

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13012/2022

in

J-2 Adayar Traffic Investigation Wing Crime No. 305/2022

Guru Abhishek

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-2 Adayar Traffic Investigation Wing,
Adayar,
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 respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 308, 337 IPC r/w 184, 185 of M.V. Act in Crime No. 305/2022 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. He had studied B.B.A. and for further studies he is attempting to go to Canada. Due to the negligent act of the victim, the accident had occurred. Victim sustained simple injury and he has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 24.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner drove his car in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and hit the two wheeler of the defacto complainant and caused injury to him.

5. According to CPP, victim was discharged from the hospital after two days of treatment. This petitioner has no bad antecedents. Car involved in the accident was recovered.

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. Injured discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 24.7.2022. According to counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner is attempting to go to Canada for his further studies. 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 IV 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 IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13012/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13145/2022

in

J-3 Guindy P.S. Crime No. 768/2021

Tamilarasan @ Vicky @ Nondi Vicky

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-3 Guindy Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Pandian, S. Dhilipan, R. Karthick, 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 13.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 326, 367 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 768/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. Wordy quarrel arose between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. For which, the defacto complainant lodged a false complaint against the petitioner with false allegations. Without proper enquiry, the police registered the case against the petitioner. A4, A5 and A6 were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. Victim already discharged from the hospital. This petitioner is in custody from 13.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 10 accused. This petitioner is arrayed as A2. Occurrence took place on 19.9.2021. This petitioner was absconded for the past 10 months and after much effort, now only, the police is able to arrest him. This petitioner along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant in a bike. When the

defacto complaint tried to escape from the accused, he was assaulted by the accused and sustained injury on his head. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender, history sheeter and he is having 7 previous cases. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of crime. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Though victim was discharged from the hospital and some of the co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court, as far as this petitioner is concerned, he was absconded for the past 10 months and now only, he was arrested and he is in custody for a short period. Further, this petitioner is having 7 previous cases and according to CPP, he is a history sheeter. Considering the antecedents of the petitioner, objection raised by the CPP and short duration of custody, 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**

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13146/2022

in

V-6 Kolathur P.S. Crime No. 13/2022

Kokila

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V-6 Kolathur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.D. Prasanna 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 under P.T. Warrant on 8.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 13/2022 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. She is friend of one Saravanan, who is the prime accused in this case. The respondent police to find out the whereabouts of the said Saravanan, arrested this petitioner and after securing him, the respondent police released her on the same day. Again, the respondent police arrested this petitioner and she was remanded to judicial custody. This petitioner was originally arrested in Crime No.58/2022 on the file of K7 ICF Police Station on 3.5.2022. In this case, she was produced under P.T. Warrant and remanded to judicial custody on 8.7.2022. Co-accused/A2 was granted bail by the lower court on 25.7.2022 in Crl.M.P.No.18924/2022. She is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on her and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused break open the defacto complainant's house and stolen away 19 sovereigns of gold ornaments. Out of which, only 7 ½ sovereigns recovered and 10 ½ sovereigns is not yet recovered. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Occurrence took place on 1.1.2022. Formal arrest has been effected on the petitioner on 8.7.2022. Co-accused was granted bail by the lower court on 25.7.2022. The petitioner is in custody for the past three weeks. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with stringent condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her 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 twice at 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central prison (for Women), Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13146/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 13147/2022

in

R-4 Pondy Bazaar Traffic Investigation Wing Crime No. 166/2022

M. Ramesh Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-4 Pondy Bazaar Traffic Investigation Wing,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N. Naresh, 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 279, 338, 308 IPC and sec. 185 of M.V. Act in Crime No. 166/2022 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 has been falsely implicated in this case. While the petitioner drove his two wheeler towards Koyambedu, the victim who was going in front of two wheeler had suddenly crossed without seeing signal and due to that this petitioner dashed against him. It is purely an accident. Victim sustained only simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. The petitioner is in custody from 17.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner drove his two wheeler in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and dashed against the victim and caused injury to him. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, victim sustained minor injury and he has been treated as out-patient and that the petitioner has no bad antecedents.

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. 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 11 days. 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.

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 IV 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 IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13147/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13148/2022

in

G-2 Periamet P.S. Crime No. 145/2022

Kedharbalaai

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Jaisankar, D. Manoj Kumar, D. Karthick, R. Ram Kumar, S. Pavithra, 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 21.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 457 and 380 IPC r/w 511 IPC in Crime No. 145/2022 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. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody from 21.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner attempted to break open the ATM of SBI Bank situated at Veerasamy Street, Periamet, Chennai. The attempt to break the ATM of SBI bank by the petitioner was recorded in the CCTV camera and while he attempted to break open, alarm sound heard at Bengaluru and they informed to Chennai police and based on the information, this petitioner was arrested by the police. He further submits that this petitioner hails from Oddisa State. He has no permanent address at

Chennai. If he is released on bail, chances for absconding is more and it will be very difficult to the police to secure him again. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence,. he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he attempted to break open the ATM of SBI bank and tried to stolen the amount. According to CPP, there was CCTV footage is available to connect the petitioner with the alleged crime. This petitioner hails from Oddisa State and he has no permanent address at Chennai. If he is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

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**

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13150/2022

in

K-3 Aminjikai P.S. Crime No. 182/2022

Manikandan @ Bottle Mani

.. 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. G. Sivakumar, K. Sujan Kumar, S.K. Masthan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 182/2022 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. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Victim was discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were already released on bail by this court. This petitioner is arrayed as A6. He is in custody from 1.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted him with knife with intention to kill him. Injured was admitted in hospital for 10 days as inpatient. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 13 previous cases. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. Injured was discharged from the hospital after 10 days. This petitioner is having 13 previous cases. Considering the nature of the offence and bad 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**

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13151/2022

in

K-10 Koyambedu P.S. Crime No. 252/2022

Tharsigan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 379 and 511 IPC in Crime No. 252/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He is aged 19 years. The alleged incident said to have been taken place in Nerkundram which falls within the jurisdiction of Maduravoyal. But, the defacto complainant lodged the complaint before K-10 police station. No such occurrence had taken place as narrated in the FIR. The real fact is during vehicle check near the respondent police jurisdiction, the petitioner and other accused were intervened by the respondent police. Due to wordy quarrel with the respondent police, this false case has been foisted on the accused. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 18.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A1 along with two other accused came in a motor bike and attempted to snatch the cell phone from the defacto

complainant while he was talking with his wife. He further submits that arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Investigation is still pending. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of snatching of mobile phone. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with two other accused attempted to snatch the mobile phone from the defacto complainant. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Nowadays, snatching cases rises in the City. Granting of bail in such a case, will send wrong signal to the society at large. Hence, 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**

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 13152/2022

in

C-4 R.G.G.G.H P.S. Crime No. 96/2021

M. Ajithakumar

.. 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.J. Senthilkumar, M.J. Srinivas, S. Saranraj, B. Kannan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 96/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 6.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, this petitioner along with other accused stolen away the defacto complainant's two wheeler bearing registration No. TN 20 CB 5074 Balck colour Honda Activa when it was parked near Neuro Ward at Rajiv Gandhi Government General Hospital. He further submits that totally 13 bikes were stolen away from the said hospital premises. Investigation is going on. 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 13 motor bikes which were parked at Government General Hospital premises. This petitioner was arrested only on 6.7.2022. Investigation is not yet completed. Considering the above facts, nature of offence, attitude of the petitioner and short duration of custody, 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**

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12893/2022

in

R-3 Ashok Nagar P.S. Crime No. 188/2022

1. Ravi Shankar
2. Malaisamy

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. Ranjith Kumar, S. Puvinthan, 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 20.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 6(a) r/w 24(i)(B) of COTP Act 2003 and sec. 328 IPC in Crime No. 188/2022 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 of the offence. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 20.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners were found in possession of 33 Kg of banned tobacco products at the time of search conducted by the respondent police.

5. According to CPP, entire property and cash Rs.15,000/- towards the sale proceeds of the tobacco products have been recovered by the police.

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioners. It is reported by the CPP that the entire property and cash Rs.15000/- towards the sale proceeds of tobacco products were recovered. No one is reported as hospitalized after consuming the contraband. The petitioners are in custody from 20.7.2022. Considering all the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

7. 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 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 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 XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12893/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13006/2022

in

H-1 Washermentpet Traffic Investigation Wing Crime No. 95/2022

Syed Ibrahim

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-1 Washermentpet Traffic Investigation Wing,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Prabakar, U. Azarudhin, P. Marudhupandiyan, S. Selvi, P.M. Harini, N.S. Deepak, 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 24.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 279 and 308 IPC in Crime No. 95/2022 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. He drove his car in a normal speed. But, at one point of time, he lost his control and therefore, the car dashed against the electric post at pavement and capsized. No one sustained injury. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 24.7.2022. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner drove his car in a rash and negligent manner under the influence of alcohol and hit against the electric post and caused damage to the supporting wall of the electric post.

5. According to CPP, no one sustained injury and that the petitioner has no bad antecedents.

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. No one sustained injury in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 24.7.2022. Considering the above facts, 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 III 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 III Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13006/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 13153/2022

in

W.10, Flower Bazaar AWPS., Crime No.4/2022

Sathish Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W.10, Flower Bazaar All Women Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P.S. Amalraj, K.T.S. Sivakumar, S. Lakshmipathy, 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 3.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 417, 420, 376 of IPC and Sec.3 of Dowry Prohibition Act in Crime No.4/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner and the defacto complainant's daughter loved each other and with the consent of their parents, their betrothal ceremony was conducted at Nilgiri District. The petitioner has no physical relationship with the daughter of the defacto complainant and there was no dowry demand at all. The offence u/s.417 and 376 IPC does not attract. The defacto complainant, mother demanded the petitioner to live at their native place, Nilgiri District, which was refused by the petitioner. Due to which, she called off the marriage. Even now, the petitioner is ready to marry the daughter of the defacto complainant. It is only the defacto complainant, who is against their marriage. False and exaggerated complaint has been lodged against this petitioner and his parents. They are noway connected with the

alleged offence. The petitioner is in custody from 3.7.2022 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner had love affair with the defacto complainant's daughter and with the consent of their parents, betrothal ceremony was conducted by the defacto complainant during February 2022 and both the families agreed to conduct the marriage during September 2022. Suddenly, the petitioner and his parents demanded 25 sovereigns of gold jewels and Rs.5 lakhs cash as dowry and refused to marry the defacto complainant's daughter. According to learned CPP, the petitioner had physical relationship with the victim on several occasions and now refused to marry her by demanding dowry and cheated her. Investigation is pending. Hence, he seriously objects granting bail.

5. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the defacto complainant, mother demanded the petitioner to live at their native place, Nilgiri District, which was refused by the petitioner. Due to which, she called off the marriage. Even now, the petitioner is ready to marry the daughter of the defacto complainant. It is only the defacto complainant, who is against their marriage. Even as per the FIR, after conducting betrothal, this petitioner and the defacto complainant's daughter went to several places. According to CPP, on several occasions, the petitioner had physical relationship with the victim girl and that itself would go to show that this petitioner may had physical relationship with her with the consent of the victim girl. Hence, sec. 376 IPC does not attract. It is clear, after betrothal, this petitioner and the daughter of the complainant went to several places and thereafter some dispute may be arose between the two families. Whether dowry demand made by the petitioner and his family members is subject matter of trial. There are chances for exaggeration of complaint. Co-accused, i.e., the father and mother of the petitioner were released on bail by this court on 18.7.2022. The petitioner is in custody from 3.7.2022. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering all the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 13153/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12897/2022

in

F-4 Thousand Light P.S. Crime No. 134/2022

Senthil

.. 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.A. Anburaja, S. Prakash, M. Madhavan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 406 and 420 IPC in Crime No. 134/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The allegation against the petitioner is that the defacto complainant Rs.7,18,590/- was handed over to this petitioner and that amount was utilised by him for his own purpose without paying the subscription to the chit and this petitioner had taken two Air conditioner and 15 chairs worth about Rs.7,01,226/- from the office under the control of this petitioner at Anna Nagar and he sold out all the above mentioned office articles. While pending official inquiry, on 4.4.2022, the petitioner suddenly left the job without prior intimation to them. This petitioner was relieved from the defacto complainant's office after getting better opportunity and he was joined in the Vembu Chit Funds in petter post. After his relieving, more than 25 to 30 staff members are relieved from the defacto complainant

office and joined in the Vembu Chit Funds with the help of this petitioner. Due to which defacto complainant office is unable to do the day to day work with the limited staff members. Therefore, due to the said vengeance, the defacto complainant lodged the false complaint against the petitioner. This petitioner has not committed any crime as stated in the complaint. The allegation in the FIR is totally false. This petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 9.7.2022. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. Hence, he prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant Shriram Chits (India) Pvt. Ltd., has been providing financial services to the public and having subscribers more than 48 years within its head office in Chennai and branch across India. This petitioner was working as a Manager of the Anna Nagar branch office of the defacto complainant. During his tenure, he handled the money paid by the subscribers. He had failed to credit the chit amount to the respective customers account and made the wrong entry in the accounts and misappropriated a sum of Rs.15,19,816/-. Though he had collected entire amount from the customers, he had given credit to the partial amount which causes huge wrongful loss to the defacto complainant's company. One Mr. Charmakani, who is one of the subscriber of the defacto complainant lodged a complaint with the defacto complainant stating that he has not received a sum of Rs.7,18,595/- from the petitioner's branch which supposed to be credited to his account. On internal enquiry, it was confirmed that the said chit amount was misappropriated by the petitioner. Further, this petitioner swindled the gold coins and silver coins which were given to the agent of the defacto complainant which is worth about Rs.7,01,226/- and also he removed the Air conditioners and furnitures which is worth about Rs.1 lakh and left the job without informing the defacto complainant. It is further submitted that this petitioner misusing his official capacity, manipulated the accounts and transfer the amount to some other account and committed fraud and criminal breach of trust. Investigation is still going on. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more and there is every possibility in tampering the witnesses. He further submits that this petitioner filed similar bail application before the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore and the same is posted today for enquiry. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that had failed to credit the chit the chit amount to the respective customers account and made the wrong entry in the accounts and misappropriated Rs.15,19,816/- during his tenure at defacto complainant's Anna Nagar branch. Based on the complaint made by one Charmakani, internal enquiry was conducted and during enquiry it was confirmed that this petitioner failed to credit Rs.7,18,595/- to his account and also swindled the gold coins and silver coins worth about Rs.7,01,226/- and also caused wrongful loss to the defacto complainant company by way of removing Air conditioners and furnitures worth about Rs.1 lakh and committed fraud and breach of trust. Investigation is not yet completed. The amount involved in this case is not yet recovered. This petitioner also moved similar bail application before the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore and the same is posted today for enquiry and that itself would go to show the attitude of the petitioner herein. Considering the grave nature of offence, involvement of huge amount and the stage of the investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. 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**

Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12786/2022

in

CCB, Crime No.108/2022

Vasudevan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Anbarasan, P.G. Madan Kumar, A. Praveen 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 30.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 r/w 120B of IPC in Crime No.108/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent. He is doing real estate business. The petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. There is no overt act against him. The named accused in the FIR alone encroached the property and created bogus deeds. This petitioner only acted as a mediator to sell the property by introducing the purchasers and had collected charges from the purchasers. This petitioner is noway connected with the fraudulent act committed by the named accused. There is no materials to show that this petitioner acted as the back bone of the entire transaction. This petitioner do not have any transaction with the alleged impersonators. The property claimed by the defacto complainant is nothing to do with Plot No.40 relating to the sale by

the purchasers introduced by this petitioner. The boundaries and extent of the properties are different. The dispute is civil in nature. Without conducting any enquiry, the respondent police hurriedly implicated the petitioner in this case and arrested him. Co-accused/A8 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.M.P.No.17188/2022 dated 25.7.2022. The petitioner has no bad antecedent. He is in custody from 30.6.2022 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, on 1.2.2022, the defacto complainant has preferred a complaint before the Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai, alleging that she is the owner of the land admeasuring an extent of 3274 Sq.ft. comprised in Survey No. 132/3A2, bearing plot No.1, situated at 8th street, Kuberan Nagar, Madipakkam, Chennai having purchased the same from one Muthulingam and Ravikumar through a sale deed dated 5.9.2005, vide document No.3842/2005 in the office of SRO, Velachery and her vendors have purchased the said property from one Mrs. Ansibai, through a sale deed dated 9.3.2001, at SRO, Velachery, vide document No. 957/2001 and she had been in possession and enjoyment of the said property right from the purchase without any hindrance. While being so, during February 2022, she had intended to develop the said property and applied for bank loan, when she searched online encumbrance certificate, to her shock and surprise, she has found that the persons namely Rengasamy, S/o. Jambulingam, Harikrishnan S/o. Rengasamy, Narayanamurthy, S/o. Katirvel, Sub Registrar, Velachery, Srividhya.R W/o. Baskar and Swathy.U W/o. Sathish have colluded and conspired together and fraudulently created bogus and fake documents for the very same property and grabbed her property ad without any parent document, the said Rengasamy and Harikrishnan have fraudulently created a settlement deed dated 20.4.2021 and also a General Power of Attorney deed dated 20.4.2021 on the file of SRO, Velachery and sold the same to the said Srividhya and Swathy by making the said plot into two parts and committed the offence of grabbing the land of the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, totally 10 accused involved in this case. This petitioner is A7. This petitioner along with other accused colluded with each other created forged documents in respect of the property owned by the defacto complainant at Madipakkam

Village measuring an extent of 3274 sq.ft. and sold the same to A5 and A6 for the sale consideration of Rs.50 lakhs. In the above said transaction, this petitioner has received Rs.10 lakhs towards his share. During investigation it came to light that the purchasers have obtained Rs.70 lakhs from the State Bank of India on the security of the forged documents of the property. Investigation is pending. A7 to A10 alone were arrested. Other accused are yet to be secured. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility of tampering of evidence and thus seriously objects granting bail.

6. According to counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner acted only as mediator for the sale of the property. Similarly placed accused/A8 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.No.17788/2022 dated 25.7.2022. This petitioner is in custody from 30.6.2022. Considering the above facts and 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 **Special Metropolitan Magistrate No.II, (Special Court for Land Grabbing Cases) Egmore at Allikulam, Chennai** and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily twice at 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The Special Metropolitan Magistrate No.II, (Special Court for Land Grabbing Cases)
Egmore at Allikulam, Chennai
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12786/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.12652/2022

in

F.4, Thousandlights PS. Crime No. not known of 2022

A. Mohammed Nazeemuddin

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F.4 Thousandlights Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me in the presence of M/s. J. Janarthanan, P. Archana, K. Priyadharshini, S.P. Chellammal, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the 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.406, 420 of IPC in Cr.No.not known of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He was working as an Accountant and Sales in MS World Travel Company for the past 4 years. The defacto complainant is the proprietor of said company. During February 2022, the petitioner has given resignation and the same was accepted by the defacto complainant after completing all the formalities and procedure and relieved after 3 months. Thereafter, the petitioner had started his business and doing very gradually. Whiles on 3.3.2022, the defacto complainant called the petitioner to his office, wherein he along with others attacked the petitioner. As against which, the petitioner has lodged a complaint. Since the police has not taken steps to register the case, the petitioner has filed a petition before the learned XIV Metropolitan Magistrate for direction and the same is pending. As a counter blast, the

defacto complainant has filed this false complaint. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that no case has been registered against the petitioner 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
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.12657/2022

in

V.4, Rajamangalam PS. Crime No. not known of 2022

Madhan Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police(L&O),
V.4, Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me in the presence of M/s. J. Janarthanan, K. Priyadharshini, S.P. Chellammal, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for the 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, 323, 506(i) of IPC in Cr.No.not known of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Both the petitioner and the defacto complainant are friends. During the wordy quarrel, the defacto complainant fell down and sustained injury. However, the injured was treated as out-patient. Only to harass the petitioner, this false complaint has been given. he petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that no case has been registered against the petitioner 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.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.13020/2022

in

H.3,Tondiarpet P.S. Cr.No.223/2022

1. Rajan

2. Nalini Kumar

.. Petitioners/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. P. Praveen Kumar, A. Vinoth Kumar, V. Kumaresan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.294(b), 326, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.223/2022 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. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that in the wine shop, these petitioners along with other accused demanded money from the defacto complainant for consuming liquor, that on his refusal, the accused have attacked him using hands, due to which, the defacto complainant had a dislocation of shoulder joint on the left. He was admitted to the hospital and after taking 6 days in-patient treatment he was discharged. However, he submits that the petitioners have no previous case.

5. The allegation against the petitioners is that they along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant with hands. According to learned CPP, the injured was

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13020/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.13021/2022

in

R.7, K.K. Nagar P.S. Cr.No.266/2022

A. Chitra

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police(L&O),
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. J. Janarthanan, N. Vennila, G. Jeevitha, K. Priyadharshini, S.P. Chellammal, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.294(b), 506(i) IPC in Cr.No.266/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The defacto complainant is the accused in C.C.No.7584/2018 under N.I. Act pending on the file of FTC for trial, wherein the petitioner is the defacto complainant. In order to protract the said proceedings, this false complaint has been lodged suppressing the real facts. The petitioner is noway connected with the alleged offence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner is doing money lending business. The defacto complainant introduced his friend Prabhakar to the accused and the said Prabhakar had obtained a loan of Rs.50,000/-. The accused had received more than Rs.11 lakhs by way of charging exorbitant interest. Even then the petitioner had demanded the Prabhakar to pay further amount and asked to issue Cheque, for which, the

defacto complainant issued a cheque on behalf of Prabakar. Even after discharging the loan, she refused to return the cheque stating that it was misplaced. Suddenly, she threatened the defacto complainant as if she would file a case based on the cheque, if the amount was not paid. When the defacto complainant and his friend contacted the petitioner through phone, she abused them in filthy language and threatened them with dire consequences. However he submits that the petitioner has no previous case.

5. It appears there exists money dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Already, criminal proceedings in C.C.No.7584/2018 is pending between the parties. As per the FIR, the only allegation against the petitioner is that she had made verbal abuse and threatened the defacto complainant. Nothing untoward is happened. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has no previous case. 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 her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

[b] the petitioner shall 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, R.7, K.K. Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.13021/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

CrI.M.P.No.13022/2022

in

K.2, Ayanavaram P.S., Cr.No.not known of 2022

1. R. Vel Murugan
2. Raja
3. R. Nagammal

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K.2, Ayanavaram Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. Janarthanan, K. Priyadharshini, S.P. Chellammal, J. Elanchezhien, R. Premkumari, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.341, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.not known of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1st petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant. The petitioners 2 and 3 are the in-law of the defacto complainant. There exists matrimonial dispute between the 1st petitioner and his wife. Due to which, the 1st petitioner had filed a divorce petition in O.P.No.1811/2017 and the same is pending on the file of III Additional Family Court, Chennai. Against which, the defacto complainant had filed a maintenance petition in M.C.No.41/2017 before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Trichy and also a case under Domestic Violence Act in D.V.C.No.117/2019 pending on the file of Addl. Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai. The defacto complainant had demanded huge amount as settlement. Since the 1st petitioner did

not accept the same, she lodged this false complaint against the petitioners. The petitioners 2 and 3 came to Chennai for eye treatment and stayed at the 1st petitioner's house on 19.7.2022 and at that time, the defacto complainant along with her hooligans came to the house and assaulted them. Since 2017, both the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant are living separately and this complaint was lodged only during 2022 in order to achieve her goal. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. They are apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant has lodged a complaint alleging that the marriage of the defacto complainant and the 1st petitioner was took place in the year 2008 and they lived together at Ayanavaram Mettu Street. During December 2016, the 1st petitioner has purchased a house property by availing loan from HDFC Bank, for which, the defacto complainant gave Rs.10 lakhs by pledging her jewels in the name of 3rd petitioner and gave Rs.10,00,000/-. Due to non payment of EMIs, the Bank has taken steps for sale through auction. The 1st petitioner had illegal affair with another woman and he had married the woman without the knowledge of the defacto complainant, while the marriage with her is in existence. They had two children also. Against which, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint on 15.5.2018 and CSR was given. The defacto complainant is living separately from 2017. When the defacto complainant and her friend went to the 1st petitioner's house requesting him to pay the EMIs to the bank regularly for the house property, wherein the defacto complainant is residing now, these petitioners along with other accused abused them in filthy language and assaulted the defacto complainant. He would further submits that the complaint has been received by the respondent police, CSR was given and petition enquiry is pending.

5. The 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant are husband and wife. The petitioners 2 and 3 are the parents of the 1st petitioner. There exists matrimonial dispute between the spouses. However, it appears that already the 1st petitioner has approached the Family Court, Chennai by way of filing a petition for divorce and the defacto complainant has filed maintenance case under Sec.125 Cr.PC., and also a case under

Domestic Violence Act and all are pending. It is seen that both the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant are living separately from 2017. The present complaint was given in the year 2022 and is pending for enquiry. On perusal of the complaint, the defacto complainant alleged that the petitioners along with other accused abused her in filthy language and assaulted her. Even as per the complaint, the defacto complainant was treated as out-patient. Under these circumstances, considering the above nature of dispute, the pending litigations between the parties, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.13022/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12797/2022

And

Crl.M.P.No.13054/2022

(intervene petition)

in

V.4, Rajamangalam PS. Crime No.490/2022

1. Senthilkumar
2. Vinothkumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V.4, Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me in the presence of M/s. S. Michael, K.S. Harish, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent and of M/s. M. Soundar Vijay Arulram, S. Jerome, M. Rubeshwaran, K.A.M. Jagadish Kumar, 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.406, 420, 294(b), 506(i), 409 of IPC in Cr.No.490/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are brothers. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. For the same occurrence, two cases have been foisted. The defacto complainant, Revathy is the Proprietor of M/s. Surgitech Corporation. The 1st petitioner herein is the Proprietor of M/s. Surgiwear Medcare and the 3rd accused/Nirmal is the proprietor of M/s. Evergreen Pvt. Ltd., All are engaged in production, distribution and sale of medical equipments. During the course of

business, the defacto complainant has paid a sum Rs.10,00,000/- on various dates for supply of medical equipments, for which, the petitioners 1 and 2 herein had delivered the products worth about Rs.6,20,000/- and the balance amount of R.4,30,000/- only is due. there exists agreement between the parties. The non repayment of amount or not fulfilling the terms of agreement would amount to breach of contract alone, but it is not a criminal act. There is no intention or motive to cheat the defacto complainant. Due covid-19 situation, the petitioners were unable to deliver the goods as promised. The transaction is purely civil in nature. Everything is borne by records. There is no need for custodial interrogation of the petitioners. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the intervener as well as learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is running a company in the name and style of M/s. Surgitech Corporation Firm. During January 2019, A3/Nirmal, proprietor of M/s. Evergreen Firm along with these petitioners, had approached the defacto complainant stating that they have orders for purchase of medical equipment and they are shortage of cash for Rs.21 lakhs. At their request, the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.10,50,000/- through NEFT transaction and they had promised to supply medical equipments for that value. However, they have supplied the equipments worth about Rs.6,20,000/- and failed to supply the materials for the balance amount of Rs.4,30,000/- and on demand, the accused have threatened her with dire consequences and thus committed cheating. According to learned CPP, as per the direction of the learned XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, the case has been registered and till date, the petitioners neither supplied medical equipments for the value of balance amount nor returned the amount. Investigation is pending and the arrest of the petitioners is very much necessary to complete the investigation and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of cheating. The allegations against the petitioners is that they have not supplied the medical equipments as promised and cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.4,30,000/- and also threatened them with dire consequences. According to learned CPP, investigation is pending and the petitioners are having similar case and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is very much necessary. Considering the nature

of offence, the amount involved in this case, the fact that investigation is pending and the objection raised by learned CPP, 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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12798/2022

And

Crl.M.P.No.13053/2022

(intervene petition)

in

V.4, Rajamangalam PS. Crime No.489/2022

1. Senthilkumar
2. Vinothkumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
V.4, Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me in the presence of M/s. S. Michael, K.S. Harish, Counsel for the petitioners and the CPP for the respondent and of M/s. M. Soundar Vijay Arulram, S. Jerome, M. Rubeshwaran, K.A.M. Jagadish Kumar, 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.406, 420, 294(b), 506(i) of IPC in Cr.No.489/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are brothers. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. For the same occurrence, two cases have been foisted. The defacto complainant, Madhan Kumar is the Proprietor of M/s. A2Z Enterprises. The 1st petitioner herein is the Proprietor of M/s. Surgiwear Medcare. Both of them engaged in production, distribution and sale of medical equipments. During the course of business, the defacto complainant has paid a sum Rs.15,30,000/- on

various dates for supply of medical equipments, for which, the petitioners 1 and 2 herein had delivered the products worth about Rs.5,88,239/- and the balance amount of R.9,41,761/- only is due. There exists agreement between the parties. The non repayment of amount or not fulfilling the terms of agreement would amount to breach of contract alone, but it is not a criminal act. There is no intention or motive to cheat the defacto complainant. Due covid-19 situation, the petitioners were unable to deliver the goods as promised. The transaction is purely civil in nature. Everything is borne by records. There is no need for custodial interrogation of the petitioners. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the intervener as well as learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is running a company in the name and style of M/s. A2Z Enterprises. During January 2019, these petitioners, proprietors of M/s.Surgiwear Medcare had approached the defacto complainant stating that they have orders for purchase of medical equipment and they are shortage of cash for Rs.20 lakhs. At their request, the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.15,30,000/- through NEFT transaction and they had promised to supply medical equipments for that value. However, they have supplied the equipments worth about Rs.5,86,239/- and failed to supply the materials for the balance amount of Rs.9,41,761/- and on demand, the accused have threatened him with dire consequences and thus committed cheating. According to learned CPP, as per the direction of the learned XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, the case has been registered and till date, the petitioners neither supplied medical equipments for the value of balance amount nor returned the amount. Investigation is pending and the arrest of the petitioners is very much necessary to complete the investigation and thus seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of cheating. The allegations against the petitioners is that they have not supplied the medical equipments as promised and cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.9,41,761/- and also threatened them with dire consequences. According to learned CPP, investigation is pending and the petitioners are having similar case and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is very much necessary. Considering the nature of offence, the amount involved in this case, the fact that investigation is pending and the

objection raised by learned CPP, 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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 27th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12907/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.9032/2022

in

Crime No.450/2022

Murugeshan @ Murugesh

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

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

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A.L. Nagarajan, 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.9032/2022, dt:9.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9032/2022 on 9.6.2022 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 33 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.