationship of Supriya(deceased) with rival of her husband/Ruban. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that one of the co-accused Kamaladevi was granted bail by this court and hence prays for granting bail considering the gender. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that co-accused was granted bail after two months of incarceration and this petitioner cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused. The petitioner was arrested

only on 18.6.2021. Considering the gravity of offence and duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

5. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd./- R. Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11619/2021

in

K-1, Sembium P.S. Crime No.761/2021

C.Venkatesan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
K-1, Sembium 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.Arunkumar and E.Chandru and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC r/w Sec.4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.761/2021 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 defacto complainant made character assassination on petitioner's wife, over which, there was quarrel between them. Injured discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 13.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously opposed the petition stating that the petitioner and defacto complainant are living in platform. When the defacto complainant informed the illegal affair of petitioner's wife to him, he caused cut injury in her throat. Tracheostomy collar was fixed on the throat of the defacto complainant and still she is taking treatment.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. The injured is still taking treatment. Considering nature of injury and duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11620/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.414/2021

Ragupathi (Karupa)

.. 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.G.Sivakumar, S.K.Masthan and R.Murugan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a), 4(1-A) of TNP Act and Sec.328 of IPC in Cr.No.414/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.11064/2021 on 5.7.2021. He is in custody from 25.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with another accused were found in possession of 19 bottles of brandy bottles and 1 Kg Maava without valid licence. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having four previous cases.
5. The petitioner has been in custody for the past 22 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having four previous cases. However, as far as this case is concerned, property has been recovered and no one was hospitalized due to the

consumption of contraband. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11620/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11622/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.394/2021

Ragupathi (Karupa)

.. 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.G.Sivakumar, S.K.Masthan and R.Murugan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 392, 397, 427, 336 and 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.394/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the present case. He was arrested in connection with Cr.No.414/2021 on the file of the respondent police on 25.6.2021. At that time, he was falsely implicated in the present case for statistical purpose and remanded in this case also. The F.I.R. is registered with usual story. He is in custody for 22 days and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with other accused went to the defacto complainant's roadside tiffin shop and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused assaulted him and at knife point robbed cash Rs.1,200/- from the cash box. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having four previous cases.

5. However, the petitioner is in custody for the past 22 days. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11622/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021
Crl.M.P.No.11621/2021

in

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

Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-2, Egmore Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M.Hussaini Basha, I.Gowri Shankar and Shaik Abu Thahir, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 5.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a) and 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No.517/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not involved in any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is having two tender children. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11433/2021 on 12.7.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 5.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and other accused were found in possession of 58 quarter bottles. The petitioner is having four previous cases. The date of arrest is only on 5.7.2021 and thus objects granting bail.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 10 days. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.
6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11621/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.11595/2021

in

E-3, Teynampet P.S. Crime No.270/2021

K.Kumar

.. 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, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.J.William Shakesphere, V.Ravi, A.Gurumoorthy and T.Srikanth 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), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.270/2021 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 defacto complainant is the neighbour of the petitioner's father-in-law. There was some family problem and wordy quarrel. However, an exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is the friend of petitioner's father-in-law. There was family dispute between the petitioner and his wife. The defacto complainant tried to compromise the spouse. Thereafter, the petitioner went to the car shed of defacto complainant and assaulted him with knife. The injured discharged from the hospital after four days treatment.

5. Family quarrel. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Injured discharged from the hospital. Considering the nature of case, 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 XVIII 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, E-3, Teynampet Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11595/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11596/2021

in

I.C.F. P.S. Crime No.127/2021

1. Praveen
2. D.Maavarman

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
I.C.F. 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.M.Santharam, M.Elumalai, A.Umar Farook Ali and S.Vijay 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 341, 294(b), 323 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.127/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. When the defacto complainant tried to attack the petitioner's son and his friends, the petitioner intervened and rescued them. However, an exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that already C.S.R. was registered on 19.4.2021 and the matter was compromised. Again, on 10.7.2021, the petitioners and others waylaid the defacto complainant and others and assaulted them with hands and also abused them in filthy language.

5. There was previous enmity between the petitioners and defacto complainant, for which, there was a compromise in the police station. Again, the petitioner and others involved in the quarrel. There are chances for exaggeration. Except 506(ii) IPC, other

offences are bailable. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the 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, K-7, I.C.F. Police Station, Chennai.

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11596/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11606/2021

in

H-5, New Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.1672/2021

M.Vichu @ Saileshkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-5, New Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC r/w Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act, 1992 in Cr.No.1672/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in Cr.No.1053/2021 u/s 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) of IPC r/w Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act as if there was an occurrence on 4.6.2021. Though he is no way connected with the said offence, to avoid arrest, he was staying at Nagapattinam District. That being so, he has been taken by the respondent police from the place of hiding to Chennai and he has been severely assaulted. He has sustained fracture on his leg. In order to safeguard themselves, the prosecution registered the present case in Cr.No.1672/2021 as if he was involved in another offence of similar nature on 9.7.2021 at 11 hours. He further submits that though the cases are foisted cases, he sustained fracture on his right leg due to the assault of the police. Even in the Remand Report, the fracture has been noted by the Magistrate and the allegation against the police has been recorded. Whatever be the cause,

now his right leg was fractured and immediate treatment is required. On that ground, he prays for bail to the petitioner.

4. On perusal of the records, it appears Cr.No.1053/2021 was registered on 5.6.2021. The petitioner was arrested only on 9.7.2021 in that crime number. While producing before the Magistrate, in the remand order, the learned Magistrate noted as if the accused is absconding for more than a month and remanded him to custody till 23.7.2021. In the present case Cr.No.1672/2021 also he has been remanded to custody till 23.7.2021. In both the Remand Reports, the fracture sustained by the petitioner has been noted. In Cr.No.1672/2021 Remand Report, the Magistrate categorically observed as if he made allegation against the police as if he was hit by iron rod in the police station and his right leg got fractured. In the Remand Report in Cr.No.1053/2021 also the Magistrate noted about the fracture. Apart from that, the learned counsel for the petitioner produced some documents to show passing of messages to the Commissioner of Police on 9.7.2021 at 11.37 hours. The case has been registered in Cr.No.1672/2021 as if the occurrence took place at 11 a.m. When at 11 a.m. the accused / petitioner was able to commit the offence of robbery, how he had sustained fracture, is to be explained by the prosecution. As alleged by the petitioner's counsel, there are chances for registering case in Cr.No.1672/2021 to cover-up the illegal arrest and assault made on the petitioner while arresting him in Cr.No.1053/2021. Whatever be the reason, it is an admitted fact that he had a fracture in the right leg. The x-ray copy produced by the petitioner would go to show displaced fracture. Considering the grievous injury sustained by the petitioner and necessity for giving better medical treatment, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11606/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July 2021

CrI.M.P.No.11607/2021

in

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

M.Vichu @ Saileshkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-5, New Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) of IPC r/w Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act, 1992 in Cr.No.1053/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in Cr.No.1053/2021 u/s 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) of IPC r/w Sec.3 of TNPPDL Act as if there was an occurrence on 4.6.2021. Though he is no way connected with the said offence, to avoid arrest, he was staying at Nagapattinam District. That being so, he has been taken by the respondent police from the place of hiding to Chennai and he has been severely assaulted. He has sustained fracture on his leg. In order to safeguard themselves, the prosecution registered the case in Cr.No.1672/2021 as if he was involved in another offence of similar nature on 9.7.2021 at 11 hours. He further submits that though the cases are foisted cases, he sustained fracture on his right leg due to the assault of the police. Even in the Remand Report, the fracture has been noted by the Magistrate and the allegation against the police has been recorded. Whatever be the cause, now his right leg

was fractured and immediate treatment is required. On that ground, he prays for bail to the petitioner.

4. On perusal of the records, it appears Cr.No.1053/2021 was registered on 5.6.2021. The petitioner was arrested only on 9.7.2021 in that crime number. While producing before the Magistrate, in the remand order, the learned Magistrate noted as if the accused is absconding for more than a month and remanded him to custody till 23.7.2021. In Cr.No.1672/2021 also he has been remanded to custody till 23.7.2021. In both the Remand Reports, the fracture sustained by the petitioner has been noted. In Cr.No.1672/2021 Remand Report, the Magistrate categorically observed as if he made allegation against the police as if he was hit by iron rod in the police station and his right leg got fractured. In the Remand Report in Cr.No.1053/2021 also the Magistrate noted about the fracture. Apart from that, the learned counsel for the petitioner produced some documents to show passing of messages to the Commissioner of Police on 9.7.2021 at 11.37 hours. The case has been registered in Cr.No.1672/2021 as if the occurrence took place at 11 a.m. When at 11 a.m. the accused / petitioner was able to commit the offence of robbery, how he had sustained fracture, is to be explained by the prosecution. As alleged by the petitioner's counsel, there are chances for registering case in Cr.No.1672/2021 to cover-up the illegal arrest and assault made on the petitioner while arresting him in Cr.No.1053/2021. Whatever be the reason, it is an admitted fact that he had a fracture in the right leg. The x-ray copy produced by the petitioner would go to show displaced fracture. Considering the grievous injury sustained by the petitioner and necessity for giving better medical treatment, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11607/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021.**

CrL.M.P.No.11597/2021

in

EOW-II Crime No.14/2021

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

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Balaji, K.Easwar, S.Chandrasekaran, P.Kumar and Gugappriya 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 420, 409 r/w 34 of IPC in Crime No.14/2021 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 some money transaction between the petitioners and defacto complainant over running of chit by the petitioners. For discharging the amount due to the defacto complainant, cheques were also issued. It is purely a civil dispute. In case of dishonour of cheque, the remedy open to the defacto complainant is to file complaint u/s 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act. On other hand, he has chosen to convert the same as criminal offence and filed this complaint. Though the petitioners are ready to settle the amount in instalments, the defacto complainant and police insisted to settle the same at one instance. Further he submits that the petitioners 1 and 2 are women and 3rd petitioner is aged about 65. Arresting them is unnecessary and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a grave case of cheating. Though the petitioners are having a chit fund company, the chits subscribed by the defacto

complainant are unauthorised chits. He has subscribed two chits for Rs.10 lakhs each and one chit for Rs.7 lakhs. Though all the instalments have been paid by the defacto complainant, the petitioners failed to repay the same. On the other hand, they have diverted the funds to some other purpose and wantonly cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.21 lakhs and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the records, it appears the subscription of three chits and the instalments thereon was duly endorsed by the 2nd petitioner herein. However, the chits appears to be unauthorised chits. No doubt, there was default. The petitioners have also issued two cheques for the amount claimed by the defacto complainant. Though the transaction, prima facie, appears to be civil in nature, criminal offence is also attracted. Considering the gender and age of the petitioners, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail on condition to deposit Rs.2 lakhs each by the petitioners.

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 Chief 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 deposit a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- each (Rupees Two Lakhs each) to the credit of the Crime No.14/2021 before the said court and the final order in respect of the amount will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court.

[c] the 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 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].

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, EOW-II Headquarters Police Station,
Guindy, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11597/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11602/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.53/2021

against

M.P.No.28/2021

in

LIR No.581/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2020

in

H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.136/2020 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C.

Vignesh @ Dhavid

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent /
Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner
Washermenpet, Chennai.

2. The State represented by
Inspector of Police,(Law & Order),
H-1, Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..

Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/

Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Illiyas and A.Venkateswara Babu and upon perusing the records, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the revision petition.

2. The counsel for the petitioner was heard through Video Conference.

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.28/2021 in LIR No.581/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2020 in H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.136/2020 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 114 days for violation of bond executed u/s 107 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 6.7.2021.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has fair chance of success in the revision. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

5. This Court has also perused the revision petition and the submission made by the petitioner's counsel. The revision has been preferred without any delay.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 114 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

7. Hence, the order passed by the 1st respondent / Executive Magistrate is hereby stayed till the disposal of the revision and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

8. The Revision is made over to I Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

9. The Revision is posted on 16.8.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11604/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.54/2021

against

M.P.No.27/2021

in

LIR No.628/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2020

in

H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.152/2020 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C.

Kalai @ Kalaiarasan
/

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent

Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner
Washermenpet, Chennai.

2. The State represented by
Inspector of Police,(Law & Order),
H-1, Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..

Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/

Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Illiyas and A.Venkateswara Babu and upon perusing the records, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the revision petition.

2. The counsel for the petitioner was heard through Video Conference.

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.27/2021 in LIR No.628/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2020 in H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.152/2020 U/s 107 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 136 days for violation of bond executed u/s 107 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 6.7.2021.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has fair chance of success in the revision. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

5. This Court has also perused the revision petition and the submission made by the petitioner's counsel. The revision has been preferred without any delay.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 136 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

7. Hence, the order passed by the 1st respondent / Executive Magistrate is hereby stayed till the disposal of the revision and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

8. The Revision is made over to I Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

9. The Revision is posted on 16.8.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 16th day of July, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11628/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.55/2021

against

M.P.No.26/2021

in

LIR No.119/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021

in

H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.47/2021 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C.

Manikandan @ Poochi Manikandan

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent /
Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner
Washermenpet, Chennai.

2. The State represented by
Inspector of Police,(Law & Order),
H-1, Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..

Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/

Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Illiyas and A.Venkateswara Babu and upon perusing the records, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the revision petition.

2. The counsel for the petitioner was heard through Video Conference.

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.26/2021 in LIR No.119/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021 in H-1, Washermenpet P.S. SL.No.47/2021 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 353 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 6.7.2021.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has fair chance of success in the revision. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

5. This Court has also perused the revision petition and the submission made by the petitioner's counsel. The revision has been preferred without any delay.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 353 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

7. Hence, the order passed by the 1st respondent / Executive Magistrate is hereby stayed till the disposal of the revision and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

8. The Revision is made over to I Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

9. The Revision is posted on 16.8.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

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

ss