

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 19925/2021

in

E-1 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 1035/2021

Mani @ Bonda Mani @ Manikandan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 31.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 353 IPC r/w 25(1-A) of Arms Act r/w 4(b) of Explosive Substances Act 1908 in Crime No.1035/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. He is a fishermen by profession. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court on 1.11.2021. He is in custody from 31.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that during vehicle check, this petitioner along with other accused were found in possession of deadly weapons and country made bomb. On enquiry, it came to light that one Saravanan, son of A1 was murdered by Dori Mani and his associates and in order to take revenge upon them, the present petitioner along with others hatched a plan and while they proceeding in a two-wheeler and Auto, they have been intercepted by the police and they found that deadly weapons and country-made bomb were found in the possession of the accused.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner has no bad antecedents and co-accused were already granted bail by this court.

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court on 1.11.2021. The petitioner is in custody for the past 26 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 19925/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20490/2021

in

E-1 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 1089/2021

Saravanan @ Kava Saravanan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1089/2021 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. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 26.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's tiffin shop and demanded money. On his refusal, the accused threatened him at knife point and taken away Rs.300/- from cash box and also thrown stones on the public.
5. According to CPP, the petitioner is a habitual offender and having 10 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

6. Though the petitioner is having previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 20490/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20789/2021

in

G-7 Chetpet P.S. Crime No. 332/2021

P. Prakash

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-7 Chetpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 452, 364A, 397, 506(ii) r/w 120(B) IPC in Crime No.332/2021 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 was engaged by A1 as acting driver and apart from that this petitioner does not know anything about the background of the crime. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused/A3 was granted bail and another accused was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No. 22077/2021 dtated 24.11.2021 and Crl.O.P.No. 20288/2021 on 2.11.2021. Investigation is almost completed. This petitioner is in custody for more than one month and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused kidnapped the victim namely Musa in a car and detained him illegally for ransom in the rehabilitation centre run by the petitioner and his wife.

5. According to CPP, Originally, the case was registered as “Man Missing” and subsequently, on investigation, it was altered to 397 and 506(ii) IPC as well as 364(A) of IPC. Now, the victim was secured and handed over to his son/defacto complainant and co-accused were granted bail by the Hon’ble High Court.

6. Co-accused were granted bail and anticipatory bail by the Hon’ble High Court. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 20789/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20796/2021

in

F-4 Thousand light P.S. Crime No. 348/2021

Tamil Selvan

.. 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. C. Jagan, V. Kavitha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 336, 427, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 348/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody for the past one month and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, the accused assaulted the victim and robbed Rs.800/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 6 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

6. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for more than a month. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 6 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 20796/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20935/2021

in

CCB, Cr.No.254/2020

Anthony Gunalan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch -1, Team 23,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 409, 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w 34 and 109 of IPC in Cr.No.254/2020 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. The allegation against A1 Kamaraj is that he involved in fraud, cheating, forgery, impersonation with land grabbing activities. But, A1 was not impersonated but was a mistaken identity. A1 received the allotment letter regarding the allotment of plot by TNHB authorities. A1 registered the plot to one Vijayan/A2. A2 in turn appointed this petitioner as power holder in the year 2011. This petitioner who was unaware of the earlier facts, sold the plot to one Baskaran(A4) in the year 2012. A2 was already granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No. 20529/2021 dated 17.11.2021. Now, A1/Kamaraj died. This petitioner is in custody for more than one month and prays for granting bail.

4. On perusal of the records, it appears that A1 Kamaraj was allotted a plot by the TNHB authorities and for which letter was addressed by the TNHB officials to A1. A1 registered the plot to one Vijayan (A2) at the sub-registrar office, Thiruvottriyur. A2 appointed this petitioner as power holder in the year 2011. This petitioner sold the plot to one Baskaran (A4) in the year 2012. No doubt, on 12.12.2007 the Tamil Nadu Housing Board executed Sale Deed in favour of Kamaraj. On 13.12.2007, A2 Vijayan purchased the property from Kamaraj. There was a Power Deed also on the same date in favour of the present petitioner. There are chances of innocence. Complaint is only in the year 2020 after 9 years. Now, A1 Kamaraj died on 5.9.2020 and death certificate was produced by the petitioner. Co-accused A2 was granted bail by this court on 17.11.2021. This petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering all these circumstances and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Special Metropolitan Magistrate No.II, Special Court exclusively for Land Grabbing Cases, Egmore, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned Special Metropolitan Magistrate No.II,
Special Court exclusively for Land Grabbing Cases,
Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 20935/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21127/2021

in

S.C.No.286/2021

(on the file of II Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

F-1 Chintadripet P.S.Crime No.134/2018

1. Dinesh @ Pulimootai Dinesh
2. Chinnathambi

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-1 Chintadripet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were formally arrested on 4.10.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC r/w sec. 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No. 134/2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were originally arrested on 26.4.2021 in Crime No. 75/2021 and subsequently formally arrested in Crime No. 841/2021 on 11.5.2021. In this case, they have been formally arrested on 4.10.2021. The petitioners were detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention order No.148/2021 dated 28.5.2021. Now, the detention order as against the petitioners have been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court in HCP Nos. 933 and 940/2021 dated 19.11.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past 1 ½ months and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, the 1st petitioner is having 4 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, he submits that the detention order as against the petitioners was set aside by the Hon'ble High Court and he does not raise any serious objection.

5. Considering the fact that the detention order as against the petitioners have been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court and the duration of custody of the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned II Additional Sessions Judge, 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 said Court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The II Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21127/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21213/2021

in

C.C.No. 4512/2009

(on the file of VII Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai)

in

B-3 Fort P.S. Crime No. 42/2009

K. Parthasarathy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
B-3 Fort Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Shanmugam, P. Sivakumar, K. Ramya, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.10.2021 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 332, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 42/2009 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for more than one month. Due to his illness, the petitioner was unable to appear before the trial court and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 20.1.2021. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Prior to issuance of NBW, he was regularly attended the court. Hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court. He is in custody from 8.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 20.1.2021 and it was executed on 8.10.2021 after nine months. Now, the case

is pending for examination of Investigating Officer. If the petitioner is released on bail, again he will abscond and objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 1 ½ months. NBW was issued on 20.1.2021 and it was executed on 8.10.2021. According to CPP, the case is now pending for examination of I.O. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties, who must be a blood relative, 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 said Court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond during trial.

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 21213/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21248/2021

in

P.R.C.No.136/2021

(on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Chennai)

in

K.3, Aminjikai P.S. Cr.No.72/2021

Anthony Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.3.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 307, 302 @ 380, 511, 307 & 302 of IPC in Cr.No.72/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that now charge sheet has been filed u/s.120B r/w. 392, 454, 453, 455,459, 393 r/w. 397, 394, 302 r/w. 109 r/w. 34 IPC.

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 was arrested on 1.3.2021 and detained under Act 14 of 1982. Now the detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 22.11.2021 in HCP.No.1032/2021. Investigation is over. Charge sheet has been filed and numbered as P.R.C.No.136/2021 on the file of the V Metropolitan Magistrate Court,

Chennai. The petitioner has been in custody for more than 8 months. Hence prays for granting bail.

4. The petitioner has been in custody for more than 8 months. The detention order as against the petitioner has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court. Charge sheet has been filed and taken on file as PRC.No.136/2021. Considering the duration of custody and the stage of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. Learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Poonamallee.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21248/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21054/2021

in

N.2, Kasimedu PS. Crime No.763/2021

Nithya @ Nithya anand

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence M/s. S. Apunu, D. Sugumar, R. Kamesh, K. Subburaj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s. 380, 392, 457 IPC in Cr.No.763/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is aged 19 years. He is innocent. He is a physically challenged person. There is no possibility of his involvement in the offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail. He is apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused committed theft of two tabs, 3 cellphones and cash Rs.5000/- from the defacto complainant's house. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail stating that the

petitioner cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who was enlarged on bail after sufficient period of incarceration.

5. It is a case of 380 IPC. Granting anticipatory bail in such cases will send a wrong signal to the society at large. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. The petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21130/2021

in

H.3, Tondiarpet P.S. Cr.No.1332/2021

Lakshman

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H.3, Tondiarpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Mukeshkannah, M. Akbar Basha and S. Musthabah, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 341, 294(b), 325, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.1332/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a physically challenged affected with Post Polio Residual Paralysis. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. There exists dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. The defacto complainant is a Marriage Broker. There was some dispute in arranging marriage of the petitioner's daughter. Considering the nature of dispute, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a

likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of two weeks.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21130/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21135/2021

in

F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Cr.No.803/2021

Thameem Ansari

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

F.5, Choolaimedu Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, D. Jaisankar, P. Muthumari, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 341, 294(a), 323, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.803/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Only wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. Arrested accused already enlarged on bail. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Money dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. No deadly weapon is used. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences areailable. Hence, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall

execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of two weeks.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Cri.M.P.No.21135/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21133/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.11577/2021

in

G.5, Secretariat Colony P.S. Cr.No.146/2021

Ajay @ Ajaykumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

G.5, Secretariat Colony Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, D. Jaisankar, 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.11577/2021, dt:15.7.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.11577/2021 on 15.7.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 116 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21134/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.16504/2021

in

J.4, Kotturpuram P.S. Cr.No.590/2021

Viji @ Vijay

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,

J.4, Kotturpuram Police Station,

Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16504/2021, dt:22.9.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16504/2021 on 22.9.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 43 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21136/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.19914/2021

in

K.2, Ayanavaram P.S. Cr.No.632/2021

Latshumi Narayanan

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. T.P. Savitha, 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.19914/2021, dt:15.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19914/2021 on 15.11.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 7 days alone. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a college student and the respondent police retained him for the whole day, when he was going to comply the condition. Due to which, he is facing difficulty to attend the college. Considering the representation of the petitioner's counsel, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

CrI.M.P.Nos.21214, 21215, 21216 of 2021

in

D.3, Ice House P.S. Crime No.564/2021

1. K. Parthasarathy
2. Jai Kumar
3. Dinesh

.. Petitioners/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.21214/2021

1. Dinakaran
2. Silambarasan

.. Petitioners/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.21215/2021

Kannan

.. Petitioner/Accused in
CrI.M.P.No.21216/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D.3, Ice House 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. V. Karthick, S. Raj, A.G. Abdul Kareem, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 7.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.564/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was a wordy quarrel over parking of vehicles. There was a wordy altercation between two groups. However an

exaggerated complaint has been given. Petitioners are in custody from 7.11.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that all the accused were remanded only on 8.11.2021. Whatever it be, on perusal of the records, the dispute arose over parking of vehicles without giving way for other vehicles, which culminated into clash between two groups. AR copy available in the Case Diary would go to show simple injuries to one Jayakumar and one Jayavel. Considering the duration of custody and nature of occurrence, this court is inclined to grant bail to all the petitioners subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.21214, 21215 and 21216 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021**

CrI.M.P.No.18494/2021

and

CrI.M.P.No.18859/2021

(intervene petition)

in

B-1 North Beach P.S. Crime No.70/2021

1. Aravind Kumar
2. Gokul
3. Valarmathi

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Irudayasamy, I. Romeo Roy Alfred, S. Valarmathi, Counsel for the petitioner and of M/s. Giridhar @ Sai, Y. Kavitha, G. Thamizharasi, D. Prasanna, Counsel for the intervenor 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 u/s.406 and 420 IPC in Crime No.70/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners are close relatives of the complainant. There was some partition dispute. The defacto complainant is the son of a divorced wife of one Subburaj. The present petitioners are sons and wife of Subburaj's brother/Velusamy. The dispute is civil in nature and hence, prays for anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the counsel appearing for the intervenor/who is the legitimate son of said Subburaj submits that there was some misunderstanding between Subburaj and

his married wife, which leads to separation. Subburaj is doing business at Chennai. The defacto complainant is away from Chennai. Taking advantage of defacto complainant's absence after the death of said Subburaj, the present petitioners misappropriated the amount available in his bank account by using cheque leaves and debit card and withdrawn more than Rs.30 lakh and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the records, it appears after the death of Subburaj, the amount in his bank account was withdrawn by using his debit card and cheque leaves by forging the signature of deceased Subburaj. The factum of withdrawing the money after the death of Subburaj is not seriously in dispute. That's why, this court is inclined to refer the matter before Mediation. Even before Mediation, at the very first instance itself, failure report has been given. Learned counsel for the petitioner still argued that the dispute is civil in nature and prays for granting anticipatory bail. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, the manner in which the available balance amount in the bank account of deceased Subburaj was withdrawn by illegal means, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21123/2021

in

CCB-I Crime No.183/2020

Ganesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-1,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.C.Prabhakaran, A.Kasi and R.Parthiban, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 420, 465, 468, 471 of IPC in Crime No.183/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case has been registered against the petitioner as if he obtained two car loans from two different banks by forging Registration Certificate of the Vehicle. He is prepared to deposit the amount borrowed Rs.8,90,000/- into the Court. He is in custody for about a week and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On perusal of the records, it appears it is an undisputed fact that the petitioner obtained loan from two banks namely Corporation Bank and State Bank of Mysore by forging Registration Certificate as if it is hypothecated with State Bank of Mysore and in another set of Registration Certificate hypothecated to Corporation Bank. After obtaining said loan from the State Bank of Mysore, it appears the petitioner has not even paid single

EMI. The loan was in the year 2013. After 8 years, when the fraud came into light depositing amount borrowed may not justify the crime committed by the petitioner. Though the case was registered in the year 2020, the petitioner has not chosen to resolve the issue for more than a year. Though the petitioner is prepared to deposit Rs.8,90,000/- into Court, considering the short duration of custody and the available records against the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

5. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20764/2021

in

CCB-I, Crime No.177/2021

A. Johnson

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Gandhi Kumar, D. Shobana, R. Jayaprathap, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406, 420, 465, 468 of IPC r/w. 34 of IPC in Crime No.177/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He had received amount and handed over to A1/Sivakumar. The petitioner is only a middle man and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that anticipatory bail petitions moved by the prime accused were dismissed by this Court twice and thereafter he has been arrested. It is Job racketing involving more than 115 complaints. Investigation is at the budding stage and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. Though as per the present complaint, the amount was handed over to Sivakumar, there are other facts also. In fact, the petitioner is running a Coaching Centre. Prime accused/Sivakumar is also running IAS Academy. As per instruction of one Sathya Arivazhagan, the defacto complainant/Kasinathan along with the present petitioner, who is

the brother of Sathya Arivazhagan met Sivakumar and handed over the cash under the pretext that Sivakumar is very close to then Chief Minister. Investigation is at the budding stage. Several persons were cheated in the series of offence is to be unearthed. As per prosecution, more than 115 complaints have been received. In view of all these circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20130/2021

in

AVS-II, Crime No.13/2021

V. Balakrishnan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
AVS-II,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Shreedhar, Yaminipriya Shreedhar, W. Camyles Gandhi, N. Geetha Priya, Kasilda.J, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 3(2)(a), 4(1), 5(1)(a) of ITP Act @ 3(2)(a), 4(1), 5(1)(a), 5(1)(d) of ITP Act and Sec.370 A(2) of IPC in Crime No.13/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is running a Spa with due license from the authorities. Since, there was some dispute in payment of mamool, the respondent police entered into the premises of the petitioner and secured some girls as if they were involved in sex trade and they were released after sufficient period of time. The business of running massage parlour is legally permissible. However, the prosecution is doing mischief by sending tekai witnesses and deliberately acted against the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court and used to harass the parlour owners by registering the cases of this nature. As far as this case is concerned, there was no prostitution at all. No victim has given statement as if they were engaged in prostitution under compulsion. There was CCTV

coverage for the petitioner's Spa. That too has been seized by the police. Very perusal of the recordings would go to show the falsity of the prosecution case. The property seized were also not produced before the concerned Court, Petitioner moved the concerned Magistrate Court for return of property seized, which was returned as if the properties were not yet produced before the Court. He also lodged a complaint before the Commissioner of Police, Chennai. In view of the strained relationship between the petitioner and the prosecution, he apprehends arrest at the hands of the police and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the case of the prosecution is that there was prostitution at the Massage Centre and concerned persons were arrested and remanded to custody. They are acting as per the Rules and Regulations. Simply because, there was license given to Spa, it does not mean that they can involve in topless, fully nude massage, happy ending services, in turn it amounts to prostitution. Further, he submits that the petitioner is not at all an accused in this case. Their apprehension is unfounded and thus prays for dismissal of the petition.

5. On perusal of the records produced by the petitioner as well as prosecution, it appears Door No.85, Park View Apartment, 1st Floor, G.N. Chetty Road, T. Nagar, Chennai was taken on lease by the petitioner's wife. The very Lease Deed is not in the name of the petitioner, though he had obtained license for running the Spa in the said premises. Whatever it be, the Case Diary produced would show one Kulothungan as A1, Rajesh as A2, Balamurugan as A3, Balaji as A4. The present petitioner's name does not find a place in the records of investigation. Further, the specific case of the arrested accused is that the massage centre is owned by one Kulothungan, who is absconding. It is not the case of the petitioner that the petitioner had alias name as Kulothungan. Under such circumstances, in view of the statement of the co-accused, the very apprehension arrest of the petitioner is unfounded. Apart from that though the petitioner alleged the abuse of process by the police authorities, it cannot be a ground for granting anticipatory bail. Granting anticipatory bail in this sort of cases would send a wrong signal to the Society at large. Then the Spa owners will knock the door of the Court for anticipatory bail and that will be a never ending process. The same will encourage others to commit such crime. The Police cannot maintain the Law and Order properly. The petitioner is always at liberty to approach the Court for

other remedies. Considering all these circumstances, 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: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge.**

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21212/2021

in

CCB Crime No.190/2020

Kaleeswari

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.R.C.Paul Kanagaraj and M.Soundar Vijay Arul Ram, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 120-B, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 of IPC in Crime No.190/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner stood as guarantor for her husband for obtaining a loan of Rs.8 crores from Catholic Syrian Bank. She also deposited title deeds as security. Now, she has been arrested since there was default in making payment. She had no knowledge about the documents filed before bank authorities at the time of availing loan. She signed at the request of her husband. She had not produced any Income Tax Returns. She is a woman. She is in custody for a week and prays for bail. Further, he submits that in respect of the loan, recovery proceedings were initiated. The outstanding is likely to be recovered by bringing the property in auction, which was given as security and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner stood as guarantor and produced her own documents as security for obtaining the loan.

4. As far as the present petitioner is concerned, she has produced Income-tax Returns with Pan I.D. ANTPK6594K. She had shown the income for the year 2013-14 as Rs.27,07,720/- instead of Rs.2,71,770/- The loan sanctioned on the basis of the assurance given by the petitioner and her husband, remains unpaid. There is no explanation for not making payment properly after obtaining loan. The amount involved is Rs.8 crores plus interest. The accused is in custody only for the past one week. Having signed as guarantor for the loan she cannot plead ignorance or innocence. Considering the short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21210/2021

in

K-7, I.C.F. P.S. Crime No.209/2021

Nagarjunan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-7, I.C.F. Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 189, 294(b), 353, 324 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.209/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He had wordy altercation with the police during the vehicle check-up. An exaggerated complaint has been given and he was remanded to custody. He is in custody from 30.10.2021 and prays for bail.

3. On perusal of the F.I.R., it appears when the police stopped the vehicle of the petitioner and asked him to blow air for alcohol test, he refused and in furtherance there was an altercation between the police officials and the petitioner. Anyhow, the petitioner is in custody for nearly four weeks. The quarrel is under the influence of alcohol. It is alleged that he also paid fine for drunken driving. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Chengalpet.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.21210/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.21193/2021

in

C.A.No.185/2021

in

C.C.No.3195/2013

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

Mrs.Latha Gandhi,
Proprietrix,
Presently having office and residing at
M/s.Evergreen IT Needs,
Plot No.56, Flat No.B-1,
Ashtalakshmi Nagar,
Alapakkam, Porur,
Chennai-600116

....Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

M/s.Redington (India) Ltd.,
represented by
Mr.M.Sundararajan,
Senior Legal Executive,
SPL Guindy House,
95, Mount Road,
Guindy, Chennai-600032.

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, in the presence of M/s.J.H.Batchu, R.Joe Anand, K.S.Muvendan and S.Aishwarya, Counsel for the petitioner, upon hearing the petitioner's side, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.
2. The Petitioner / Appellant herein is the accused in C.C.No.3195/2013 on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai. On 29.10.2021, judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner was found guilty u/s.138 of N.I. Act and sentenced to undergo nine months simple imprisonment and to pay the amount covered under the cheques as compensation to the complainant.
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 counsel. The trial court suspended the sentence till 29.11.2021.

6. 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 nine 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.

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

8. 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 her executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai. Further the petitioner shall deposit 20% of the cheque amount to the credit of C.C. number on the file of the Trial Court within sixty days from the date of this Order.

9. The appeal has been made over to XXIII Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

10. The appeal stands posted to 23.12.2021.

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to
The Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai.

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.21194/2021

in

C.A.No.186/2021

in

C.C.No.926/2013

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

Mrs.Latha Gandhi,
Proprietrix,
Presently having office and residing at
M/s.Evergreen IT Needs,
Plot No.56, Flat No.B-1,
Ashtalakshmi Nagar,
Alapakkam, Porur,
Chennai-600116

....Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

M/s.Redington (India) Ltd.,
represented by
Mr.M.Sundararajan,
Senior Legal Executive,
SPL Guindy House,
95, Mount Road,
Guindy, Chennai-600032.

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, in the presence of M/s.J.H.Batchu, R.Joe Anand, K.S.Muvendan and S.Aishwarya, Counsel for the petitioner, upon hearing the petitioner's side, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.
2. The Petitioner / Appellant herein is the accused in C.C.No.926/2013 on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai. On 29.10.2021, judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner was found guilty u/s.138 of N.I. Act and sentenced to undergo nine months simple imprisonment and to pay the amount covered under the cheques as compensation to the complainant.
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 counsel. The trial court suspended the sentence till 29.11.2021.

6. 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 nine 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.

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

8. 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 her executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai. Further the petitioner shall deposit 20% of the cheque amount to the credit of C.C. number on the file of the Trial Court within sixty days from the date of this Order.

9. The appeal has been made over to XXIII Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

10. The appeal stands posted to 23.12.2021.

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to
The Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai.

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20370/2021

in

S.C.No.345/2014

(On the file of the learned IV Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

R-8, Vadapalani P.S. Cr.No.973/2013

M.Seenu @ Srinivasan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. 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.A.Muthukumar, S.V.Shyamkumar, D.Pavithra and A.Saravanakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on N.B.W. on 9.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392 r/w 397, 353, 336 and 506(ii) of IPC in S.C.No.345/2014 on the file of the learned IV Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was suffering from jaundice and hence, he could not attend the court for hearing. So, N.B.W. was issued against him and he was arrested and remanded on 9.8.2021. Since then, he is in custody. Hereinafter, he will regularly appear before the court and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that the petitioner was absent for three years. After much effort, he was arrested and produced before the court.

4. The case is of the year 2014. Warrant is pending for more than three years. No valid reason for the absence. There are chances for absconding again. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

SS

Principal Sessions Judge.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 26th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20382/2021

in

C.C.No.6683/2013

(On the file of the learned CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)

Joswan Nikalson

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Team-II,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.P.Kannan and C.Sathish, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 381, 341, 419, 467, 468, 420, 471 r/w 109, 34 and 411 of IPC in C.C.No.6683/2013 on the file of the learned CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner does not know about the case. The very pendency of the case is coming to his knowledge very recently. He voluntarily surrendered before the Magistrate and the learned Magistrate recalled the warrant and directed to obtain bail. Thus, he filed the present petition.

3. On perusal of the C.D., it appears, the petitioner was shown in the absconding column in the Final Report. Though the case is of the year 2013, the warrant was not executed and the petitioner voluntarily surrendered before the court. Considering the same, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

4. 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

CCB and CBCID 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 said court daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond during trial.

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, Central Crime Branch, Team-II, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.20382/2021

