

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12784/2022**

in

**P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 499/2022**

1. Ravikumar @ Pallu Ravi
2. Ashok @ Thoppai
3. Arunpandi

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 24.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 499/2022 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. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Victim was discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 24.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, due to previous enmity, these petitioners/A1 to A3 along with another accused entered into the defacto complainant's house and attacked him using knife and wooden logs. Due to which, the defacto complainant sustained multiple grievous cut injuries all over his body and when the defacto complainant's father came to rescue the defacto complainant, the accused also attacked his father using knife and caused injury on

his face and head and thereafter, they escaped from the spot. He further submits that father of the defacto complainant only discharged from the hospital. The defacto complainant is still taking treatment in hospital. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the fact that one of the the victim is still taking treatment in hospital, nature of injury sustained by the victim and that investigation is not yet completed, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12789/2022**

in

**R-4 Pondy Bazaar TIW P.S. Crime No. 166/2022**

M. Ramesh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-4 Pondy Bazaar Traffic Investigation Wing,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N. Naresh, 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 17.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 279, 338, 308 IPC and sec. 185 of M.V. Act in Crime No. 166/2022 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 falsely implicated in this case. While the petitioner drove his two wheeler towards Koyambedu, the victim who was going in front of two wheeler had suddenly crossed without seeing signal and due to that this petitioner dashed against him. It is purely an accident. Victim sustained only simple injury. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. The petitioner is in custody from 17.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner drove his two wheeler in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and dashed against the victim and caused injury to him. He further submits that arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Investigation is at an early stage. Hence, objects the grant of bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he drove his vehicle in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and dashed against the victim and caused injury to him. This petitioner was arrested only on 17.7.2022. Investigation is at initial stage. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12790/2022**

in

**K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 238/2022**

Pavan Kumar Yadav

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. R. Barnabas, 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 8.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 6(a), 24(1) of COTP Act 2003 in Crime No. 238/2022 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 falsely implicated in this case. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody from 8.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner was found in possession of banned tobacco products such as Hans 120 packet and Cool Lip 460 packets for sale.

5. According to CPP, the property involved in this case has been recovered and that the petitioner has no bad antecedents.

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. No one is hospitalized after consuming the alleged contraband. It is reported by the CPP that the property involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody from 8.7.2022. Considering the

above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12790/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12791/2022**

in

**K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 233/2022**

Manikandan @ DioMani

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, D. Jaisankar, P. Muthumari, 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 392 IPC in Crime No. 233/2022 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 falsely implicated in this case. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. This petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. 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/A2 along with five another accused robbed 5 mobile phones and cash Rs.1,50,000/- from the defacto complainant. He further submits that one cell phone only recovered. Remaining phones and cash not yet recovered. Investigation is still pending. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 11 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is reported by the CPP that only one cell phone is recovered and remaining portion of property and cash is not yet recovered. Investigation is going on. Considering the above facts, value of the properties involved in this case , antecedents of the petitioner and also considering the stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12792/2022**

in

**H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 350/2022**

Prathap

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, D. Jaisankar, P. Muthumari, 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 17.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 350/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Since this petitioner is having some previous cases, this false case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 17.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant, assaulted him and also robbed Rs.300/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 6 previous cases including one murder case.

6. The petitioner is in custody for more than two months. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 6 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 daily at 10.00 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.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12792/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12794/2022**

**in**

**P.R.C. No. 02/2020**

**(on the file of learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)**

**in**

**K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 124/2019**

Gopi @ Gopi Krishnan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Mrs. A. Kalaichelvi, 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 20.5.2022 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 392 r/w 397 and 506(ii) IPC in PRC No. 2/2020 on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore in Crime No. 124/2019 on the file respondent police , seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner could not appear before the committal court due to his illness and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 13.8.2021 for his absence. He was regularly attended the court prior to issuance of NBW. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. This petitioner is in custody from 20.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, it is a jumped bail. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 13.8.2021 and it was executed on 20.5.2022 . The petitioner is absent for the past 9 months. Case is not yet committed to the court of sessions due to the absence of the petitioner. Due

to the absence of the petitioner, the case could not be proceeded further. If the petitioner is released on bail, the further proceedings of the case will be stalled. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the case records, it would go to show that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 13.8.2021 and it was executed on 20.5.2022. The petitioner is in custody for more than two months. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail with stringent 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 said Court daily twice at 10.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders.

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

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond during 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.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12794/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12795/2022**

**in**

**S.C. No. 234/2013**

**(on the file of learned I Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)**

**in**

**P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 196/2009**

Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Vijayaraghavan, D. Manoj Kumar, J. Krishna Kumar, R. Ram Kumar, S. Pavithra, 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 19.5.2022 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No. 234/2013 on the file of I Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai in Crime No. 196/2009 on the file respondent police , seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner could not appear before the trial court due to jaundice and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 1.2.20217 for his absence. He was regularly attended the court prior to issuance of NBW. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. This petitioner is in custody from 19.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, it is a jumped bail. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 1.2.2017 and it was executed on 19.5.2022 . The petitioner is absent for the past 5 years. Case is pending for framing of charges. Due to the absence of the petitioner, the case could not be proceeded further. If the petitioner is released on bail, the further proceedings of the case will be stalled. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. On perusal of the case records, it would go to show that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 1.2.2017 and and it was executed on 19.5.2022. The petitioner was absent for the past 5 years. In the meantime, this petitioner has not chosen to surrender and recall the warrant. The case is of the year 2013. There is no valid reason stated by the petitioner for his long absence. Due to the absence of this petitioner, the case could not be proceeded further. According to CPP, if the petitioner is released on bail, he will again get abscond and will not be available for trial. This court finds force in the contention of CPP. The conduct of the petitioner does not inspire the confidence of the court that he will be available for trial if he is released on bail. Under the above circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c of Principal Sessions Court**

**Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12642/2022**

in

**F-5 Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No. 666/2021**

Sriram

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F-5 Choolaimedu Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Mrs. G. Manju, 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 26.8.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 435 IPC r/w. Sec.4(a) of Explosive Substances Act 1908 in Crime No.666/2021 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 no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody for the past 11 months and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused thrown petrol bombs on the defacto complainant's car, due to which, the front portion of the car got damaged.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner was already granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19218/2021 dated 27.10.2021 with condition to deposit Rs.5000/-. But, this petitioner failed to comply with the said condition and the earlier bail ordered by this court

is still in force. Suppressing the above facts, the present bail application is filed by the petitioner. Hence, the present bail application is not maintainable.

6. In view of the representation made by the CPP, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No.12645/2022**

**in**

**K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.131/2022**

Elumalai

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. S. Nagaraj, P. Sathish, D. Janakiraman, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 323, 354 IPC in Cr.No.131/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The defacto complainant is the daughter of petitioner's brother. There exists property dispute. Only wordy quarrel arose between the parties. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. No one sustained injury. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is the brother of defacto complainant's father. The petitioner damaged the concrete slab placed on the rainwater canal in front of the defacto complainant's house. When it was questioned by her, this petitioner abused her in filthy language, pulled her saree and assaulted her with hands. However, he submits that no one sustained injury.

5. Petitioner is the brother of the defacto complainant's father. Dispute between the relatives. The allegation against the petitioner is that he abused the defacto

complainant and assaulted her. According to learned CPP, no one sustained injury and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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 this order, before the learned V 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 10.00 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 in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
***I/c. of Principal Sessions Court***

Copies to:

1. Learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K.10, Koyambedu Police Station, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12658/2022**

**in**

**K.2, Ayanavaram P.S. Cr.No.289/2022**

Suryaparakash @ Suryaprabhu

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. U. Yuvaraj, G. Vasudevan, A. Vinoth Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.289/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. This is a case in counter. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail by the Court below. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case in counter. During the course of wordy quarrel, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his friends with hands and wooden logs and caused injury. However he submits that injured has been treated as out-patient and the petitioner has no previous case.

5. It is a case in counter. Dispute between two groups. The allegation against the petitioner is that during the course of wordy quarrel, the petitioner and other accused assaulted the defacto complainant and others. According to learned CPP, the injured has

been treated as out-patient and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. It is also stated by the petitioner's counsel that arrested accused were enlarged on bail by the Court below. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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 this order, before the learned V 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 10.00 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 in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
***I/c. of Principal Sessions Court***

Copies to:

1. Learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K.2, Ayanavaram Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12658/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No.12655/2022**

**in**

**E.2, Royapettah P.S. Cr.No.134/2022**

Kubendran

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E.2, Royapettah Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 406 420, 448, 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.134/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. In fact, on 3.7.2018, A1/Jayanthi had obtained a loan of Rs.6 lakhs from this petitioner by mortgaging the house property and had failed to repay the said amount. Hence, she had executed a Sworn Affidavit dated 22.3.2021 agreeing to repay the principal along with interest of Rs.70,000/- on or before 30.5.2021, failing which, she will execute a sale deed in favour of the petitioner. Suppressing the said fact, she had sold the property to the defacto complainant. The petitioner is noway connected with the fraudulent act done by A1. The petitioner had also filed civil suits against A1 and the same are pending. Based on the confession statement of A1, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner has appeared before the respondent police for enquiry and narrated the entire facts. However, the petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that A1/Jayanthi in collusion with this petitioner/A2 sold the property to the defacto complainant without original allotment order

issued by the Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board. Only CSR issued by the police was given stating that allotment order was misplaced. The defacto complainant also paid the tax before the Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board and started the renovation work of the house. At that time, this petitioner/A2 entered into the house with the rowdy elements and occupied the property by forcibly evicting the defacto complainant. Thus the accused have cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.7,30,000/-. Investigation is pending. Accused are yet to be secured. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. This petitioner has been arrayed as A2 in this case. As per FIR averments, A1 is the allottee of the TNSCB. She sold the flat to the defacto complainant for a sum of Rs.7,30,000/- alleging that the original allotment order was misplaced and she gave the copy of the allotment order and the CSR issued by the respondent police and also possession of the property was handed over to the defacto complainant. The specific overt act against this petitioner is that he forcibly evicted the defacto complainant and her family alleging that the vendor did not pay the loan availed from him. According to learned CPP, both the accused colluded with each other cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.7,30,000/-. Investigation is pending and the accused are yet to be secured. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that A1 has availed loan from this petitioner by mortgaging the property and without repaying the sold the property to the defacto complainant and thus A1 alone committed cheating. However, it is the matter for trial. Considering the nature of offence, the specific overt act against the petitioner, the amount involved in this case, the fact that investigation is pending and the objection made by learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
***I/c. of Principal Sessions Court***

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12537/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9336/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.not known of 2022**

1. Harikrishnan  
2. Diana Mendonca

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J.6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Suchit Anant Palande, Suyesh, Palande, Jeevika K.A. Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9336/2022, dt:14.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9336/2022 on 14.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition for the past 30 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c. of Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12649/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8697/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.123/2022**

1. Dhanush
2. Poonguzhali
3. Usha
4. Sumithra
5. Ayothi Periyasamy

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

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

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Azhagiri, C.Jagan, V. Venkatesan. Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8697/2022, dt:3.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8697/2022 on 3.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition for the past 32 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
*I/c. of Principal Sessions Court*

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12650/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.10755/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9145/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.not known of 2022**

1. Madhu Marshal  
2. Hema Marshal

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W.3, All Women Police Station,  
Chintadripet,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R.C. Paul Kanagaraj, M. Soundar Vijay Arul Ram, P. John Sundar Jabez, K.A.M. Jagadish Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10755/2022, dt:30.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9145/2022 on 14.6.2022 for the alleged offence u/s.376, 417, 420 of IPC with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Subsequently, on petition the said condition was modified to appear before the learned

Metropolitan Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Chennai daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders as per the order of this court dated 30.6.2022 in CrI.M.P.No.10755/2022.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1st petitioner has sustained fracture on the leg and he is taking treatment and the 2nd petitioner, being the wife accompanied him for his treatment. Due to frequent travel and walk, the 1st petitioner could not recover from the illness. Hence prays for relaxation.

5. According to learned CPP, initially the petitioners have complied the condition for 5 days before the respondent police and after modification, they are complying the condition for the past 16 days. Though the counsel for the petitioners seeks relaxation on the basis of the illness of the 1st petitioner, the petitioners have been complying the condition only for 21 days according to learned CPP. Considering the nature of case and number of days complied, this court is not inclined to relax the condition.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

nmk

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
***I/c. of Principal Sessions Court***

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12654/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8606/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.304/2022**

1. Dilli Raj @ Dilli Babu
2. Leo Karthick
3. Amalan Machado

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. N. Kumar, A. Venkatesan, S. Thamizh Selvan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8606/2022, dt:2.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8606/2022 on 2.6.2022 for the alleged offence u/s.294(b), 341, 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition only for 17 days. Considering the nature of case and number of days complied, this court is not inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c. of Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12656/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9125/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.228/2022**

Rathish

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,  
K.11, CMBT Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T. Vincent, S. Gopi, K. Madhan, A. Krishnamurthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9125/2022, dt:9.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9125/2022 on 9.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 37 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c. of Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12664/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8763/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.456/2022**

Imran @ Khaseem

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

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

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Vijayakumar, D. Nandhakumar, B. Yuvaraj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8763/2022, dt:6.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8763/2022 on 6.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 41 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/c. of Principal Sessions Court**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru. V. Thangamariappan,  
I Additional Sessions Judge  
I/C. of Principal Sessions Court  
Friday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12818/2022**

in

Crl.R.C.No.118/2022

against

M.P.No.14/2022

in

ந.க.எண்.231/செ.நடு/கா.து. மயிலாப்பூர் மாவட்டம்/2022

in

E.1, Mylapore P.S. Sl.No.87/2022 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C.

Anand

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent /  
Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate  
cum Deputy Commissioner of Police,  
Mylapore District, Chennai.
2. The State represented by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E.1, Mylapore Police Station,  
Chennai.

.. Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/  
Complainant

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

**ORDER**

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

2. Heard.

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.14/2022 in ந.க.எண்.231/செ.நடு/கா.து. மயிலாப்பூர் மாவட்டம்/2022 in E.1, Mylapore P.S. Sl.No.87/2022 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment

for 352 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 8.7.2022.

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 352 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

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

9. The Revision is posted on 11.8.2022.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Sd/- V. Thangamariappan,**  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
*I/c. of Principal Sessions Court*

**Copy to :**

1. The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. The Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mylapore District, Chennai.

**nmk**