

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July , 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 11533/2022**

**in**

**PRC No.54/2011**

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

**in**

**S.C.No. 181/2021**

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

**in**

**K-6 T.P. Chathiram P.S. Crime No. 23/2010**

Sugu @ Sugumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Vishnu, M.S. Vigneswaran, 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 29.1.2020 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 392 r/w 397, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No.181/2021 in Crime No. 23/2010 on the file of respondent police seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that when this case was in PRC stage, NBW was issued against the petitioner by the committal court and subsequently, this petitioner was produced under PT Warrant in this case on 29.1.2020 and on the same day, he has been remanded to judicial custody. Thereafter, this case was committed to the Court of Sessions and it was registered as S.C.No.181/2021 which is pending before XV Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai at trial stage. This petitioner was convicted by the

XVIII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai on 7.1.2019 in S.C.No.122/2012 and subsequently he filed criminal appeal before the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in Criminal Appeal No. 621/2019 and the Hon'ble High Court set aside the lower court judgment on 30.3.2022. Due to the conviction, this petitioner was unable to appear before the committal court. He further submits that this petitioner was produced before the XV Additional Court and his remand is extended from time to time from 15.4.2021 till 4.7.2022. No NBW was issued against this petitioner by the XV Additional Sessions Court. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. The petitioner is in custody from 29.1.2020 and prays for granting bail.

4. On perusal of the records, it would go to show that this petitioner was remanded to judicial custody in this case on 29.1.2020 under PT Warrant while NBW was pending against this petitioner. The petitioner has not mentioned in the petition that when NBW was issued against the petitioner in this case. NBW was issued by the Committal court in PRC No.54/2011. But, the date of issuance of NBW has not been furnished by the petitioner. Subsequently, the case was committed to the court of Sessions and registered as S.C.No.181/2021 and now pending before the XV Additional Sessions Court. The counsel for the petitioner has to furnish the correct particulars to obtain bail. But, he failed to do so. Apart from that, after 10 years, the case has been committed to the Court of Sessions. If the petitioner is released on bail, he will again get abscond. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12215/2022**

in

**D-2 Anna Salai P.S. Crime No. 111/2022**

Jagan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D-2 Anna Salai Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 302 IPC in Crime No. 111/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. This petitioner is arrayed as A3 and he is one of the inmates of the said de-addiction centre viz., Madras Care Centre. This petitioner did not attack the deceased and there is no specific overt act against him. Co-accused/A4 and A7 were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No. 15667 and 15739/2022 dated 7.7.2022. A2 was already granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioner is in custody from 15.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, totally 10 accused involved in this case in which this petitioner is arrayed as A3. He along with other accused persons, due to previous enmity, attacked the deceased with sticks and other deadly weapon and caused grievous injuries on the deceased, due to which he died on the same day i.e., on 2.5.2022. Investigation is going on. Hence, he

seriously objects the grant of bail. However, according to CPP, some of the co-accused were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court.

5. Co-accused/A4 and A7 were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court on 7.7.2022. A2 was already granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court since she is only a licence holder. This petitioner is in custody for the past 70 days. 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 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 twice at 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12215/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12638/2022**

in

**CBCID Metro Wing-II Crime No. 02/2021**

A. Surulivel

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Crime Branch CID,  
Metro Wing-II  
Egmore, Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 465, 467, 468, 471 and 420 IPC in Crime No. 02/2021 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. This petitioner only introduced the job seekers to A1. He has not received any amount from the victims. A1 only received the amount. He never received any amount from the defacto complainant. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. A5 and A7 were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.13277 and 13587/2022 dated 15.6.2022. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioner is in custody from 6.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the complaint has been lodged by one Dharaneeswaran, Deputy Director, O/o. Advocate General of Tamil Nadu, High Court of Madras alleging that the accused persons created, forged the documents and committed cheating by issuing fake appointment orders in the name of the Office of Advocate General of Tamil Nadu, High Court of Madras. On investigation, it was found that fake appointment

orders were created and issued in the name of Registrar General of Madras High Court and the Office of Advocate General by using their signatures and seals. This petitioner is the prime accused. This petitioner entered into a criminal conspiracy with other accused and committed the offence of forgery of documents and cheated by issuing fake appointment orders for the post of Magisterial Clerk in the name of Office of the Advocate General, Tamil Nadu. Hence, the case.

5. According to CPP, it is a case of job racketing. During the course of investigation, it reveals that this petitioner had collected money around Rs.6 lakhs from each person and given Rs.4 lakhs to A1 Nagendra Kumar for fake appointment as Magisterial clerk at High Court of Madras and retained Rs.2 lakhs as commission from each person and he had collected money from several persons and swindled around Rs.80 lakhs and thereby cheated the job aspirants under the guise of getting job at High Court fraudulently. In fact, they conducted interview in the corridor of the City Civil Court and fabricated appointment orders and served them. Nearly 35 persons were cheated and totally Rs.5 Crores was swindled. The co-accused, who were released on bail by the Hon'ble High Court are also one of the victims. Hence, this petitioner cannot claim parity with them. This petitioner is also a prime accused. A1 Nagendrakumar's bail petition was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on 6.7.2022. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

6. It is a case of job racketing. Totally 7 accused in this case. This petitioner is arrayed as A2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he collected money around Rs.6 lakhs from each person and given Rs.4 lakhs to A1 Nagendra Kumar for fake appointment as Magisterial Clerk at High Court of Madras and retained Rs.2 lakhs as commission from each person likewise he collected money from several persons and swindled several lakhs. The counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court on 15.6.2022 and the same benefit may be extended to this petitioner also. However, according to CPP, the co-accused, who were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court are also victims. But, this petitioner introduced job seekers to A1 and received commission for that and nearly Rs.80 lakhs has been swindled by him. The total cheated amount runs to the tune of Rs.5 Crores. According to CPP, 35 young job aspirants were cheated by the petitioner and others. Hence, he cannot claim parity with co-accused. A1's

bail application was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on 6.7.2022. Investigation is not yet completed. This petitioner has committed very serious offence as against the society, that too, fabricated the seal of Hon'ble High Court and forged the signatures of the Registrar General of Hon'ble High Court. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12641/2022**

**in**

**B.1, North Beach P.S. Crime No.1541/2021**

Deepan Chakkaravarthy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
B.1, North Beach Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Shahul Hameeth, K. Manikandan, A. Mohammed Iqbal, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 392 of IPC in Crime No.1541/2021 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. This petitioner's name not mentioned in the FIR. Only to close the pending FIR, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was already granted bail by this court on 22.6.2022. The petitioner is in custody from 19.5.2022 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that totally 4 accused, this petitioner is arrayed as A2. This petitioner along with other accused, came in a Car dashed against the defacto complainant's two wheeler and tried to snatch the bag containing cash and i-phone from him, which was thwarted by the defacto complainant. When the defacto complainant tried to escape from the place, the accused had stolen his two wheeler and flee from the place. There is CCTV footage to connect the accused with



the crime. Though the occurrence took place during November 2021, the petitioner was absconded for a long time and he was arrested only on 19.5.2022. He further submits that this petitioner is having 8 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Though it is represented by the CPP that the bike involved in this case has been recovered, considering the antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12890/2022**

in

**J-5 Sastri Nagar P.S. Crime No. 151/2022**

Rabindra Kumar Majhi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Velmurugan, R. Kabali, 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 16.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 328 IPC and sec. 20(2) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act 2003 in Crime No. 151/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. This petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case only due to mistaken identity. He is in custody from 16.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner was found in possession of 17 Kg of banned tobacco products at the time of search conducted by the police.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it would go to show that this petitioner is the manufacturer of banned tobacco products. At the time of search conducted at the premises of the petitioner, the police seized 14 Kg of banned tobacco products, grinder, mixie, one cell phone and cash Rs.3950/-. Except the 14 Kg, already 3 Kg of banned tobacco products

were seized by the police from the petitioner. So, totally 17 Kg of banned tobacco products were recovered from the petitioner. But, in the petition, this petitioner only stated 3 Kg of tobacco products seized from him and suppressed the total quantity of tobacco products seized from his premises. Further, this petitioner was arrested only on 16.7.2022. Investigation is at an early stage. In the above said circumstances, 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: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12894/2022**

in

**J-1 Saidapet P.S. Crime No.169/2022**

Bala @ Balakrishnan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J-1 Saidapet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 31.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 169/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused was granted bail by this court on 10.6.2022 in Crl.M.P.No.9126/2022. The petitioner is in custody from 31.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with three other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.130/- and a mobile phone from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 15

previous cases. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of crime. Hence, seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12785/2022**

in

**P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 529/2022**

Pradeep Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Elumalai, S. Shanmugam, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 529/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Injured was discharged from the hospital. He is in custody from 8.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked him using knife. Due to which the defacto complainant sustained cut injuries over head, left side neck and left hand wrist and he was admitted to hospital for treatment. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. However, according to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody for the past 18 days. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. 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.

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 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12785/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12886/2022**

in

**N-4 Fishing Harbour P.S. Crime No. 138/2022**

Vallarasu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Apunu, R. Kamesh, K. Subburaj, 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 6.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 399 IPC in Crime No. 138/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Nothing was recovered from this petitioner. Co-accused were already granted bail. The petitioner is in custody from 6.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A2 along with four other accused planned to commit dacoity. He further submits that this petitioner is having 3 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. Co-ccused were already granted bail. No offence committed. The petitioner is in custody for the past three weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, considering the nature of offence 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 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12886/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Cr.L.M.P.No. 12895/2022**

in

**F-4 Thousand Light P.S. Crime No. 140/2022**

Mani @ Maran @ Manimaran

.. 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. M. Rajavelu, R. Raghavel, S. Sarala, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for respondent, and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 140/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody from 6.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner robbed Rs.500/- from the defacto complainant's petty shop at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 6 previous cases and he is a history sheeter as per Egmore police station records. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

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

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12896/2022**

in

**B-1 North Beach P.S. Crime No. 252/2022**

Jana @ Janarthanan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
B-1 North Beach Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Durai, A. Nazar, 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 9.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 252/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The property involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody from 9.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A1 along with two other accused stolen away the two wheeler of the defacto complainant when it was parked in front of his chithi's house. He further submits that this petitioner is having one previous case.

5. However, according to CPP, the bike involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. 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.

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 VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12896/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12898/2022**

in

**F-2 Egmore P.S. Crime No. 236/2022**

S. Saran @ Mosas

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Kamal, D. Sruthi, 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 6.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 302 of IPC r/w. 34 IPC in Crime No.236/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. A1 to A4 alone murdered the deceased. The petitioner is noway connected with the murder. As per the FIR, there is no overt act as against this petitioner. The petitioner's two wheeler was used by A1 and A2 and A5's two wheeler was used by A3 and A4. Based on the confession statement of co-accused this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is aged 19 years. He is in custody from 6.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 6 accused involved in this case. This petitioner is A6. Due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused brutally attacked the deceased with knife and murdered him. The petitioner is the

named accused and there is specific overt act against the petitioner as per FIR. Investigation is not yet completed. Co-accused bail petition also dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 13.7.2022 and that there is no change in circumstance. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is a named accused. As per FIR averments, the overt act against this petitioner is that he along with other accused brutally attacked the deceased with knife. According to learned CPP investigation is pending. Considering the gravity of offence, the fact that a valuable life has been lost, the specific overt act against the petitioner, no change in circumstance was reported before this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application and the fact that investigation is at crucial stage, 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**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12338/2022**

in

**R-7 K.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No. 283/2022**

Vinith

.. 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. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, S. Petchi Muthukumar, P. Muthumari, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. These petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 283/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. False case has been foisted on him with an ulterior motive. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. This petitioner has no role in the alleged offence. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court on 18.7.2022. Hence, he prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 6 accused. This petitioner is arrayed as A2. On 26.6.2022 while playing carom board, there was a wordy quarrel arose between A1 Richard and the defacto complainant's friend Magesh. Due to which, all the accused joined together and attacked the defacto complainant and his friend and caused injury to them and that the victims were admitted to hospital for treatment. However, according to CPP, the victims were discharged from the hospital after two days. He further submits that the petitioner has no bad antecedents.



6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. According to CPP, victims were discharged from the hospital after two days of treatment. Some of the co-accused were granted bail by this court on 18.7.2022. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

7. 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 XXIII 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 report before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open court

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. The XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R-7 K.K. Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

vv

**CrI.M.P.No. 12338/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12904/2022**

**in**

**E.4, Abiramapuram P.S. Crime No.259/2022**

V. Nandagopal

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
E.4, Abiramapuram Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Prashanth, 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 1.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.259/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent. On 1.7.2022, this petitioner along with his son, aged 12 years and a pet dog went for morning walk on Greenways Road. At that time, one gentleman was along bringing his dog accompanied by the defacto complainant for a walk. Since the defacto complainant did not fetter their dog properly, it bounced on the petitioner's dog and bite it. Petitioner's dog got severe bleeding injuries. Due to which, the petitioner asked them, why they did not tie their dog properly. The defacto complainant informed him that the gentleman is the sitting Judge of Hon'ble High Court of Madras. Immediately, the petitioner extended his apology. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has no intention or motive. Since his dog got injured, he got angry. Further, his dog died after 13 days,

without responding to the treatment. The petitioner is having 3 children. The respondent police has filed the charge sheet by altering the Sections as 341, 323, 294(b), 506(ii) IPC, but the same is not yet numbered. He is in custody from 1.7.2022 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that when the Hon'ble Judge, High Court of Madras along with his pet dog was walking on the Greenways road accompanied by the defacto complainant working as Gardener in the bungalow, this petitioner, who was standing in suspicious manner, waylaid them and abused them and tried to attack the defacto complainant. However, he submits that charge sheet has been filed by altering the sections 289, 341, 294(b)(2 counts), 353, 352, 506(i) IPC and is yet to be numbered and the prosecution is taking steps to conduct the speedy trial. He objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 25 days. The period for taking custodial interrogation is over. As per the FIR, the allegation against the petitioner is that he abused the defacto complainant and tried to attack him which was thwarted by him. According to learned CPP, investigation is over and charge sheet has been filed and is yet to be numbered. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

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

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the

learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

**nmk**

**Crl.M.P.No.12904/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12899/2022**

**in**

**V.1, Villivakkam P.S. Crime No.301/2022**

C. Surya

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
V.1, Villivakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Sonai Bothi Rajan, T. Vinoth Kumar, 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 4.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 394 r/w. 397 of IPC in Crime No.301/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 4.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and at knife point demanded his wrist watch, that on his refusal, the accused had robbed cash Rs.500/- and the wrist watch from him and also attacked him. Investigation is pending and amount has not yet been recovered. However, he submits that wrist watch has been recovered and the petitioner is having only one previous case.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 22 days. The period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Considering the duration of custody and the petitioner is having only one previous case, 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 XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

**nmk**

**Crl.M.P.No.12899/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12902/2022**

**in**

**H.6, R.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No.369/2022**

Shahul Hameed

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H.6, R.K. 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. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, M. Mohammadhu Ajar, R. Raja Rajeshwari, 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 22.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 174(iii) Cr.P.C. @ Sec.302 of IPC in Crime No.369/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The deceased is his wife and they had a female child aged 10 months. Both of them are leading a peaceful life. On the occurrence day, there was wordy quarrel arose between them. Suddenly she fell down and went to unconscious. There is no motive. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged. He is noway responsible for the death of the deceased. The defacto complainant, mother of the deceased is not having good opinion on the petitioner and based on suspicion, this false complaint has been given. He has to take care of his child. The petitioner is in custody from 22.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.



4. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant, mother of the deceased lodged a complaint stating that there exists family dispute between the petitioner and her daughter, Afrin Rossia(now deceased) and therefore, often they picked up quarrel. On 17.6.2022, she received a message from the neighbour of the deceased that her daughter fell down unconsciously and admitted to the hospital. But, the doctor declared that she was brought dead at 10.30 a.m. When the defacto complainant saw her daughter she sustained blood injury on her lip and there was ligature mark on the neck. According to learned CPP, based on the complaint, initially, the case was registered u/s.174(iii) Cr.P.C. During investigation it came to light that the petitioner had a quarrel with the deceased and under the influence of alcohol, he had assaulted her and strangled her with shawl and smothered with a pillow and murdered her and thereby, section was altered into 302 IPC. RDO report is awaited. Investigation is going on. Earlier petition was dismissed on 18.7.2022 and there is no change of circumstance and thus seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. On perusal of FIR, it is alleged that the deceased had an injury on her lips and a ligature mark on the neck. The marriage of the petitioner and the deceased was solemnized on 24.2.2020. It is an unnatural death within 7 years of the marriage. Prima facie doubt is against the husband. According to the CPP, RDO report is yet to be received. Investigation is at preliminary stage. Earlier petition was dismissed only on 18.7.2022. Considering the gravity of offence, the fact that a valuable life has been lost, short duration of custody and stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12796/2022**

**in**

**N.2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.147/2022**

1. Naveen
2. Kavitha
3. Suganya
4. Naveena
5. A. Aarthi
6. A. Ammu

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Section 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.147/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that this petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that A1 under the influence of alcohol, demanded Rs.500/- from the defacto complainant, that on his refusal and also due to previous enmity, the petitioner kicked him and picked quarrel. On seeing the incident,

the petitioners herein, relatives of A1 came there and all of them along with A1 attacked the defacto complainant with hands and wooden logs. The victim sustained grievous injuries and he is still taking treatment as in-patient in the Govt. Stanley Hospital. It is a recent occurrence and investigation is pending. Hence, seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, the fact that injured is still taking treatment and the fact that investigation is pending, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12799/2022**

**in**

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

K. Nagoorkani

.. 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. S. Mohan Raj, V. Vinodha, B.J. Santhosh Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

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

2. Heard both sides.

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

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

5. It is a case in counter. Dispute between two groups. The allegation against the petitioner is that during the course of wordy quarrel, the petitioner and other accused

assaulted the defacto complainant and others. According to learned CPP, the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. It is also stated by the petitioner's counsel that arrested accused were enlarged on bail by the Court below and one of the co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12800/2022**

**in**

**W.9, AWPS Villivakkam, Cr.No.8/2022**

Selvakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
W.9, All Women Police Station, Villivakkam,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 354, 506(ii) of IPC and Sec.67 of IT Act in Cr.No.8/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner is the father of A1. The defacto complainant, who is a married woman, having two grown up children had developed illegal intimacy with the petitioner's son/A1. When the petitioner came to know the fact, he warned both the defacto complainant and A1 not to continue their relationship. The defacto complainant demanded huge money to break off the relationship with A1, which was refused by the petitioner. Enraged over that only to tarnish the image of the family, this false and exaggerated complaint has been given. A1 was granted bail on 31.7.2022 based on the compromise between the parties. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner is A2, father of A1. A1 had developed relationship with the defacto complainant and had physical

relationship on several times and had taken intimate photographs without her knowledge. Taking advantage of the photographs possessed by him, A1 had sex with defacto complainant under threat and also harassed her both mentally and physically. When she complaints about the conduct of A1 to his father, the petitioner herein abused her and through whatsapp message, he had threatened to kill her and also her children. Investigation is pending. Earlier petition was dismissed on 5.7.2022 and there is no change of circumstance. He cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who was enlarged on bail after incarceration. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the FIR, the allegation against this petitioner is that he along with his son/A1, threatened the defacto complainant to upload the obscene photographs of the defacto complainant in the Youtube channel as well as in the social media. The petitioner went to the defacto complainant's house and threatened her dire consequences not to speak about the truth and also through whatsapp. Co-accused was granted bail after incarceration and this petitioner cannot claim parity with him. Earlier petition was dismissed on 5.7.2022. Considering the serious nature of offence, the allegation against this petitioner, the fact that investigation is pending and the serious objection raised by learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12801/2022**

**in**

**P.5, MKB Nagar P.S. Cr.No.504/2022**

Rajakani @ Ramakani

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.504/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, the defacto complainant and his friends alone blocked the way to the vehicle driven by the petitioner and started to attack him. This is a case in counter. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case in counter. The petitioner drove his vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and stopped in front of the defacto complainant as if to dash against them. When the defcto complainant questioned him, this petitioner abused him and attacked the defacto complainant and his friend with knife and caused injury. However he submits that injured have been discharged after taking two days in-patient treatment and the petitioner has no previous case.



5. It is a case in counter. The allegation against the petitioner is that during the course of wordy quarrel, the petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant and others. According to learned CPP, the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12801/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12802/2022**

**in**

**R.5, Virugambakkam P.S. Cr.No.229/2022**

Ashraf

.. 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. T. Saraganan, S. Raj, A. Vishar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.365 IPC @ 147, 294(b), 341, 323, 365, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.229/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner innocent. One Mr. Ravi, father of the defacto complainant posed himself as owner of the premises at Door No.18/24, Appadurai Main Street, Ayanavaram, Chennai and entered into a lease agreement with this petitioner and received a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- on 9.3.2022. Likewise, he had also obtained a sum of Rs.8 lakhs from one Nasurudeen agreeing to lease out the said premises. Against the said Ravi, this petitioner has lodged a complaint in Cr.No.142/2022 u/s.406, 420 IPC and Nasurudeen lodged a complaint in Cr.No.143/2022. As a counter blast, this false complaint has been given. On 25.3.2022, the said Nasurudeen saw Ravi at Virugambakkam and took him to the Ayanavaram Police Station, but the said Ravi had created a scene as if he was kidnapped and through his son, lodged this false complaint. In fact, Ravi, father of the defacto complainant alone cheated both the petitioner and Nasurudeen. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged

offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 8 accused involved in this case. Due to money dispute, this petitioner and Nasurudeen along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant's father and detained him in a Car and demanded to return the lease amount of Rs.13 lakhs paid by them and had taken scooter key, Vivo Cellphones, gold rings, wrist watch and cash Rs.21,000/-. Under threat the victim made a whatsapp call to his wife and asked her to bring the money at Puzhal Bypass Road without intimating the relatives or the police. Based on the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant case was registered and the respondent police went to the spot and rescued the victim and arrested the accused and three two wheelers, 7 cellphones, gold rings, wrist watch cash Rs.21,000/- and Car were seized. The occurrence took place on 25.3.2022. While 6 accused were arrested, this petitioner and A6 escaped from the spot and till date the petitioner is absconding. He is the prime accused. Arrest of the petitioner is very much necessary to complete the investigation and thus he seriously objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of 365 IPC. On perusal of FIR, it appears there exists money transaction between the petitioner and the defacto complainant's father. In order to recover the amount, this petitioner along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant's father and detained him in a car and demanded return of money. According to learned CPP, investigation is pending and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to complete the investigation. Considering the grave nature of offence, the overt act against the petitioner and the fact that investigation is pending, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12803/2022**

**in**

**N.1, Royapuram P.S. Cr.No.382/2022**

Navin @ Manikandan

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.341, 294(b), 324, 323, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.382/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner innocent. In fact, A1/Suresh and the defacto complainant had enmity between them. This petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 5 accused. This petitioner is A2. Due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his father with hands and wooden logs. The victim sustained injury and sutures were made. However, learned CPP submits that injured have been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner has no previous case.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his father. According to learned CPP, the injured

were discharged from the hospital and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. Learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, N.1, Royapuram Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12803/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12653/2022**

**in**

**J.5, Sasthiri Nagar P.S. Crime No.151/2022**

P. Annamalai

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Muthu, J. Vijaya Kumar, R. Rajasekaran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Section 328 of IPC and Sec.20(2) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act 2003 in Crime No.151/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is the landlord. A1 in this case ailing from Odisha approached this petitioner to let out a portion as he is working in the Metro Rail Project. Believing his words, this petitioner let out a portion to him. This petitioner has no knowledge about the offence committed by A1. This petitioner is noway connected with the alleged storage of tobacco products. Since the petitioner is owner of the house, he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that on information, the respondent police went to the place of occurrence and found that A1 was indulged in the sale of banned tobacco products and he was arrested and from him 3 Kg of Maava was seized. During enquiry, he gave statement that with the knowledge of his landlord, he is manufacturing Maava by mixing the toxic substance in the tenanted premises at C-6, Ellaiamman Koil Street, Oorurkuppam. Based on his statement, the police went in search of the premises and seized 11 Kg Jardha, Supari - 3 Kg, Mixie, cash, Rs.3950, cellphone. This petitioner having knowledge about the manufacturing of toxic substance, let out his premise to A1 for commission. It is a recent occurrence. Investigation is pending. The bail petition moved by A1 was dismissed by this court. Hence, seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, recovery of huge quantity of banned tobacco products, the allegation against the petitioner, the fact that investigation is pending, the arrested accused is still in custody and the objection raised by 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**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12543/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8698/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.193/2022**

1. Y. Abdul Basith
2. Farijis Fathima
3. Megharaj Begum

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. K. Madhan, S. Faizal Rahman, S. Vinoth, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8698/2022, dt:3.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8698/2022 on 3.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12544/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8681/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.193/2022**

1. Nijamudeen
2. Saidabanu
3. Parveen Banu

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. S. Faizal Rahman, S. Vinoth, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8681/2022, dt:3.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8681/2022 on 3.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12545/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8762/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.193/2022**

1. H. Roja Mariam
2. H. Abu Abdullah
3. H. Jameera Ahmed

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State 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. S. Faizal Rahman, S. Vinoth, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8762/2022, dt:8.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8762/2022 on 8.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12805/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.10219/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.112/2022**

Lokeshwari

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D.2, Anna Salai Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Thirumaran, K. Purushothaman, B. Deepak, 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.10219/2022, dt:24.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10219/2022 on 24.6.2022 for the offence u/s. 147, 341, 294(b), 324, 326, 506(ii) r/w. Sec.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2015 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition only for 16 days. Considering the nature of offence and the number of days complied, this court is not inclined to relax the condition.

5. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12806/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9243/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.212/2022**

M. Nasrulla

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. I. MD. Arif, D. Manoj Kumar, R. Ram Kumar, L. Leo Valan, K. Monika, 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.9243/2022, dt:13.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9243/2022 on 13.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 31 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12807/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.7836/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.397/2022**

Poovalingam

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. T.R.Udaya Kumar, R. Selvi, N. Venkatesan, 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.7836/2022, dt:11.5.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.7836/2022 on 11.5.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 61 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12808/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.7841/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.397/2022**

Sakthi @ Sakthiyendiram

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. T.R.Udaya Kumar, R. Selvi, N. Venkatesan, 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.7841/2022, dt:11.5.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.7841/2022 on 11.5.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 61 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**