

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20344/2021**

**in**

P.R.C.No. 124/2014

(on the file of XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai)

**in**

**E-2 Royapettah P.S. Crime No. 948/2013**

Saravanan

.. 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. S.N. Arunkumar, R. Nesarajan, M. Nagoor Moideen, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.10.2021 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 448, 506(ii), 307 r/w 120(B) IPC in Crime No. 948/2013 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than one month. Due to illness, he was unable to appear before the Committal court and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 4.9.2021. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Prior to issuance of NBW, he was regularly attended the court. Hereafter, he will regular in attending the court and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 4.9.2021 and it was executed on 8.10.2021. One or the other accused wantonly absent themselves. Due to their absent, the case could not be committed to the

Court of Sessions. If the petitioner is released on bail, again, he will abscond and objects the grant of bail.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner was regular in attending the court prior to issuance of NBW. NBW was issued on 4.9.2021 and it was executed on 8.10.2021. The case is of the year 2014. NBW also pending against other accused also. This petitioner is in custody for more than a month. 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the said Court daily at 10.30 a.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 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 in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 20344/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20362/2021**

**in**

**K-3 Aminjikai P.S. Crime No. 873/2021**

Lokesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 28.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 397 IPC in Crime No.873/2021 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 has not committed any offence as alleged. He is aged 21 years. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. This petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 28.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner came in a two wheeler and robbed the mobile phone from the defacto complainant while he was standing in front of a medical shop.

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

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. It is reported that the property involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody for the past 27 days. Considering the above facts, age of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20362/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20366/2021**

**in**

**C-3 Seven Wells P.S. Crime No. 729/2021**

Hari Babu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
C-3 Seven Wells Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 729/2021 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 has not committed any offence as alleged. He is aged 22 years. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. He is in custody from 18.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused came in a two wheeler and snatched the mobile phone from the defacto complainant and escaped from the spot.

5. According to CPP, the petitioner is a habitual offender and having 11 previous cases. However, he submits that co-accused were already granted bail.

6. It is reported by the CPP that co-accused were already granted bail. This petitioner is in custody for more than a month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts, age of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20366/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20636/2021**

**in**

**C.C.No. 2946/2021**

**(on the file of XI Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai)**

**in**

**CCB Crime No. 11/2021**

Madan Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Cyber Crime Cell,  
Central Crime Branch, Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Conscious Ilango, M.P. Venkatakrishnan, R. Sangavi, 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 67, 67A of IT Act and 294(b), 509 IPC and sec. 4 of Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act 1986 in Crime No.11/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner played PUBG game of Korea, which has not been banned in India and uploading the same in his You Tube Channel. There were some subscribers in his Channel. According to the prosecution, while playing the game, the petitioner used vulgar language representing the women in a vulgar manner outraging the modesty of women and thereby he attracted subscribers including minor boys and girls. For which, a case has been registered u/s.294(b), 509 IPC and Sec.67,

67A of IT Act and Sec. 4 of IRW Act. Except sec.67(A) of the IT Act, other offences are bailable. In fact, the offence u/s.67(A) is not attracted. Because as per sec. 67(A) of the Act, if any obscene material with sexually explicit act is published, Sec.67(A) is attracted. Even as per the prosecution case, no sexually explicit act had been uploaded by the petitioner. So the offence under sec. 67(A) of the IT Act is not prima facie attracted. This petitioner is in custody for more than 5 months and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that by using vulgar language representing the women in a vulgar manner, this petitioner attracted young adolescent subscribers and thereby lured them to part with their money. Out of such indecent activities, the petitioner amazed wealth more than a Crore.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner was already detained under Act 14/1982 and the detention order is not yet revoked and objects the grant of bail.

6. It is represented by the CPP that this petitioner was already detained under Act 14/1982 and the detention order as against the petitioner is not yet set aside. Considering the gravity of offence and the objection made by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

7. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20730/2021**

**in**

**P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 2734/2021**

Sarathi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a), 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No.2734/2021 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 has not committed any offence as alleged. He is aged 19 years. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. This petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 19.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner was found in possession of 20 bottles of TASMAL brandy for sale without valid licence at the time of search made by the police.
5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 8 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

6. No one reported as hospitalized after consuming the contraband. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for more than a month. Considering the above facts, age of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

(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 in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20730/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20734/2021**

**in**

**N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Crime No. 741/2021**

1. Deepath  
2. Pursothaman

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Nithiyavel, R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Kokila, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 3.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.741/2021 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. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. They are in custody from 3.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.700/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 6 previous cases and 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 2 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

6. Since the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 6 previous cases, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present. Whereas, it is represented that the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 2

previous cases. He is in custody for more than three weeks. Considering the above facts and duration custody of the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner alone subject to condition.

7. Accordingly, the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 XVI 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

8. As far as the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20734/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20791/2021**

**in**

**K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 1095/2021**

Rajesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Sivakumar, S.K. Masthan, K. Sujan Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 2.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 408 and 420 IPC in Crime No. 1095/2021 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 has not committed any offence as alleged. He is nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 2.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, this petitioner received Rs.2,70,000/- from the defacto complainant under the guise of getting job for his daughter at Punjab National Bank and subsequently failed to keep up his promise and thus committed cheating.

5. The counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner has so far paid Rs.1,40,000/- to the defacto complainant and Rs.1,30,000/- is yet to be paid and he admitted the fact that he received Rs.2,70,000/- from the defacto complainant for getting job at Punjab National Bank and he issued bogus appointment order.

6. It is a admitted fact that this petitioner received Rs.2,70,000/- from the defacto complainant for getting job at PNB for his daughter. Later, he unable to secure the job as promised by him. During arguments, the counsel for the petitioner submits that so far, this

petitioner has returned Rs.1,40,000/- to the defacto complainant and balance amount of Rs.1,30,000/- is yet to be paid. The petitioner is in custody for the past 3 weeks. Considering the nature of offence, duration of custody and the submission made by the counsel for the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition to deposit Rs.1,30,000/- before the V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

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 petitioner shall also deposit a sum of Rs.1,30,000/- (Rupees One Lakh thirty thousand only) to the credit of the crime no. 1095/2021 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20791/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20363/2021**

**in**

**C-2 Elephant Gate P.S. Crime No. 1284/2021**

1. Narpat Bharti  
2. Dasharath Bhai

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 29.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 457, 380 IPC in Crime No. 1284/2021 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 are no way connected with the alleged offence. The defacto complainant appeared before the lower court and filed an affidavit stating that these petitioners are not involved in the crime and real culprits have escaped. The petitioners are in custody from 29.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners break opened the defacto complainant's Steel shop shutter and stolen away cash Rs.60,000/- from the cash box and escaped from the spot.

5. On perusal of the trial court order, filing of affidavit by the defacto complainant has been referred. No bad antecedents is reported as against the petitioners. Property involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioners are in custody for the past 26 days. Considering all those circumstances, 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 VIII 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. for two weeks.

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the 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 in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20363/2021**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.15476/2021**

**and**

**Crl.M.P.No.15741/2021**

(intervene petition)

**And**

**Crl.M.P.No.15477/2021**

**and**

**Crl.M.P.No.15742/2021**

(intervene petition)

in

**CCB, Team-I, Cr.No.157/2021**

Ramya Bhaarath

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.15476/2021.

M.R. Bhaarath

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.15477/2021.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCB, Team-I, Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

The above petitions came on 22.11.2021 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Agilesh Kumar.S and B. Sanjay Balachandar, Counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions and of CPP for respondent and of M/s. M. Deivanandam and K. Prasanthan, Counsel for the intervener, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.157/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners/M.R. Bhaarath and Ramya Bhaarath submits that the defacto complainant's mother/Mangala Krishnan was a family friend of the petitioners. The petitioners are in the field of Financing. Since the said Mangala Krishnan was in financial need, she availed a loan of nearly Rs.25 lakh from the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner firm. Unable to repay the amount, the said Mangala Krishnan and his son and others decided to sell their property at Srinagar, Colony, Saidapet and there were Sale Agreements and subsequent Sale Deeds in favour of the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner herein in the year 2012 and 2013, respectively. After the death of Mangala Krishnan, it appears that her son Vijay Krishnan lodged this false complaint as if, the petitioners cheated the family members of Mangala Krishnan and swallowed the properties of their family. Even after referring the matter to the Mediation Centre, the matter has not been settled. He further submits that the dispute is purely civil in nature. Even in order to enforce the Memorandum of Understanding alleged to have been executed between the parties is of the year 2013. At no stretch of imagination, it can be enforced at present, since it is barred by limitation and thus prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the intervener submits that it is a clear case of breach of trust and cheating. There is no change of circumstance as of now to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Earlier petition was dismissed on 25.8.2021. These petitions are filed immediately on 7.9.2021. Since there is element of mediation, this court pleased to refer the matter to mediation. Even before mediation, no settlement arrived between the parties. There is no change of circumstance from the earlier order. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Both the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20933/2021**

in

**J.6, Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No.852/2021**

Ezra Samuel Manoharan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. 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. J. Karthikeyan, M. Hari Rajan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 395 IPC in Crime No.852/2021 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. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. As per FIR contention, 5 persons aged about 20 years waylaid the victim and robbed Rs.500/- and a pair of slippers from him at knife point. This petitioner is aged 28 years. He has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, the victim in this case has spent Rs.500/- for his friends and while they were playing nearby, his slippers were lost. Petitioner is nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is an Architect by profession. The petitioner is in custody from 19.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant's son, who is a student studying 12<sup>th</sup> Std., and demanded money, on his refusal, the accused assaulted him and at knife point robbed cash

Rs.500/- and the slippers from him. He further submits that it is a recent occurrence and investigation is pending and thus objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner was arrested only on 19.11.2021. Period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20934/2021**

in

**D-3, Ice House P.S. Crime No.408/2021**

Vicky @ Vignesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D-3, Ice House Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.S.Madhusudanan, D. Arulthumilan, C. Lingam, R. Vinod Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC altered to 147, 148, 302 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.408/2021 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 and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Charge sheet filed and the case is pending in PRC stage. Co-accused was granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody for more than 3 months and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused murdered the deceased. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 6 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than 3 months. Investigation is over. Charge sheet has been filed. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail by this court. Considering

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.20934/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.20936/2021**

in

**P.1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.1288/2021**

V. Suresh @ Arcot Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
P.1, Pulianthope Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Haridharan, P.Yuvaraj, T. Sandeep, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1288/2021 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 of the offence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. It is a foisted case. This petitioner is in custody from 26.9.2021 and prays for granting of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1500/- from him at knife point and also attacked him using knife. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is having 31 previous cases and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for about 2 months. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 31 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 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, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20936/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20937/2021**

in

**K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.1094/2021**

Appu

.. 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. A. Rajesh Kanna, V. Tamilselvan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 353, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1094/2021 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. The petitioner and his family members are residing in the land belongs to the temple, A/m. Marga Sagaya Easwarar Temple for the past 60 years. The petitioner is unaware of the exparte order passed against them. All of sudden, the defacto complainant along with HR & CE officials and police came to the occurrence place and executed the order and locked and sealed the premises of the petitioner and others. Due to which there was a commotion. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been wrongly identified. The petitioner has approached the Hon'ble High Court for anticipatory bail in Crl.OP.No.18950/2021 and the same was dismissed on 2.11.2021 for his non-appearance. Further, the petitioner also preferred revision before the Commissioner of HR & CE,

Chennai against the eviction order, wherein order was passed to unseal the petitioner premises with a condition to pay 30 percent of the entire arrears of amount. The only dispute is with respect of extent of land. While so, the respondent police arrested the petitioner on 20.11.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 23.9.2021, the Executive Officer of Arulmigu Marga Sagaya Easwarar Thirukovil, along with other H.R. & C.E higher officials, went to the place of occurrence to lock and seal the commercial premises encroached by the petitioner and others as per the eviction order. During that time, the petitioner and others wantonly restrained the defacto complainant and other officials from discharging their official duty and also attacked them. Further, the accused threatened the officials by pouring kerosene on them and tried to set fire, in order to prevent the authorities from discharging their duty. Learned CPP further submits that in the attack, the victim sustained injury on the left hand. The anticipatory bail moved by the petitioner was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on merits. The petitioner was arrested recently and thus, seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner was arrested only on 20.11.2021. The accused poured kerosene on the officials and tried to set fire. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20939/2021**

in

**P.5, MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No.1300/2021**

1. Venkatesh  
2. Thomas

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Nesarajan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 7.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1300/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 7.11.2021. He is noway connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point robbed Rs.800/- from him. He objects granting bail stating that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 2 previous cases and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 1 previous case.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 17 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioners are having previous cases. However, considering the 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 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 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, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.20939/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20941/2021**

in

**J.5, Sastri P.S. Crime No.564/2021**

Suriyavikram @ Mechanic Surya

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J.5, Sastri Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Balasubramaniam, S. Dhanasekar, A.K. Mathy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.564/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from for more than a month. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. He is noway connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point robbed cash Rs.380/- and a Nokia Cellphone from him. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 10 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 10 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 IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.20941/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20940/2021**

in

**P.2, Otteri P.S. Crime No.1509/2021**

Guhan B

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Vimal and J. Siranjeevi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1509/2021 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 noway connected with the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody from 10.11.2021. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point robbed Rs.900/- from him. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is having 1 previous case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 14 days. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having 1 previous case. 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 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, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Tiruvallur.

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.20940/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.Nos.20942, 20943, 20944 and 20945 of 2021**

in

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

M. Akash	.. Petitioner/Accused in CrI.M.P.No.20942/2021
M. Appu @ Madhavan	.. Petitioner/Accused in CrI.M.P.No.20943/2021
C. Sathish	.. Petitioner/Accused in CrI.M.P.No.20944/2021
M. Prakash	.. Petitioner/Accused in CrI.M.P.No.20945/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in  
all the petitions.

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Kingston Jerold and H. Radha Krishnan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

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

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. There was a quarrel between the parties under the influence of alcohol. The deceased Mahesh fallen down and sustained injuries. The deceased died after 10 days. The

petitioners are noway responsible for the death of the deceased. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Sec.302 IPC does not attract. They are in custody from 15.11.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that there was a quarrel between the accused and the defacto complainant's friends near Petrol Bund. Both the parties were under the influence of alcohol. During the quarrel, these petitioners attacked the defacto complainant and his friends/ Mahesh and Hariharan with the iron barricade and the Mahesh who sustained grievous injuries died in the hospital. He further submits that initially, the case was registered u/s. 294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC and later the case has been altered into Sec.302 IPC after the death of the victim. He further submits that the petitioners were arrested recently and investigation is pending and thus objects granting bail.

5. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, Sec.302 IPC does not attract. However, the victim succumbed to injuries. A valuable life has been lost. Petitioners were arrested only on 15.11.2021. Period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, all the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Cr.L.M.P.No.20792/2021**

in

**CCB, Crime No.201/2019**

S. Ravishanker

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch-I Egmore,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Mr. V. Saravanan, 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 14.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 120-B r/w. 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC in Crime No.201/2019 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.,

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of obtaining vehicle loan by producing bogus Registration Certificate. The petitioner is innocent. The prime accused, one Abraham Selvakumar under the guise of arranging loan, manipulated some documents such as vehicle registration certificate. The petitioner himself has been trapped into the issue by other accused. All the transactions were through Bank and written instruments, which are already in the custody of the police. Investigation is almost over. Co-accused was enlarged on bail by this court on 7.10.2021. He is in custody for more than 2 months from 14.9.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the Bank Official gave a complaint, in which nearly 9 persons were arrayed as accused. A1 to A8 obtained vehicle loans from the Punjab and Sindh Bank, Ashok Nagar Branch. This petitioner is A7. The

amount was routed through one Balaji Auto Mobiles. As per records, the borrowers purchased the vehicles from the Balaji Auto Mobiles and they also produced Registration Certificate to the Manager of the Bank as proof of purchasing the vehicles. All the loans turned to Non Performing Asset. On verification, it came to light that though the loans were sanctioned in the name of individuals, no vehicle has been purchased. With the connivance of the Dealer, the cheques issued in favour of the Dealer has been encashed through some other bank and the proceeds were paid to the borrowers. It is a fraud committed upon the bank. He seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the records, it appears the case was registered in the year 2019 at the instance of Regional Manager of Punjab and Sind Bank. Apart from the present petitioner, there are other accused also. As far as this petitioner is concerned, he had purchased a four wheeler and obtained a loan of Rs.14,70,000/-. In fact, there was no such purchase. According to counsel for the petitioner this petitioner has not committed any offence and he was cheated by the prime accused. Any how, the crime number is 2019. Investigation might have been completed by this time. The petitioner is in custody for more than 2 months. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on condition to deposit Rs.5 lakh into the Court. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition to deposit Rs.5 lakhs into court.

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 Metropolitan Magistrate, for CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) The petitioner shall also deposit a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs Only) to the credit of the crime no.201/2019 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate, for CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.20792/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.19735/2021**

in

**CCB, Crime No.150/2020**

Velavan Deepak

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCB, Bank Fraud Wing,  
Commissioner Office, Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M.P. Saravanan, B. Jawahar, P. Prabhakaran, 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 offences u/s.120-B, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC in Cr.No.150/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits no criminal offence has been committed by the petitioner. He had borrowed some amount from the defacto complainant's bank. Since there was some default in making payments, an exaggerated, false complaint has been given and the petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. The loan is fully secured loan and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a grave case of cheating. Under the guise of running two companies, namely M/s. V. Tech Park, in two places produced the documents as if they are running BPO Centres and obtained a loan to the tune of Rs.2.3 Crore and failed to repay the same. They have produced bogus quotations

for supply of Computers, Laptops, etc., for the said companies. But in fact, nothing has been purchased. They have diverted the funds for some other purpose, thereby cheated the Bank. He further submits that earlier petition was dismissed on 22.10.2021 and there is no change of circumstance. Second 2<sup>nd</sup> anticipatory bail petition before this court is not maintainable and thus seriously objects this petition.

5. It is a preplanned fraud committed by the petitioner and others. The amount involved is Rs. 2.3 Crore with interest. Earlier petition was dismissed on 22.10.2021. There is no change of circumstance. Hence,, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20029/2021**

in

**R.5, Virugambakkam P.S., Crime No.978/2021**

M.K. Prabhakar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. William Shakesphere, V. Ravi, A. Sachinraja, 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 offences u/s.147, 148, 420, 419, 365, 344, 384, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.978/2021 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 petitioner and his colleagues were entrusted by the defacto complainant and her family to sell the property and executed a Power of Attorney. While so, the defacto complainant and her family members tried to deal with the property with some third parties. When the petitioner and others questioned the same, there arose wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail by the Court below. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant owns property at Chennai. When his son came to Chennai to deal with the property, this petitioner along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant's son and taken the



original title deed of the property and created bogus power deed. Further, the accused demanded Rs.10 Crore from the defacto complainant to release his son. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who was enlarged on bail after sufficient period of incarceration.

5. It is a grave case of kidnapping. The accused kidnapped the defacto complainant and using the original title deed created bogus Power Deed and also demanded Rs.10 Crore. Granting anticipatory bail in such cases may send a wrong signal to the society at large. Considering the above facts and the objection of learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20531/2021**

**in**

**F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Cr.No.792/2021**

Robin @ Robert

.. 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 M/s. J. William Shakesphere, V. Ravi, A. Gurumoorthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 341, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.792/2021 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. No serious injury. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Wordy quarrel between the parties. Injured treated as out-patient. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

5. 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 XVII 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. for a period of two weeks.

[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.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Chennai.

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.20531/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20870/2021**

**in**

**K.6, T.P. Chathiram P.S. Cr.No.502/2020**

1. Suriyakumar  
2. Chandrakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.6, T.P. Chathiram Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.502/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are neighbours. There was only a wordy quarrel. Petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The victim was treated as out-patient. A3 was granted bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Wordy quarrel between the parties. Injured treated as out-patient. One of the co-accused was granted bail in the police station itself as reported by learned CPP. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

5. 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 10.30 a.m. for a period of two weeks.

[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.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, K.6, T.P. Chathiram P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20531/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.20871 and 20874 of 2021**

**in**

**H.5, New Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.667/2018**

Ravishankar @ Ravi @ Kalvettu Ravi

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
CrI.M.P.No.20871/2021.

1. Appu @ Anbalagan

2. Rukku @ Rukkumangathan

3. Appu @ Citizen @ Vikneshwar

.. Petitioners/Accused in  
CrI.M.P.No.20874/2021.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

H.5, New Washermenpet Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

For petitioner : M/s. M. Kaveriselvam, M. Jaishankar, K.P. Rajendran  
Advocates in CrI.M.P.No.20871/2021

For petitioners : M/s. C. Umamaheswaran, A. Manikandan, S. Sathish, P. Nagaraj,  
Advocates in CrI.M.P.No.20874/2021

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

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of above said Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.667/2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. The alleged occurrence took place in the year 2018. The petitioners were arrested and released on bail subsequently in other case. Now, the respondent police falsely implicated these petitioners in the old case in order to close the pending FIR. Co-accused was already granted anticipatory bail in the year 2018 itself. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. The alleged occurrence is of the year 2018. The respondent police have not chosen to arrest the petitioners in this case till date. On perusal of the FIR, the alleged assault in with hands only. It is reported that co-accused was already granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both the petitions on condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. 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, in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, H.5, New Washermenpet P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20871 and 20874 of 2021



