

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.Nos. 12787& 13008/2022**

in

**P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 467/2022**

Suriya @ Dolakku Suriya

.. Petitioner/Accused  
in CrI.M.P.No.12787/2022

Santhosh

.. Petitioner/Accused  
in CrI.M.P.No.13008/2022

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.  
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Pandian, Counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No. 12787/2022 and of M/s. G. Pandian, S. Dhilipan, Counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.13008/2022 and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 18.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 467/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent. The petitioners are aged 22 years. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 18.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.250/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the

petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.12787/2022 Suriya @ Dolakku Suriya is having one previous cases. Whereas, the peittioner Santhosh has no previous case.

5. No previous case is reported against the petitioner Santhosh. According to CPP, the petitioner Suriya is having one previous case. Both the petitioners are in custody from 18.7.2022. Considering the above facts and the age of the petitioners, this court is inclined to grant bail to them subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 above petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

vv

**CrI.M.P.Nos. 12787 & 13008/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,**

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12788/2022**

in

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

Vicky @ Vignesh

.. 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. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 283/2022 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 with an ulterior motive. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Some of the co-accused were already granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.12211/2022 dated 18.7.2022 and one of the accused was granted anticipatory bail by this court on 25.7.2022 in CrI.M.P.No.12338/2022. The petitioner is in custody from 27.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 6 accused. This petitioner is arrayed as A4. 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, this petitioner along with other accused 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 is having 2 previous cases.

5. It is reported by the CPP that victims were discharged from the hospital after two days of treatment. Most of the co-accused were already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody for about a month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. 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 10.00 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

2. The Superintendent, Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12788/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 12793/2022**

in

**K.3, Aminjikai P.S. Crime No.257/2022**

Meenu @ Praveen

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Raj, A.G. Abdul Kareem, S. Divakar, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for respondent, and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was voluntarily surrendered before the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai on 23.5.2022 and remanded to judicial custody on the same day for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 302 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.257/2022 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. This petitioner was not at all present at the scene of occurrence and he is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. A9 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, Madras and A6 was granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 23.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, this petitioner/A3, along with other accused hatched a criminal conspiracy to eliminate the victim. In continuation of that, they chased the victim in a two wheeler and brutally attacked him using deadly weapons and caused multiple grievous injuries all over his body and due to which, the victim died in the hospital. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, it is a preplanned murder. Totally 9 accused involved in this case and this petitioner is A3. This petitioner/A3 directly involved in the crime and murdered the victim along with other accused using deadly weapons. The murder was took place at 1.30 p.m. in the broad day light. 4 knives, Car which is used to escape from the spot were recovered. A9 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court as he provided the car to the accused. A6 was granted bail by this court on medical grounds. As far as this petitioner is concerned, he actively participated in the crime. Investigation is at crucial stage. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more and also there is every possibilities in tampering the witnesses. He further submits that this petitioner is having 5 previous cases including one murder case. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

6. It is a preplanned brutal murder due to previous enmity. The investigation reveals that this petitioner as a prime accused, actively participated in committing the murder. The victim was brutally murdered by this accused and others using deadly weapons in a broad day light. Investigation is still going on. Considering the gravity of offence, role played by this petitioner in the alleged crime, antecedents of the petitioner, stage of the investigation and the objection raised by the learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this juncture.

7. 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**

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 12887/2022**

in

**R-2 Kodambakkam P.S. Crime No. 137/2022**

1. Rishi @ Rishikesh
2. Ram @ Anthony Raj
3. Shogan Joseph

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-2 Kodambakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Jagan, S. Vedavalli, R. Raj Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 11.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 137/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 11.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.600/- from him at knife point and also assaulted him using hands. He further submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 5 previous cases. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners are having one previous case.

5. Since, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 5 previous cases, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present. As far as the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners are concerned, they are in custody for the past two weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners alone subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 above 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 12887/2022**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13003/2022**

in

**R-3 Ashok Nagar P.S. Crime No. 147/2022**

S. V. Shivrhaj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-3 Ashok Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Giri Shankar, R. Uma Devi, 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 22.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 323, 324, 326, 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) and 427 IPC in Crime No. 147/2022 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. Originally, this petitioner was not arrayed as accused when the case was registered on 15.6.2022. Thereafter, the respondent police without any prima facie evidence, booked the petitioner u/s.307 IPC and altered the section. This petitioner had no role in the alleged incident. The defacto complainant by name Shiyas is the real offender, who had brought rowdy elements and they had attacked their own members. This petitioner is not an absconder because he was not arrayed as accused initially. This petitioner carrying his restaurant business. This petitioner is no way connected with the civil dispute pending regarding the property. This petitioner has no motive against the defacto complainant. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 22.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 8 accused and this petitioner is arrayed as A8. This petitioner was absconded for nearly one month and arrested only on 22.7.2022. This petitioner along with other accused abused the defacto complainant and her family members in filthy language and assaulted them with knife. Injured was admitted in hospital for 15 days and thereafter discharged.

5. Property dispute between relatives. This petitioner was implicated in this case only after alteration of FIR. His name does not find a place in the original FIR and there is no specific overtact attributed against him. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Already two co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 22.7.2022. Considering the above facts, 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 XVII 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 XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

**vv**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13003/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13004/2022**

in

**K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 100/2022**

Raagu @ Ragavendran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Thiyagarajan, V. Manimaran, A. Tamilselvan, B. Sasikala, 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 8.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 447, 448, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(i) IPC in Crime No. 100/2022 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. Already this petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 and thereafter it was revoked by the Advisory Board on 19.4.2022. The petitioner is in custody from 8.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A1 along with three other accused demanded Rs.500/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. Since it was refused, the accused persons not only scolded him with filthy language, also damaged the mobile shop and one person sustained injury in the above said occurrence. He further

submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender, notorious rowdy element and he is having 11 previous cases including one murder case and therefore, he 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**

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No. 13005/2022**

in

**G-5 Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No. 201/2022**

Appu @ Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-5 Secretariat Colony Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Dinesh Kumar, C. Jagan, R. Raj 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 17.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 201/2022 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 has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 17.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A2 along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.250/- from him at knife point. However, according to him, the amount involved in this case has been recovered and that the petitioner has no bad antecedents.

5. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. According to CPP, the amount involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody for the past 10

days. 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 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 10.00 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 13005/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13007/2022**

in

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

Sakthivel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on 20.6.2022 before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Muralidharan, R. Manivannan, 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 and 397 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 the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. There is no CCTV footage to link the petitioner with the alleged occurrence. The property involved in this case has been recovered. 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/A2 along with another accused robbed Rs.500/- and a wrist watch from the defacto complainant and also attacked him using stones and due to which, the complainant sustained injury on his lip, forearm and neck. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases. Injured sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient.



5. It is reported by the CPP that the victim sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is in custody for the past three weeks. 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 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. The XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 13007/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13010/2022**

in

**H-6 R.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No. 405/2022**

Yuvaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-6 R.K. 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. Rajan, S. Kumar, Y. David Girubakaran, 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 399 and 402 IPC in Crime No. 405/2022 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 and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Nothing has been recovered from this petitioner. The petitioner is in custody from 4.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this along with four other accused unlawfully assembled and planned to commit dacoity with deadly weapons. He further submits that this petitioner is having 4 previous cases. A4 still absconding and other accused are in prison.

5. Admitted no offence offence committed. Only preparation made. This petitioner is in custody for the past three weeks. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 4 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 13010/2022**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**CrI.M.P.No. 13011/2022**

in

**C-4 R.G.G.G.H P.S. Crime No. 61/2022**

Azarudeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
C-4 R.G.G.G.H. Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M.R. Mohammed Fazululla, D. Vinodh Kumar, M.R. Mohammed Ismail, 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 2.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No.61/2022 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 working in Dunzo. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. Nothing was recovered from this petitioner. He is in custody from 2.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, this petitioner along with three other accused committed theft of defacto complainant's two wheeler bearing registration No. TN 04 AY 1577 when it was parked at Tower-1 backside of Rajiv Gandhi Government General Hospital. He further submits that totally 9 bikes were stolen by the accused including the defacto complainant's motor bike which were parked at hospital premises. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases of similar nature. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. This

petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed only on 21.7.2022 and that there is no change in circumstances. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 379 IPC. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with three other accused committed theft of 9 motor bikes which were parked at Government General Hospital premises. This petitioner was arrested only on 2.7.2022. Investigation is not yet completed. No change in circumstance was reported after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Considering the above facts, nature of offence, attitude of the petitioner, short duration of custody and the antecedents of the petitioner, 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**

**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.Nos. 13016, 13017 & 13018/2022**

in

**D-2 Anna Salai P.S. Crime No. 132/2022**

Santhosh Kumar Laser	.. Petitioner/Accused in Crl.M.P.No.13016/2022
Udhayakumar	.. Petitioner/Accused in Crl.M.P.No.13017/2022
M. Rasul Mohammed Anifa	.. Petitioner/Accused in Crl.M.P.No.13018/2022

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.  
in all the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.K. Panjamurthy, M. Arunchori, M. Varundev, Lalith R. Nevathithan, Counsel for the petitioners in all the petitions and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13016/2022 was arrested on 10.7.2022, the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13017/2022 was arrested on 12.7.2022 and the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.13018/2022 was arrested on 4.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 395 and 397 IPC in Crime No. 132/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in all the three petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. These petitioners

are no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioners are ready to abide by any condition in the event of their release. They are in custody from 4.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a pre-planned robbery. These petitioners along with three other accused chased the defacto complainant in three two-wheelers, attacked the complainant using iron rods and robbed the cash bag from him which contains cash Rs.3 lakhs and escaped from the spot. He further submits that out of Rs.3 lakhs, Rs.20,700/- only recovered and major portion of amount is yet to be recovered. According to CPP, the petitioner Santhosh Kumar Laser is having 5 previous cases, Udhayakumar is having 12 previous cases and Rasul Mohammed Anifa is having 5 previous cases. Investigation is not yet completed. If the petitioners are released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Hence, he vehemently opposes the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of robbery. On perusal of the FIR, it would go to show that the defacto complainant and his friend started a business to supply fish to hotels. For which they arranged Rs.3 lakhs and when the defacto complainant went to ATM centre to deposit the cash Rs.3 lakhs, these petitioners along with three other accused went in three motor bikes, attacked the complainant using iron rod and robbed the cash bag from him and escaped from the spot. According to CPP, out of Rs.3 lakhs, Rs.20,700/- only recovered. Major portion of amount is yet to be recovered. Investigation is not yet completed. Arrest of the petitioners is very recent one. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioners and that major portion of amount is yet to be recovered, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, all the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12667/2022**

**And**

**Crl.M.P.No.12917/2022**

**(intervene petition)**

in

**P.6, Kodungaiyur PS. Crime No.593/2022**

1. A. Kumar  
2. E. Siva

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me in the presence of M/s. S. Ilavarasan, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent and of M/s. A.K.M. Samsunihar, S Sathishkumar, Counsel for the intervener 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 u/s.294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.593/2022 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. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. While the petitioners are travelling in a Car, the defacto complainant drove his two wheeler as if to dash against the car. There arose wordy quarrel. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the intervener submits that the defacto complainant is a practicing Advocate. On 17.7.2022, while the defacto complainant was returning home in his two wheeler, the accused drove the car in a rash and negligent



manner endangering the public safety. When the defacto complainant requested them to drive the car in a moderate speed, the accused have attacked him. On verifying the CCTV footage, it came to light the persons who were travelling inside the Car is Rafi, Sub Inspector of Police, Kancheepuram District and Karthick @ Panai Karthick. But the petitioners herein have filed this anticipatory bail petition stating that they have attacked the defacto complainant. It is clear that the petitioners have filed this petition by way of impersonation to safeguard the real accused. Hence, prays to dismiss the petition.

5. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that no case has been registered against the petitioners and no complaint is pending with the respondent police. Recording the submission of learned CPP, this 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**  
**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12905/2022**

**in**

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

Suresh

.. 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. 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, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 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. It is a case in counter. This petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by this court, yesterday. 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. Totally 5 accused. This petitioner is A1. Due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his father with hands and wooden logs. The victims have 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. It is a case in counter. 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. 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 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.12905/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12908/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9509/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.not known of 2022**

B. Ramesh Kumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

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

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. G. Anbarasu, P. Karthick, 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.9509/2022, dt:15.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9509/2022 on 15.6.2022 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 32 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12909/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.7826/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.94/2022**

Arun Kumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.4 Anna Nagar Traffic Investigation Wing,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N. Subramanian, 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.7826/2022, dt:11.5.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.7826/2022 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  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12911/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8112/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.79/2022**

Thamimul Ansari

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R.1, Mambalam Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Mohamed Nazar, Amanulla, 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.8112/2022, dt:18.5.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8112/2022 on 18.5.2022 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 54 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  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12912/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.9835/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.176/2022**

E. Saravanakumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D.6, TIW Anna Square Police Station,  
Anna Square,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Senthilkumar, S. Rajesh, M. Dinesh, G. Jeevitha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**O R D E R**

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9835/2022, dt:17.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9835/2022 on 17.6.2022 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 34 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  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12913/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.10215/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.232/2022**

Selvaraj

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J.2, Adyar Traffic Investigation Wing Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Sathya Rani, 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.10215/2022, dt:22.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.10215/2022 on 22.6.2022 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.

nmk

**Principal Sessions Judge**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12914/2022**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.8758/2022**

**in**

**Crime No.157/2022**

Tamilselvan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R.8, Vadapalani Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N. Jayanthi, Muthuvel, 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.8758/2022, dt:6.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8758/2022 on 6.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 35 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**  
**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.13002/2022**

in

**Crl.R.C.No.120/2022**

against

**M.P.No.18/2022**

in

**LIR.No.335/Sec.Pro./DCP AN/2022**

in

**V.4, Rajamangalam P.S. Sl.No.40/2022 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C.**

Jeeva

... Petitioner/Petitioner/Respondent/  
Accused.

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate  
cum Deputy Commissioner of Police,  
Anna Nagar District, Chennai.
2. The State represented by  
The Inspector of Police,  
V.4, Rajamangalam Police Station,  
Chennai.

.. Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/  
Complainant

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the revision petition.
2. Heard.
3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.18/2022 in LIR. No.335/Sec.Pro./DCP AN/2022 in V.4, Rajamangalam P.S. Sl.No.40/2022 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C. on the file of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 305 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 12.7.2022.

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

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 305 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

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

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

9. The Revision is posted on 16.8.2022.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

**Copy to :**

1. The XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. The Deputy Commissioner of Police, Anna Nagar District, Chennai.

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12999/2022**

in

C.A.No.145/2022

in

E.O.C.C.No.116/2016

(on the file of learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, E.O.I, Egmore, Chennai )

V. Kannan

.. Petitioner/Appellant/Accused.

Vs.

The State

The Income Tax Officer, NCW-5(1)  
No.611, Kannammal Building, Anna Salai,  
Chennai 600 006.

.. Respondent/Respondent/  
Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Vijayan, B. Pachaimuthu, N. Madhanraj, Counsel for the petitioner/appellant/accused and upon hearing the petitioner side arguments, this court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. Heard.

2. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.

3. The petitioner/appellant herein is the accused in E.O.C.C.No.116/1996 on the file of Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court, E.O.I, Egmore, Chennai. On 14.6.2022, a judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner/accused was convicted u/s. 276 CC of Income Tax Act 1961 and SEc.276(c)(1) of the Income Tax Act 1961 and he was sentenced (i) to undergo R.I. for one year and to pay a fine of Rs.50,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for 2 months for the offence u/s.276 CC of Income Tax Act 1961 and (ii) to undergo R.I. for two years and to pay a fine of Rs.1,00,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for 3 months for the offence u/s.276(c)(1) of Income Tax Act 1961.

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

5. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal and the submission made by the petitioner's side. Fine amount has been paid. The trial court has suspended the sentence. As already stated supra, the Petitioner/Appellant/Accused was ordered to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the appeal. Considering the above facts, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence of imprisonment.

6. Accordingly, the sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner by the lower Court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, E.O.I, Egmore, Chennai.

7. The appeal stands posted to 29.8.2022.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

*Principal Sessions Judge*

**Copy**

Learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate,  
E.O.I, Egmore, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12997/2022**

in

C.A.No.143/2022

in

C.C.No.5210/2013

(on the file of learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai )

Raja

.. Petitioner/Appellant/Accused.

Vs.

The State rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J3, Guindy Traffic Investigation Wing,  
Guindy,  
Chennai - 600 032.

.. Respondent/Respondent/  
Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B.L. Jayakandan, S. Punitha, Counsel for the petitioner/appellant/accused and upon hearing the petitioner side arguments, this court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. Heard.

2. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.

3. The petitioner/appellant herein is the accused in C.C.No.5210/2013 on the file of IV Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai. On 7.6.2022, a judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner/accused was convicted u/s. 279, 337, 304(A) IPC and Sec.3 r/w. 181 and 196 of M.V. Act and sentenced to undergo S.I. for one month and to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for one week for the offence u/s.279 IPC; and (ii) to undergo S.I. for one month and to pay a fine of Rs.500/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for one week for the offence u/s.337 IPC; and (iii) to undergo S.I. for six months and to pay a fine of Rs.8,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for one month for the offence u/s.304(A) IPC; and (iv) to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for one month for the offence u/s.3 r/w. 181 M.V. Act and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for one month for the offence u/s.196 M.V. Act

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

5. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal and the submission made by the petitioner's side. Fine amount has been paid. The trial court has suspended the sentence. As already stated supra, the Petitioner/Appellant/Accused was ordered to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the appeal. Considering the above facts, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence of imprisonment.

6. Accordingly, the sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner by the lower Court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai.

7. The appeal is made over to XV Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.

8. The appeal stands posted to 16.8.2022.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

*Principal Sessions Judge*

**Copy**

Learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate,  
Saidapet, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022**

**Crl.M.P.No.12998/2022**

**in**

**C.A.No.144/2022**

**in**

**C.C.No.430/2004**

(on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-III, Saidapet, Chennai)

D. Natarajan

....Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

M/s. The Water Base Limited  
No.22, Sadasivam Street,  
Gopalapuram,  
Chennai - 600 086.  
Rep. by its Power of Attorney  
N. Mohan

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me in the presence of Mr. D. Natarajan, Counsel for the petitioner and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. Heard.

2. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.

3. The Petitioner / Appellant herein is the accused in C.C.No.430/2004 on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-III, Saidapet, Chennai. On 12.3.2020, judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner was found guilty u/s.138 of N.I. Act and he was sentenced to undergo 4 months simple imprisonment and to pay the cheque amount as compensation to the complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is aged 78 years and he is suffering from various ailments. He is a cancer survivor. He was affected with Covid-19 twice. He has lost his complete vision in the left eye and got only about 20% vision in the right eye and he is taking regular treatment. Due to his ailments, he could be



able to file the appeal only on 4.1.2021 and the same was returned. Though the order was passed on 12.3.2020, as per the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the limitation period from 15.3.2020 to 28.2.2022 shall stand extended. The petitioner has represented the appeal on 6.1.2022 and it was returned for certain complaints and thereafter represented by complying the queries. He would further submit that the petitioner has fair chance of success in the appeal. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

5. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal. As per Sec.148 of N.I. Act (Amendment Act), 2018, the Appellate Court may order the Appellant to deposit such sum which shall be a minimum of Twenty percent of the fine or Compensation awarded by the Trial Court. In the above provision, it is clearly stated that the amount shall be deposited within 60 days from the date of the Order. As already stated supra, the petitioner / appellant / accused was ordered to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 4 months and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the appeal.

6. Considering the above facts and the value of the compensation amount, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence on condition to deposit 20% of the compensation amount.

7. Accordingly, the sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner by the lower Court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-III, Chennai. Further the petitioner shall deposit 20% of the compensation amount to the credit of C.C. number on the file of the Trial Court within sixty days from the date of this Order.

8. The appeal is made over to XVI Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.

9. The appeal stands posted to 16.8.2022.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

Copy to  
**Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-III, Chennai.**