

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 10964/2021

in

K-1 Sembium P.S. Crime No. 667/2021

1. A. Charles
2. B. Gokulakrishnan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-1 Sembium Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Ram Kumar, S. Tamil Selvan, R. Stephen Shadhurak, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 8.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 667/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. 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 8.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant when he coming in his goods vehicle and robbed Rs.700/- from him at knife point and also caused damage to the vehicle worth about Rs.5000/-. He further submits that CCTV footage is also available to show the occurrence. According to CPP, the 1st petitioner is having 3 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 1 previous case.

5. According to CPP, CCTV footage is also available to connect the petitioners with the alleged occurrence and the accused caused damage to the vehicle of the defacto complainant worth about Rs.5000/- and also committed robbery of Rs.700/- from him. The petitioners are in custody for the past three weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody and the damage caused to the defacto complainant's vehicle, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions.

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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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 also deposit a sum of Rs.2,500/- each to the credit of the crime no. 667/2021 before the said court and the final order in respect of the amount will be passed at the end of the criminal proceedings by the trial court.

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

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

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

(f) 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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 10964/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 10987/2021

in

P-3 Vyasarpadi P.S. Crime No. 560/2021

1. Vikraman @ Vikram
2. Deena @ Dinesh Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-3 Vyasarpadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P.N. Veeramani, N. Naresh, D. Kannan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 13.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 427, 336, 392 r/w 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 560/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. 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 13.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.500/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 8 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

5. Since, the 1st petitioner is having 8 previous cases, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present. According to CPP, the 2nd petitioner is having 3 previous cases.

He is in custody for more than two weeks. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the 2nd petitioner alone subject to the following conditions.

6. Accordingly, the 2nd petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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 2nd petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the 2nd petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 2nd 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 2nd petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2nd 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 2nd petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

(g) As far as the 1st petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Chengalpattu.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 10987/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 10991/2021

in

H-1 Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 1212/2021

Karuna @ Kosu Karuna

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-1 Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M.M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested under P.T. Warrant on 9.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 224 IPC in Crime No. 1212/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was formally arrested in this case on 9.6.2021 under P.T. Warrant. Originally he was arrested on 31.5.2021 in Crime No. 674/2021 for the alleged offence u/s.392 IPC on the file of H3 Tondiarpet Police Station, Chennai. He is in custody from 9.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. This petitioner was originally arrested on 31.5.2021 in Crime No. 674/2021 on the file of H-3 Tondiarpet Police Station. When the police arrested the accused and taken him along with another accused for medical check up to Stanley hospital, he escaped from the police custody. Hence, the present case was registered. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the conduct of the petitioner that he escaped from the custody of the police when he was bring to hospital for medical check-up and the antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11005/2021

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 298/2021

Sankar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-4 Basin Bridge Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. C. Raja, A. Rajagopalan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 307 IPC in Crime No. 298/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to previous enmity, false case has been given against the petitioner. He is a law abiding person. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 8.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity between the accused and the defacto complainant, the petitioner's relative one Vishnu assaulted the defacto complainant's sister's 2nd son Selva. When it was questioned by the defacto complainant, the accused abused him in filthy language and also assaulted him with knife. Due to which he sustained head injury and admitted to Government Stanley hospital. He

further submits that the victim sustained grievous injury. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 21.6.2021 and that there is no change in circumstance and objects the grant of bail.

5. It appears from the A.R. copy, that the victim sustained laceration measuring 8x2x1cm on left side parietal region, outer table skull fracture palpated in left side parietal region and laceration on left hand muscle exposed. Considering the gravity of injury, no change in circumstance after the dismissal of earlier bail application and that investigation is not yet completed, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11008/2021

in

D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 305/2021

1. Arun @ Mandai Arun
2. Dinesh @ Vendakai Dinesh
3. Suresh @ Asathuma .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-3 Ice House Police Station,
Chennai. ..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. P. Thinesh, T. Sundarbabu, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 10.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 325,307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 305/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that these petitioners have nothing to do with the alleged offence and they are innocent. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners are in custody from 10.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to dispute in supplying drugs, these petitioners attacked the defacto complainant one after another on his nose and face and due to which, the complainant sustained severe bleeding injury on his nose and his teeth was broken. He further submits that the 1st petitioner and 3rd petitioners are having one previous case. 2nd petitioner is having 7 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. Since the 2nd petitioner is having 7 previous cases, this court is not inclined to grant bail to him at present. According to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital. The 1st and 3rd petitioners are in custody for the past 20 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above aspects and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to 1st and 3rd petitioners alone subject to the following condition.

6. Accordingly, the 1st and 3rd 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 photograph 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 1st and 3rd petitioners shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the 1st and 3rd petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the 1st and 3rd 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 1st and 3rd petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 1st and 3rd 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 1st and 3rd petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

(g) As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11008/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11011/2021

in

V-1 Villivakkam P.S. Crime No. 292/2021

Kamesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. T. Vinoth Kumar, Sonai Bothi Rajan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 29.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 292/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He is aged 19 years. This petitioner is working as Ambulance Driver. He is no way connected with the offence. He has been been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 29.5.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with another accused committed theft of newly bought two-wheeler(without number plate) belonging to the defacto complainant, which was parked in front of his house. He further submits that this petitioner is having one previous case and objects granting bail.

5. Considering the nature of case, conduct of the petitioner and his bad antecedent, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11015/2021

in

R-5 Virugambakkam P.S. Crime No. 575/2021

1. R. Selvakumar
2. Abdul Rafiq

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R-5 Virugambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. N. Senthilkumar, R. Girija, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The 1st petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 and the 2nd petitioner was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 397 IPC in Crime No. 575/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are aged 20 years. They are no way connected with the offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody for the past two weeks and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.500/- and a cell phone from him at knife point. According to him the 1st petitioner is having 2 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having one previous case and objects the granting of bail.

5. It is a case of robbery. Arrest of the petitioners is very recent one. The petitioners also having previous cases. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11020/2021

in

E-2 Royapettah P.S. Crime No.285/2021

K. Arun @ Kozhipadi Arun

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-2 Royapettah Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A. Lokesh Babu, K. Manikandan, R. Raja Shama Gayathri, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 147, 148, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 285/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. It is a case and counter case. In counter case, co-accused were already granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. This petitioner is no way connected with the offence. He has been been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 17.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his friends with intention to eliminate them using sticks and pelted stones on them and caused injury to them. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 12 previous cases and objects the granting of bail.

5. According to counsel for the petitioner, co-accused were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. On perusal of the bail order passed by the Hon'ble High Court, it appears that co-accused were granted bail since they have no previous cases. However, this petitioner is having 12 previous cases. Hence, he cannot claim parity with co-accused those who are granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. Considering the above facts, antecedents of the petitioner and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11022/2021

in

K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar P.S. Crime No. 161/2021

Dilip Kumar @ Dhilipan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-9 Thiru-Vi-Ka Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. K. Suthan, M. Melvin, S.Y. Syed Parvez, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 302 IPC @ 120(B), 341, 302 IPC in Crime No. 161/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He is in custody from 20.4.2021 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 while he returning from his work and brutally attacked him using deadly weapons and caused multiple cut injuries all over his body. Due to which, the victim died after few hours. Investigation is underway. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibility of his absconding and he may cause hindrance to investigation and objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a pre-planned murder. Assault was made using deadly weapons. A valuable life has been lost. Victim died due to the injuries caused by the accused. Investigation is at crucial stage. Considering the gravity of offence and the stage of investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11023/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 726/2021

Radha @ Radhakrishnan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, J. Sakthivel, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 726/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case and counter case. Counter case crime number is 725/2021. Dispute between two groups. Both the groups attacked each other and sustained injury on both sides. However, according to CPP, injured sustained simple injury and they have been treated as out-patient.

5.No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. It is reported that injured sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is in custody

for the past two weeks. 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 the following conditions.

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

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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 Judicial Magistrate No.I, Chengalpet 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.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to :

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Chengalpet.
3. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11023/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11014/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 725/2021

K. Ferose Khan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. J. Janarthanan, P. Archana, J. Elanjchezhen, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 725/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
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 them only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case and counter case. Counter case crime number is 726/2021. Dispute between two groups. Both the groups attacked each other and sustained injury on both sides. However, injured sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient.
5. No previous case is reported as against the petitioner. It is reported that injured sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. 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 the following conditions.

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

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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 Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thiruvallur 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.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to :

1. The X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thiruvallur.
3. Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11014/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 11025/2021

in

B.2, Esplanade P.S. Cr.No.393/2021

Kuppathuraja

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
B.2, Esplanade Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Nithiyavel, S. Radhakrishnan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 307 IPC in Crime No.393/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. Petitioner and the defacto complainant are relatives. Both were intoxicated at the time of occurrence. Since the defacto complainant attacked the petitioner's son, in order to protect his son, this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during the quarrel, this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant with screw driver on his chest and the victim was admitted in the hospital as in-patient for 5 days. He seriously objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner was arrested only on 16.6.2021. Investigation is not yet completed. Considering the nature of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 11027/2021

in

P.4, Basin Bridge P.S. Cr.No.188/2021

1. Sathish

2. Thamilselvan

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P.4, Basin Bridge Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M. Dharmangadaiah, M. Ramesh Babu, K. Senthil Kumar, K. Dinesh Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 28.4.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 294(b), 323, 324, 304 IPC IPC in Cr.No.188/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through video conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that at the time of occurrence, the petitioners were not in the occurrence place and it is only a put up case. Co-accused were released on bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.10690/2021 on 9.6.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past two months and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that in the occurrence one of the victim died and the other person sustained injury on his head.

5. It is a case of 304 IPC. Death was not intended. Co-accused A3 to A5 were already granted bail by this court in CrI.M.P.No.10690/2021 dated 9.6.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past two months. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody, relationship between the parties and nature of quarrel, 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/- each (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

(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]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 11027/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 10994/2021

in

N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Crime No. 585/2021

1. Kokki Senthil @ Senthil Kumar
2. Arjun

.. Petitioners/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, upon hearing M/s. M. Nithiyavel, R. Mukesh Kannah, M. Kokila, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 15.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 585/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Victim sustained simple injury and he has been discharged from the hospital on he next day of occurrence. The petitioners are in custody from 15.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant and his friends with knife and caused injury to him. Due to which, the complainant was admitted to hospital for treatment and after one day treatment, he was discharged from the hospital. He further submits that the 1st petitioner is having 3 previous cases. He also produced A.R. Copy for perusal.

5. On perusal of the A.R. copy, it would go to show the victim sustained laceration injury over right palm region which is simple in nature. The petitioners are in custody from 15.6.2021. Victim was discharged from the hospital after one day treatment. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the nature of injury inflicted and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions.

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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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.

Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 10994/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI
Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June , 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 11016/2021

in

G-2 Periamet P.S. Crime No. 81/2021

Shafeeullah Yaseen

.. 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, upon hearing M/s. J. Samiullah, P. Veera Narayanan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.5.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 392 IPC in Crime No.81/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. His two wheeler was used in the occurrence by the other accused. Since because, his vehicle was used without his knowledge in the occurrence, petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 10.5.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner and other accused preplanned and waylaid the defacto complainant while he was taking a cash of Rs.7,50,000/- and nearly 40 sovereign of gold with him in a two wheeler and snatched them and thus seriously objects granting bail. He also produced the Case Diary for perusal.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that out of the money stolen, Rs.5 lakh was recovered from this petitioner. Prima facie, there is involvement of the petitioner in the crime. The amount involved is huge in nature. The offence was committed by noting the movement of the defacto complainant/jewellery shop owner. The vehicle used in this crime is owned by this petitioner. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 22.6.2021. Another accused was detained under Act 14/1982. No change in circumstance was brought to the notice of this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application. Considering the planning and execution of the offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

**Sd/- R. Selvakumar,
Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11028/2021

in

P-5, M.K.B.Nagar P.S. Crime No.702/2021

1. Hariharan

2. Akash

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

Inspector of Police,

P-5, M.K.B.Nagar Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.Elumalai and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 12.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section Sec.341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.702/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through video conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioners are in custody from 12.6.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners robbed Rs.650/- from the defacto complainant at knife point. 1st petitioner is involved in one previous case and 2nd petitioner is involved in two previous case and thus, objects granting bail.

5. However, the petitioners are in custody from 12.6.2021. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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 as and when required.

(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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

Cri.M.P.No.11028/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11029/2021

in

D-1, Triplicane P.S. Crime No.453/2021

1. Victoria

2. Bhavani

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

Inspector of Police,

D-1, Triplicane Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.A.Elumalai and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 13.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section Sec.4(1)(a) r/w 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No.453/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through video conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioners are in custody from 13.6.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners were found in possession of 28 bottles of liquor for sale. 1st petitioner is involved in 10 previous cases and 2nd petitioner is involved in 2 previous cases, thus, he opposed the petition.

5. However, the petitioners are in custody from 13.6.2021. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

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

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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 as and when required.

(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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11029/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11031/2021

in

N-2, Kasimedu P.S. Crime No.532/2021

L.Sarath Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

Inspector of Police,

N-2, Kasimedu Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.D.Jayasekar and R.Vijay and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 8.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section Sec.294(b), 336, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.532/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 8.6.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with four persons went to the shop of the defacto complainant and after having tiffin, they refused to settle the bill. When the defacto complainant demanded for money, they threatened him and robbed Rs.500/- from him at knife point. The petitioner is having two previous cases and thus, objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is aged 22. He is in custody for the past three weeks. Considering the nature of case, duration of custody and age of the petitioner, this court inclined to grant bail.

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

(a) the sureties shall affix their photograph 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 as and when required.

(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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to :

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

ss

CrI.M.P.No.11031/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.10919/2021

in

K-10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.Not known/2021

Preamkumar @ Kutty Arul

.. 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, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Vellidoss and M.Gopalakrishnan and 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 323, 294(b) and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned CPP submits that the complaint given by the defacto complainant is withdrawn and as such no complaint and F.I.R. is pending against the petitioner before the respondent police.
4. Considering the submissions of the learned CPP, this petition is dismissed as unnecessary.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.10920/2021

in

E-2, Royapettah P.S. Crime No.285/2021

1. Vicky @ Vikram

2. Sridhar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

E-2, Royapettah Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.V.Rameshbabu, K.S.Begum, R.Hari Babu, K.Manikandan and R.Rajashamagayathri and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.285/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the defacto complainant and his friends voluntarily quarreled with the petitioners and assaulted them. The petitioner's friend Ashwin Kumar lodged a complaint and case was registered in Cr.No.284/2021. The defacto complainant has given the counter complaint. There is no injury to the defacto complainant. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners along with other accused assaulted the defacto complainant and his friends with stone and stick. They also tried to assault the defacto complainant with knife with an intention to kill him. Arrested accused not yet released on bail and thus, strongly opposed the petition.

5. Arrested accused is still in custody. It is a case of 307 IPC. Considering the nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021.

CrL.M.P.No.11002/2021

in

B-2, Esplanade P.S. Crime No.398/2021

1. Jai @ Jaikumar @ Jaykumar

2. Peter @ Prakash

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

B-2, Esplanade Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.N.Naresh and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 323, 509 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.398/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. A1 has passed comments on the defacto complainant's family members, over which, there was a quarrel. A1 arrested and released on bail. Since the petitioners are his friends, they have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners have no previous case and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners and three others have made comments on the defacto complainant's wife and daughter. When the defacto complainant's staff questioned them, they assaulted him with stone.

5. Arrested accused released on bail. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of offence, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 receipt of a copy of this order, before the VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees Ten Thousand only)

with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the 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 as and when required.

[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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The VII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, B-2, Esplanade Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11002/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021.

Cr.L.M.P.No.11003/2021

in

G-1, Vepery P.S. Crime No.92/2021

1. Bhaskar
2. Murugan @ Murugesan .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-1, Vepery Police Station,
Chennai. ..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.G.Dhayashankar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 341, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.92/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. In fact, the defacto complainant's men damaged the gate and CCTV camera, for which, a complaint was given and case in Cr.No.93/2021 was registered. The dispute is purely civil in nature. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners along with three other persons waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted him with hands.

5. The occurrence took place in April 2021. The complaint itself would go to show some civil dispute between the parties. Except 506(i) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 receipt of a copy of this order, before the II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the

petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the 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 as and when required.

[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.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, G-1, Vepery Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11003/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021.

CrI.M.P.No.11004/2021

in

H-6, R.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No.3592/2020

R.Devadasan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-6, R.K.Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.K.Purushothaman and V.Manopriya and 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 379 of IPC r/w Sec.21(1) of Mines and Minerals Act, 1957 in Crime No.3592/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the owner of the lorry, in which, it has been alleged that sand was smuggled. The petitioner is in the transport business for the past eight years. The driver Periyasamy had taken the vehicle for rent. the petitioner had no knowledge about the transport of sand. The Driver of the lorry was arrested and released on bail by this court. The lorry was returned to the petitioner. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that earlier petition in CrI.M.P.No.8829/2021 was dismissed by this court on 19.5.2021 and no change of circumstances.

5. The petitioner is the owner of the lorry, in which sand was smuggled. The driver was arrested and released. Earlier petition filed by the petitioner for anticipatory bail was dismissed by this court on 19.5.2021. This is the second petition and no change of circumstances. Considering the above circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.11001/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.6068/2021

in

Crime No.152/2021

Manikandan @ XL Mani

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-2, Aynavaram Police Station, Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.T.V.Somasundaram, U.Yuvaraj, A.Vinothkumar and P.Praveen Kumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.6068/2021, dt: 5.4.2021.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.6068/2021, dated 5.4.2021 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition from 18.4.2021 to 24.6.2021.
5. The petitioner has complied the condition for more than two months. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
6. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11019/2021

in

P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.753/2021

1. Ajay
2. Sanjay
3. Saranraj @ Chinnapaiyan .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Muralidaran, U.Yuvaraj and M.Elayakumar and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The 1st petitioner, who was arrested on 17.6.2021 and 2nd and 3rd petitioners, who were arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section Sec.341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.753/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners 1 and 2 are sons and 3rd petitioner is the son-in-law of one Lodongu Mari. Since Lodongu Mari is having some previous cases, deliberately, the police registered this false case and remanded the petitioner to custody. They are in custody for more than 10 days and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners voluntarily without any reasonable cause, assaulted the victim and caused severe injury on his head and objects granting bail.
5. C.D. was called for. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the defacto complainant Manikandan admitted to hospital with the history of assault by four known persons. He had three lacerated injuries on his head. Considering the injuries inflicted on the defacto

complainant, the representation made by the learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be not acceptable. There was assault on the defacto complainant and consequential injury. Under such circumstances, considering the short duration of custody and bad antecedents, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.11007/2021

in

F-5, Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No.542/2021

R.Tamil Selvan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.S.Mohanraj and CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 21.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 364, 365 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.542/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through video conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the friend one Varun, who had love affair with one Dilshith Begam. The family refused to marry her to the said Varun. In pursuance of that, there was a panchayat, in which the petitioner participated. Nothing more than that had happened. However, a false case has been registered against the petitioner and others. He has been arrested on 21.6.2021 and prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant's son Thaslim Basha is the cousin of Dilshith Begam. The mother of Dilshith Begam refused to marry her to the said Varun, since he refused to convert into Muslim. Thereafter, marriage was arranged to Dilshith Begam with another person by Towfiq. Being aggrieved at, the said Varun along with the petitioner and others kidnapped the defacto complainant's son Thaslim Basha in order to coerce their family to send Dilshith Begam to Varun. They have

kidnapped the defacto complainant's son in a Fortuner Car from Anna Nagar and taken him to a remote place near Chengalpet and there, he was assaulted and threatened and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the defacto complainant's son was kidnapped in order to pressurise the family members of Dilshith Begam to marry Varun, with whom she had lover affair. Further, the C.D. would go to show the involvement of Toyota Fortuner car in the kidnap. There are CCTV footage to show the forcible kidnapping of the defacto complainant's son through that car. In view of the evidence available by CCTV footage and nature of case, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 29th day of June, 2021.

Crl.M.P.Nos.10999 and 11000/2021

in

F-5, Choolaimedu P.S. Crime No.542/2021

Varun @ Vadivel

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.10999/2021 / Accused

Vinoth @ Magesh Kumar

.. Petitioner in
Crl.M.P.No.11000/2021 / Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.U.Yuvaraj, Y.Selvaraj, A.Vinoth Kumar and P.Praveen Kumar and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 341, 364, 365 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.542/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The counsel for the petitioners and CPP were heard through Video Conference.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.10999/2021 had love affair with one Dilshith Begam. The petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11000/2021 is his friend. The family of Dilshith Begam refused to marry her to the said Varun. In pursuance of that, there was a panchayat, in which the petitioners participated. Nothing more than that had happened. However, a false case has been registered against the petitioners and others. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant's son Thaslim Basha is the cousin of Dilshith Begam. The mother of Dilshith Begam refused to marry her to the petitioner Varun, since he refused to convert into Muslim. Thereafter,

marriage was arranged to Dilshith Begam with another person by Towfiq. Being aggrieved at, the petitioners herein and others kidnapped the defacto complainant's son Thaslim Basha in order to coerce their family to send Dilshith Begam to Varun. They have kidnapped the defacto complainant's son in a Fortuner Car from Anna Nagar and taken him to a remote place near Chengalpet and there, he was assaulted and threatened and seriously objects granting bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the defacto complainant's son was kidnapped in order to pressurise the family members of Dilshith Begam to marry Varun, with whom she had lover affair. Further, the C.D. would go to show the involvement of Toyota Fortuner car in the kidnap. There are CCTV footage to show the forcible kidnapping of the defacto complainant's son through that car. In view of the evidence available by CCTV footage and nature of case, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar
Principal Sessions Judge

ss