

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20500/2021**

**in**

**E-1 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 1129/2021**

Maya @ Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E-1 Mylapore Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC r/w sec. 25(1-A) of Arms Act in Crime No.1129/2021 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. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 6.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner demanded money from the defacto complainant who is a ice cream vendor. On his refusal, this petitioner forcibly taken away Rs.500/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

6. Though the petitioner is having previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past 19 days. 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20500/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20501/2021**

**in**

**C-3 Seven Wells P.S. Crime No. 1174/2021**

Radhakrishnan

.. 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 Mr. S. Palanivel, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 394, 397 IPC in Crime No.1174/2021 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. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 29.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused snatched the defacto complainant's hand bag from him which contains cash Rs.80,000/- at knife point and escaped from the spot in a two wheeler.

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

6. It is reported by the CPP that the property involved in this case has been recovered. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. He is in custody for the past 28 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. 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 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. 20501/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 20860/2021**

**in**

**F-4 Thousand light P.S. Crime No. 326/2021**

B. Sennu @ Srinivasan @ Prabakaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F-4 Thousand light Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 326/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the defacto complainant's wife developed relationship. Since the defacto complainant is a drunkard, his wife left him and came along with this petitioner. In this regard, the respondent police called both the petitioner and the defacto complainant's wife for enquiry on 18.9.2021 and retained in the police station. On 19.9.2021, he was arrested and falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody for more than 2 months and prays for bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner working as employee in the defacto complainant's Briyani Shop, developed illegal intimacy with the wife of the defacto complainant and made herself to elope with him. When the defacto complainant asked him to send back his wife, the petitioner abused him and attacked him with knife.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, he submits that injured was discharged from the hospital.

6. It is reported by the CPP that injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody for more than two months. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. According to CPP, the petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 20860/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 20931/2021**

in

**E-1 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 1033/2021**

Santhosh @ Mandai Santhosh

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E-1 Mylapore Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Ganesh Pandian, A. Shabanal, M. Mohammed Yusuff, M. Nanda Gopal, C. Prabakar, K.N. Paridhi Arasu, and U. Mohamed Siddique deen, 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 27.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 307, 448, 506(ii) IPC r/w sec. 25(1-A) of Arms Act in Crime No.1033/2021 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 nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on the petitioner with an ulterior motive. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is aged 18 years. He is in custody from 27.9.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity over a murder of one Vasanth, this petitioner along with other accused entered into the defacto complainant's shop and tried to eliminate him using deadly weapons.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, he submits that co-accused were granted bail by this court.

6. The petitioner is in custody for the past two months. It is reported that no one sustained injury. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. According to CPP, the petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, considering the 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 20931/2021



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 21038/2021**

in

**K-2 Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No. 597/2021**

Parthasarathy

.. 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. M. Surekha, 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 16.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.597/2021 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 nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on the petitioner only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is aged 22 years. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 16.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.600/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner has no previous case.

6. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. He is in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time.

Considering the 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 today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 21038/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Cr.L.M.P.No. 21039/2021**

in

**R-10 MGR Nagar P.S. Crime No. 639/2021**

Deepak @ Seemakalai

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-10 MGR Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Panneerselvan, S. Kumar, 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 25.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC in Crime No. 639/2021 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 nothing to do with the alleged offence. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioner is in custody from 25.9.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner murdered the deceased Kalimuthu using deadly weapon. Due to which, he died on the spot. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he seriously objects the granting of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. A Valuable life has been lost. According to CPP, investigation is underway. Considering the gravity of offence and non completion of 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.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No. 21045/2021**

in

**G-2 Periyamet P.S. Crime No. 459/2021**

Bharath

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-2 Periyamet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Jawahar, 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 25.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.459/2021 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 nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on the petitioner with an ulterior motive. Injured was discharged from the hospital. Co-accused was already granted bail by this court. He is in custody from 25.9.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that during the course of wordy quarrel, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant using knife and caused injury to him.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 17 previous cases. However, he submits that victim was discharged from the hospital and co-accused was granted bail by this court.

6. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 15.11.2021. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody for the past two months. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. 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 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

**CrI.M.P.No. 21045/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November , 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No. 21046 of 2021**

in

**R-7 K.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No. 495/2021**

Prabhakar @ Thakali Prabha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-7 K.K. Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Mukesh Kannah, N. Navin Bharth, 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 18.9.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 506(ii), 307 IPC r/w sec. 3 of Explosive Substance Act 1908 in Crime No. 495/2021 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. There was enmity between the defacto complainant with other accused. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on various dates. Injured has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is in custody from 18.9.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that there exists enmity between the accused and defacto complainant over murder of defacto complainant's brother/Manikandan. In pursuance of that, on the date of occurrence, A1 along with other accused including this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's house and thrown

country bomb with a view to kill him. Injured has been treated as out-patient. He further submits that this petitioner is having 20 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. Injured was treated as out-patient. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 20 previous cases. However, considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XXIII 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

**CrI.M.P.No. 21046/2021**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20383/2021**

**in**

**K.5, Peravallur P.S. Cr.No.1346/2021**

Akash @ Akashkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.5, Peravallur Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Senthilkumar, C. Jeevakumar, C.V. Yogaraj, 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. 294(b), 323, 384, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.1346/2021 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. Since he is having previous cases, he has been falsely implicated in this case. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused abused the defacto complainant and extorted cash Rs.500/- and a cellphone from the defacto complainant and threatened him by showing iron rod. He objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner is having 4 previous cases.

5. The occurrence is in the month of September 2021. It appears there was some dispute between the defacto complainant and the accused. There are chances for exaggeration. Hence, considering the nature of offence and the fact that co-accused was

already enlarged on bail, 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 10.30 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.5, Peravallur P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20383/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20800/2021**

**in**

**J.2, Adyar P.S. Cr.No.266/2021**

Karthick G.

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J.2, Adyar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Yuvarajan, D. Saravanakumar, D. Nareshkumar, R. Ashok Kumar, 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. 452, 294(b), 323, 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.266/2021 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. Quarrel due to money dispute. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Money dispute between the parties. Injured treated as out-patient according to learned CPP. No deadly weapon is used. Except Sec.506(i) 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 IX 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 IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, J.2, Adyar P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20800/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20972/2021**

**in**

**P.2, Otteri P.S. Cr.No.861/2021**

1. Jothi  
2. Malar @ Malarkodi .. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. 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. S.Y. Syed Parvez, K.V. Kalaivannan, 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.861/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. It is a case and counter case in Cr.No.860/2021. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Dispute between relatives. It is a case and counter case. Injured treated as out-patient according to learned CPP. No deadly weapon is used. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 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 X 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. for a period of 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 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 CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, P.2, Otteri P.S. Chennai.

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.20972/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20397/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.17747/2021**

**in**

**R.R.No.23/2021**

G. Sivakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Superintendent of GST & Central Excise,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Mr. P. Sundarraajan, Counsel for the petitioner and of SPP for 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.17747/2021, dt:8.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.17747/2021 on 8.10.2021 for the alleged offence u/s. 132(1)(b) and (c) of CGST Act 2017 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to the counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has been complying the condition from 9.10.2021 to till date. He is a native of Vellore and he is a diabetic patient and he finds it difficult to travel every day to comply the condition. On the other hand, learned SPP submits that investigation is not yet completed and the petitioner's appearance before the respondent is very much needed to complete the investigation and objects to

relax the condition. However, considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to modify the condition to appear before the Investigating Agency once in a week on every Friday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20876/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.18459/2021**

**in**

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

A.P. Sundaramoorthy

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

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

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Durai Kannan, R. Vijayalakshmi, E. Sadasivam, G. Naresh Kumar, M. Senthil Kumar, 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.18459/2021, dt:25.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18459/2021 on 25.10.2021 for the offence u/s.120-B, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall 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 only for 6 days from 28.10.2021 to 2.11.2011. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner was suffering from Stroke from 2.11.2011 and thats why, he is not able to comply the condition. Medical certificate also produced. Considering the medical certificate, this

court is inclined to relax the condition however with a direction to appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**nmk**

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20974/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.17099/2021**

in

**S.C.No.184/2021**

**(on the file of XXI Additional Sessions Court, Chennai**

in

**H.1, Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.4310/2020**

Manikandan @ Dio Mani

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

H.1, Washermenpet Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Durai, R. Prathap Raj, 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.17099/2021, dt:30.9.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.17099/2021 on 30.9.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the XXI Additional Sessions Court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 49 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20973/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.17098/2021**

in

**S.C.No.185/2021**

**(on the file of XXI Additional Sessions Court, Chennai**

in

**H.1, Washermenpet P.S. Cr.No.4319/2020**

Manikandan @ Dio Mani

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,  
H.1, Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Durai, R. Prathap Raj, 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.17098/2021, dt:30.9.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.17098/2021 on 30.9.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the XXI Additional Sessions Court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 49 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

SPECIAL COURT UNDER THE SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES  
(POA) ACT / PRINCIPAL SESSIONS COURT, CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Special Judge / Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.20975/2021**  
**in**  
**CrI.M.P.No.19730/2021**  
**in**  
**W.7, AWPS, Cr.No.14/2021**

1. Sarath Chandra Gupta
2. Sarvendra Gupta
3. Backiyalakshmi
4. Vani

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Police  
Anna Nagar, Chennai – 40.
2. The Inspector of Police,  
W-7, All Women Police Station,  
Anna Nagar, Chennai.
3. M. Venmani

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. Ravi Shankar, Rathinavalli, Counsel for the petitioners and of SPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in CrI.M.P.No.19730/2021, dt:1.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.19730/2021 on 1.11.2021 for the alleged offence u/s. 498(A), 406 and 506(i) IPC r/w. Sec.3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(1)(z) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities Act), 2015 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have been complying the condition from 2.11.2021 to till date. He further submits that investigation is not yet completed and the petitioners' appearance before the respondent is very much needed to complete the investigation and thus objects to relax the condition. However, considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to modify the condition to appear before the respondent police once in a week on every Monday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20772/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.10235/2021**

in

**P.5, MKB Nagar PS, Cr.No.253/2021**

1. Dinesh  
2. Geetha

.. 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. M. Nithiyavel, M. Silambarasan, R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Kokila, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.10235/2021 on 21.6.2021 for the offences u/s.341, 324, 294(b), 506(ii) of IPC on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a like sum and also to appear before the respondent police as and when required.

2. Now the present petition has been filed for extension of time.

3. Heard both sides.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that since the petitioners were affected with Covid, they are unable to surrender before the Magistrate concerned within the stipulated time. Hence, prays for extension of time.

5. The petitioners were already granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the representation made by the petitioners' counsel, this court is inclined to extend the time for further period of 1 week from today. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copies to:

1. Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. Inspector of Police, P.5, MKB Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.20772/2021**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20391/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.17514/2021**

in

**H.5, New Washermenpet PS, Cr.No.1427/2021**

Ramudevan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. I. Pandiarajan, D. Prasanna Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.17514/2021 on 5.10.2021 for the offences u/s.294(b), 324, 427, 506(i) of IPC on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a like sum and also to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for two weeks.

2. Now the present petition has been filed for extension of time.

3. Heard both sides.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to ill health, the petitioner is unable to surrender before the Magistrate concerned within the stipulated time. Hence, prays for extension of time.

5. The petitioner were already granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the representation made by the petitioner's counsel, this court is inclined to extend the time for further period of 1 week from today. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copies to:

1. Learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. Inspector of Police, H.5, Washermenpet Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.20391/2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21044/2021**

in

**Crl.M.P.No.20637/2021**

in

**P.5, MKB Nagar PS. Cr.No.1033/2021**

Dinesh @ Peekazhinjan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State rep. by:

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. B. Karthik, Y. Dhana Sekar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. Petitioner seeks amendment of his name in the bail order of this court dated 20.11.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.20637/2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.20637/2021 on 20.11.2021 for the offence u/s. 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 120(B), 302, 506(ii) of IPC with condition to execute a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per Remand Report, petitioner's name has been mentioned as 'Dinesh @ Peekazhinjan'. But in the earlier petition, petitioner's name has been wrongly mentioned as 'Dinesh Kumar @ Peekazhinjan' instead of 'Dinesh @ Peekazhinjan'. Hence, prays for amendment. Learned CPP has not raised any serious objection. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to permit amendment as prayed for.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) The office is directed to amend the petitioner's name as 'Dinesh @ Peekazhinjan' in the earlier order in CrI.M.P.No.20637/2021 and the earlier order passed by this Court stands good in all other respects.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21044/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20872/2021**

**And**

**Crl.M.P.No.20930/2021**

**(intervene petition)**

**in**

**J.13, Tharamani P.S. Cr.No.510/2021**

1. V. Sekar @ Bannu Sekar

2. S. Suriya

3. V.S. Nagaraj @ Raja

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J.13, Tharamani Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Ramesh Manikandan, S. Dilip Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and of Mr. V. Saravanan, Counsel for the intervener 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, 341, 342, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.510/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. One Dominic, who is running Dominic Travels is a tenant under the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner. The defacto complainant working as a driver under Dominic. On 27.10.2021, while the defacto complainant was taking rest in the tenanted premises, the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner herein also slept in that room and his chain was missing. When the petitioners questioned the defacto complainant, there occurred quarrel, wherein the defacto complainant got injured. An

exaggerated complaint has been given. However, the matter has been compromised between the parties and hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. According to learned CPP, these petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with iron road and wooden log and he was admitted to hospital and later discharged.

5. Defacto complainant present and submitted that they have arrived at compromise. Affidavit also filed to that effect. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned XVIII 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. for a period of 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 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 XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, J.13, Tharamani P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20872/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20947/2021**

in

**R.R.No.36/2021**

**(On the file of the Senior Intelligent Officer, Directorate of Revenue Intelligence,  
T.Nagar, Chennai-600017)**

Arunkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

Senior Intelligent Officer,  
Directorate of Revenue Intelligence,  
T.Nagar,  
Chennai-600017.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.D.Saravanan and Lellela Narasimulu, Counsel for the petitioner and of Mr.N.P.Kumar, Special Public Prosecutor for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 23.10.2021 for the offence under Section 112 and 135 of the Customs Act, in R.R.No.36/2021, on the file of the respondent, seeks bail.

2. The petition averments is as follows :

The petitioner is only a Customs House Agent of the seized consignment and he was arrested without any reason. He is being a licensed customs broker and he absolutely had no knowledge about the goods present in the consignment cleared on 22.10.2021. It is resorted only with the sender and the recipient. The petitioner is running a customs clearing agency in the name of M/s.Aala Shipping Services Pvt. Ltd., represented as a director of the private limited company. He is an Income Tax Assessee and having good reputation and there is no infringement issues for the past 12 years. He is doing business transaction with the importer named M/s.Lotus Castle Exports Pvt. Ltd., for the past one year without any infringement issues caused so far. Due to the goodwill earned by the importer in the past



years the petitioner gave credit of 60 days for the clearance payments. He received Rs.50,000/- on 11.10.2021 through NEFT transaction for the export shipment done on 5.10.2021 through Shipping Bill No.5017791 dated 1.10.2021 bearing Container No.MEDU1643940 and Seal No.45991 though Bill of Lading No.NAVMAAPKG 218650 to the same company. The petitioner spent Rs.31,050/- towards freight charges paid through Invoice Ref No.CHNLE01045/21-22 dated on 8.10.2021 to Navio Shipping Pvt. Ltd. and Rs.3,953/- towards CFS charges through the Invoice No.GSLEH/2122/04488 on 5.10.2021 to Gateway Distriparks Ltd., and transport charges paid Rs.7,000/- through Invoice No.SRT/182/2021-22 on 7.10.2021 to Sri Raghavendra Transports by way of cash and additionally labour charges, other expenses Rs.4,000/- in total Rs.46,003/- spent towards the export shipment done by the same company. The petitioner has no previous case. He is ready to abide by any stringent condition. Hence, prays for bail.

3. The averments in the counter are as follows :

The petitioner has admitted in his statement dated 23.10.2021 under section 108 of the Customs Act that he is fully aware that gold was concealed in the subject import consignment and that he has agreed to undertake customs clearance of the same for a monetary consideration of Rs.50,000/- instead of the usual service charges of Rs.10,000/- per import consignment from the importer firm M/s.Lotus Castle Exports Pvt. Ltd., Chennai. The petitioner, being a licenced customs broker has not verified the genuineness, existence and functioning of the importer in the declared address as is required under the customs broker licencing regulations, 2018 and has not exercised due diligence in undertaking the customs clearance work in as much as he has not even met the Directors of M/s.Lotus Castle Exports Pvt. Ltd. and has undertaken the said clearance work on the request of one Shri Akbar Ali who is in no way connected to the said company. The importing firm M/s.Lotus Castle Exports Pvt. Ltd. is not existing at the declared address. The department is vigorously pursuing the investigation in right earnest and is making all out efforts to apprehend the other persons materially concerned in the offence and hence, granting of bail to the petitioner will certainly jeopardise the efforts of the respondent to bring them to face justice. Hence, the petition may be dismissed.

4. Now the point for consideration is :

Whether the petitioner is entitled for bail?

**POINT :**

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is only a customs clearing agent. He had acted as per the instruction of the customer. He had no knowledge about the concealment of gold in the consignment imported to the country. He acted bonafidely and prays for bail.

6. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor submits that the petitioner deliberately acted as a customs clearing agent for enhanced fee, knowing fully well about the smuggling of the gold. Even in the previous occasion, he had acted as a customs agent of the importer M/s.Lotus Castle Exports Pvt. Ltd. In the voluntary statement given by the petitioner, he categorically admits the knowledge of the concealment of the gold in the consignment. Further, he had not verified with the importer before doing the clearing work at the instance of one Shri.Akbar Ali, who has involved in the attempt of smuggling gold as if they are machine tools, vacuum cleaner etc. and seriously objects granting bail.

7. The value of the gold smuggled in such a manner is more than Rs.2 crores. The accused is in custody only for the past one month. The prime accused yet to be secured. Considering all those circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

8. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20797/2021**

in

**CCB Crime No.532/2018**

N.Srikumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.Prakash Goklaney, Velu Srinivasan and S.Sivalinga Kesavan, 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 25.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 420 of IPC in Crime No.532/2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 25.10.2021. He is innocent. There was some mischief by the builder. The amount from the bank directly gone to the builder's account and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submitted the C.D. for perusal and objects granting bail stating that the amount involved is more than Rs.76 lakhs.

4. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the petitioner availed housing loan initially from State Bank of India, Velachery Branch. The petitioner appears to be a non-resident Indian, employed at Muscat. He applied another loan for the same property in S.B.I., Muscat branch. After availing two loans for a single property under the guise of change of flat, as on date, the total outstanding is Rs.76 lakhs. Prima faice, criminal intention is there for moving two loans in two different places for the very same property. The petitioner not

chosen to repay the EMIs also. Considering all those circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.20489/2021**

in

**G-3, Kilpauk P.S. Crime No.440/2021**

Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.G.Vinodh Kumar and A.Rawther Naina Mohamed, 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 3.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 408 of IPC in Crime No.440/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an employee of the defacto complainant. There was a misunderstanding and an exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner is in custody from 3.10.2021 to till date and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner was entrusted with gold ingots for making jewellery. While verifying the account, it came to light, 91 grams of gold entrusted with him was missing and objects granting bail.

4. No bad antecedents reported. There are chances for exaggeration at the hand of the defacto complainant. The petitioner is in custody for more than 50 days. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.20489/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.21036/2021**

in

**J-3, Guindy Traffic Investigation Wing Crime No.491/2021**

Mohan Gokul

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J-3, Guindy Traffic Investigation Wing,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.R.Ajith 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 9.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 279, 337, 338, 308 of IPC and u/s 185 of M.V. Act altered to 279, 304(2), 337 of IPC and u/s 185 of M.V.Act in Crime No.491/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. It is a case of road accident. It took place due to the negligence of the victims, for which, the petitioner had been remanded to custody by registering the case u/s 308 IPC. He is in custody for the past 15 days. He had twins, aged about 5 months. He has to take care of the twins and prays for bail. He also produced some photographs and medical certificate relating to the birth of the twins for his wife.

3. No doubt, the documents would go to show birth of the children 5 ½ months back. The document dated 15.11.2021 is relating to the blood report of the child. What was the ailment of the said children is not known. The documents would go to show the birth of babies on 31.5.2021. There are chances of such exaggerated submissions by the learned counsel for the purpose of getting bail. As far as this case is concerned, no doubt, it is a

case of road accident. The petitioner was under the influence of alcohol at the time of accident. He drove the car in a drunken mood, that too, in Mount Road, which resulted in causing road accident. Originally, the case was registered u/s 308 IPC, subsequently, since the victim died, it has been altered to 304(ii) IPC. Considering the dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Court that in a case of road accident, resulting in death, shall be viewed seriously and considering the duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

4. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

SS

**Principal Sessions Judge.**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Wednesday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.19916 and 20007/2021**

in

**N-4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Crime No.954/2021**

S.Thiresh

.. Petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.19916/2021 /  
Accused

1. Jeevan Kumar

2. Vignesh @ Vigneshwaran

.. Petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.20007/2021 /  
Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
N-4, Fishing Harbour Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

For petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.19916/2021 – M/s.K.B.Vivekanandhan, V.Sudarsan and  
S.Jayachandran.

For Petitioners in Crl.M.P.No.20007/2021 – M/s.R.Mukesh Kannah and M.Nithiyavel.

These petitions coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the above counsels, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 26.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 324 and 307 of IPC in Crime No.954/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are no way connected to the offense. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Further, it is a petty-quarrel, for which, an exaggerated complaint has been given and prays for granting bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that no doubt, it is a quarrel over riding of motor-cycle in the death procession, for which, the petitioners and others assaulted

those who are objected for riding the motor-cycle at high speed. Nearly five persons sustained injury due to the assault and objects granting bail.

4. However, the petitioners are in custody for about a month. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 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.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.Nos.19916 and 20007/2021