

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20345/2021

in

P-2 Otteri P.S. Crime No. 1442/2021

J. Youan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-2 Otteri Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Azhagiri, G. Vasanth, A. Nazar, L. Ashraf, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 506(ii) and 397 IPC in Crime No.1442/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19563/2021. He is in custody from 22.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with three other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.1300/- from him at knife point.

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

6. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above

facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 20345/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20367/2021

in

P.R.C. 37/2021

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

in

H-6 R.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No. 3616/2020

Mani @ Manikandan

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was formally arrested on 2.11.2021 under P.T. Warrant for execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 506(ii) r/w 34 IPC in Crime No. 3616/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was arrested on 2.11.2021 under PT Warrant based on the NBW pending against the petitioner issued by the trial court on 20.9.2021. Since he was in custody in some other case, he could not appear before the committal court. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. He was absent for only one hearing. Hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court. He is in custody from 2.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 20.9.2021 and it was executed on 2.11.2021. Now, the case is pending for committal. Further, this

petitioner is a habitual offender and having 10 previous cases. If the petitioner is released on bail, again, he will abscond and objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than three weeks. NBW was issued on 20.9.2021 and it was executed on 2.11.2021. According to counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner was absent for only one hearing and he was formally arrested in this case under PT Warrant. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond during trial.

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 20367/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20795/2021

in

E-4 Mylapore P.S. Crime No. 1078/2021

Manoj @ Kumki

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 397, 506(ii) IPC and sec. 25(1-A) of Arms Act in Crime No. 1078/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 20.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with three other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him at knife point. On his refusal, the accused forcibly robbed Rs.500/- from him.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having one previous case.

6. Occurrence took place on 20.10.2021. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. According to CPP, this petitioner is having one previous case. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open court

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 20795/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21042/2021

in

P-2 Otteri P.S. Crime No. 1509/2021

1. Vijay @ Pulipandi

2. Yuvaraj

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P-2 Otteri Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Dinesh Kumar, C. Jagan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 10.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1509/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. They have been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 10.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, the accused assaulted him and robbed Rs.900/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, the 1st petitioner is having 6 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having one previous case and objects the grant of bail.

6. Though the petitioners are having previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, they are in custody for the past 20 days. Considering the 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 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 in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21042/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21043/2021

in

P-2 Otteri P.S. Crime No. 1382/2021

Vijay @ Pulipandi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-2 Otteri Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 392, 506(ii) r/w 397 IPC in Crime No. 1382/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 10.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, the accused assaulted him and robbed Rs.8000/- from him at knife point.

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

6. Though the petitioner is having previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for the past 20 days. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21043/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21122/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 1033/2021

1. Thamizh @ Thambi
2. Praveen Kumar @ Praveen
3. Vasudevan
4. Shankar

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Shankar, Mohammed Aasif, V. Venkatesan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 24.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 120(B), 302, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1033/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that since the 4th petitioner was already granted bail, he is withdrawing this bail application as against 4th petitioner. As far as other petitioners are concerned, he submits that the petitioners 1 to 3 are innocent. They have been falsely implicated in this case. They are not at all present at the scene of occurrence. Investigation is completed. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. The petitioners 1 to 3 are in custody from 24.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, on 23.8.2021, these petitioners along with other accused came in a two wheeler and assaulted the deceased indiscriminately using deadly weapons. After that the victim was admitted to hospital and later he died due to injuries.

5. According to CPP, these petitioners along with other accused brutally murdered the deceased due to previous enmity. These petitioners have no previous case.

Investigation is completed and Charge Sheet has been filed in this case in PRC No. 3/2021.

6. The petitioners 1 to 3 are in custody for the past 3 months. According to CPP, charge sheet has been filed in this case. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners 1 to 3 subject to condition.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners 1 to 3 are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioners 1 to 3 shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

8. As far as the 4th petitioner Shankar is concerned, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21122/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21305/2021

in

K-7 ICF P.S. Crime No. 183/2021

1. P. Manickam
2. R. Prasanth @ Kullakaruppan
3. K. Azhagarsamy @ Aan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-7 ICF Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Jai Sankar, D. Manoj Kumar, D. Karthick, R. Ram Kumar, S. Pavithra, S. Jayapriya, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 26.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 183/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have not committed any offence as alleged. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 26.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, the accused forcibly taken away Rs.4300/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, each petitioner is having 2 previous cases and therefore, he objects the grant of bail.

6. Though the petitioners are having previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, they are in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 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 in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21305/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

CrI.M.P.Nos. 21306, 21307, 21308 and 21309/2021

in

K-10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.1103, 1110, 1111 and 1114 /2021

Kamalesh

.. Petitioner in all the petitions /
accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.
in all the petitions.

These petitions coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.V.Sathish, S.Vijayaraghavan, P. Yuvaraj, H. Mahadir Mohammed, M. Rajakumaran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

COMMON ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 457 and 380 of IPC in Crime No.1103/2021 in CrI.M.P.No.21306/2021 and sec. 379 IPC in Crime No. 1110/2021, and u/s.379 IPC in Crime No. 1111/2021, and sec. 341, 294(b), 392, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.1114/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is aged about 20. He is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the cases. All the four cases were registered on the same day deliberately by the police for statistical purpose and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that valuable properties were recovered from the petitioner and others. The cases were registered for theft, robbery and seriously objects granting bail.

4. On perusal of the records, it appears in Cr.No.1114/2021, the properties stolen is cellphone and cash of Rs.1,200/-. In Cr.No.1111/2021, the property stolen was a two-

wheeler. In Cr.No.1103/2021, it is a case of 457 and 380 IPC and the property stolen is 19 ½ sovereign gold jewels. In Cr.No.1110/2021, the property stolen was a two-wheeler. The properties were recovered from the petitioner and others. Nearly 150 grams of gold jewels were recovered. That cannot be a foisted one. Earlier bail applications were dismissed on 19.11.2021. No change in circumstances was reported. Considering the number of cases pending against the petitioner and nature of offence, this court is not inclined to grant bail at present.

5. Hence, all the petitions are dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21310/2021

in

J-6 Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No. 852/2021

P. Abhishek

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-6 Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 19.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 395 IPC in Crime No. 852/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has not committed any offence as alleged. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 19.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with four other accused waylaid the defacto complainant's son and robbed Rs.500/- from him at knife point.

5. According to CPP, the arrest of the petitioner is very recent one and his antecedents are yet to be ascertained. If he is released on bail, he will again indulge in similar nature of crime and objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the nature of offence, objection raised by the CPP and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20868/2021

in

CCB-1 Chit and Kanduvatti Prevention Team VII Crime No. 182/2021

Saravanan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB-1 Chit and Kanduvatti Prevention Team VII,
Vepery,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 406, 420, 506(i) r/w 34 IPC and sec. 76(1) of Chit Funds Act 1982 in Crime No.182/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. His wife and daughter alone conducted unauthorised chit. He is ready to deposit Rs.5 lakhs. The petitioner was arrested on 9.10.2021 and he is in custody for the past one month and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that apart from the defacto complainant, more than 50 persons were cheated by the accused by conducting chit and Diwali fund . According to CPP, the defacto complainant totally paid Rs.8,20,000/- for five chits. After receiving the entire amount, the accused failed to return the money. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The alleged cheated amount comes to Rs.75 lakhs. According to prosecution, this petitioner also joined with his wife and daughter and conducted the unauthorised chit and failed to return the amount to the victims. As far as the defacto complainant is concerned, she has paid Rs.8,20,000/- to the petitioner and his associates towards chit amount. The counsel for the petitioner also submits that he is ready to deposit Rs.5 lakhs. The petitioner is in custody for the past 50 days. Considering all the above facts, involvement of amount in this case and the duration of custody and the submission made by the counsel for the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition to deposit Rs.5 lakhs before the Metropolitan Magistrate, for CCB and CB CID Cases.

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 Metropolitan Magistrate, for CCB and CB CID Cases, Egmore, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) The petitioner shall also deposit a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only) to the credit of the crime no. 182/2021 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 petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

(e) the petitioner 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 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]**.

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate, for CCB and CB CID Cases, Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 20868/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20811/2021

in

K.10,Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.84/2021

R. Yogesh

.. 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. S. Rajesh, M. Dinesh, G. Jeevitha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 379 IPC in Cr.No.84/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Originally, the petitioner arrested on 14.9.2021 in Cr.No.223/2021 on the file of the respondent police, wherein he was granted bail by this Court on 10.11.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.20009/2021. At that time, the respondent herein has not chosen to arrest him in this case. After release, when the petitioner was appearing before the respondent police for complying the condition, he came to know the pendency of three cases against him. He has been falsely implicated in the pending cases. Petitioner is a student studying Diploma in Automobile. He apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's two wheeler which was parked in front of the Corporation Office Ward No.143, Chennai – 95. He further submits that the petitioner is also involved in 3 other cases of similar nature and today the petitioner has moved anticipatory bail petitions in three cases and prays for dismissing all the petitions.

5. The present case has been registered in Cr.No.84/2021 in the month of February 2021. In subsequent Cr.No.223/2021, the petitioner has been arrested on 14.9.2021 and remanded to custody and subsequently, he has been granted bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.20009/2021. Therefore, though the cases are pending from the month of February and March 2021, it is alleged that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in these cases. There is no valid reason for not remanding the petitioner in these 3 cases while remanding in Cr.No.223/2021. Petitioner is a student, aged 20 years. Considering all these circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 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 Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20811/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20813/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.119/2021

R. Yogesh

.. 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. S. Rajesh, M. Dinesh, G. Jeevitha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 379 IPC in Cr.No.119/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Originally, the petitioner arrested on 14.9.2021 in Cr.No.223/2021 on the file of the respondent police, wherein he was granted bail by this Court on 10.11.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.20009/2021. At that time, the respondent herein has not chosen to arrest him in this case. After release, when the petitioner was appearing before the respondent police for complying the condition, he came to know the pendency of three cases against him. He has been falsely implicated in the pending cases. Petitioner is a student studying Diploma in Automobile. He apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's two wheeler which was parked in front of his house. He further submits that the petitioner is also involved in 3 other cases of similar nature and today the petitioner has moved anticipatory bail petitions in three cases and prays for dismissing all the petitions.

5. The present case has been registered in Cr.No.119/2021 in the month of March 2021. In subsequent Cr.No.223/2021, the petitioner has been arrested on 14.9.2021 and remanded to custody and subsequently, he has been granted bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.20009/2021. Therefore, though the cases are pending from the month of February and March 2021, it is alleged that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in these cases. There is no valid reason for not remanding the petitioner in these 3 cases, while remanding in Cr.No.223/2021. Petitioner is a student, aged 20 years. Considering all these circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 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 Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20813/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20814/2021

in

K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Cr.No.79/2021

R. Yogesh

.. 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. S. Rajesh, M. Dinesh, G. Jeevitha, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 379 IPC in Cr.No.79/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Originally, the petitioner arrested on 14.9.2021 in Cr.No.223/2021 on the file of the respondent police, wherein he was granted bail by this Court on 10.11.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.20009/2021. At that time, the respondent herein has not chosen to arrest him in this case. After release, when the petitioner was appearing before the respondent police for complying the condition, he came to know the pendency of three cases against him. He has been falsely implicated in the pending cases. Petitioner is a student studying Diploma in Automobile. He apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of defacto complainant's two wheeler which was parked in the two wheeler's parking at Koyambedu. He further submits that the petitioner is also involved in 3 other cases of similar nature and today, the petitioner has moved anticipatory bail petitions in three cases and prays for dismissing all the petitions.

5. The present case has been registered in Cr.No.79/2021 in the month of February 2021. In subsequent Cr.No.223/2021, the petitioner has been arrested on 14.9.2021 and remanded to custody and subsequently, he has been granted bail by this Court in CrI.M.P.No.20009/2021. Therefore, though the cases are pending from the month of February and March 2021, it is alleged that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in these cases. There is no valid reason for not remanding the petitioner in these 3 cases, while remanding in Cr.No.223/2021. Petitioner is a student, aged 20 years. Considering all these circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 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 Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.20814/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Crl.M.P.No.21053/2021

in

G.1, Vepery P.S. Cr.No.877/2021

Albert @ Mohanraj

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police(L&O),
G.1, Vepery Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, P. 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 apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 323, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.877/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Only wordy quarrel between the parties. No serious injury. Injured treated as out-patient. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Quarrel between the parties. Injured treated as out-patient according to learned CPP. No deadly weapon is used. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police(L&O), G.1, Vepery P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21053/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21252/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.18426/2021

in

C.2, Elephant Gate P.S. Cr.No.1260/2021

Sagarmal

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
C.2, Elephant Gate Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Prem Anandhan, P. Srinivasan, 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.18426/2021, dt:21.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18426/2021 on 21.10.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 25.10.2021 to 25.11.2021. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21254/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.17929/2021

in

S.C.No.112/2015

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

Amanullah

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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 in the presence of M/s. P. Jagadeeswaran, Abdul Saleem, 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.17929/2021, dt:22.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.17929/2021 on 22.10.2021 for the offence u/s.302 IPC with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the II Additional Session Court, Chennai daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition from 8.11.2021 to till date. The petitioner was summoned by the II Additional Sessions Court,

Chennai u/s.319 Cr.P.C., and on the basis of the evidence of PW1, he has been implicated in this case. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21253/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.19630/2021

in

AWPS, Thirumangalam PS, Cr.No.25/2021

R. Kalarani

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

AWPS, Thirumangalam,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Mr. V. Saravanan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. Petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.19630/2021 on 8.11.2021 for the offences u/s.498(A), 294(b), 506(ii) of IPC on execution of a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a like sum and also to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

2. Now the present petition has been filed for extension of time.

3. Heard both sides.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a senior citizen, aged 62 years. Due to heavy rain, the petitioner was unable to surrender before the Magistrate concerned within the stipulated time. Hence, prays for extension of time.

5. The petitioner was already granted anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the representation made by the petitioner's counsel, this court is inclined to extend the time for further period of 1 week from today. Accordingly, petition is allowed.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copies to:

1. Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Addl. Mahila Court, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station,
Thirumangalam, Chennai.

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21304/2021

in

CCB, Crime No.69/2021

Lokesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Central Crime Branch, Vepery,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 354-D, 419, 420 of IPC and Sec.66C, 66D of I.T. Act in Crime No.69/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 1.11.2021. The petitioner and the defacto complainant are working in the same You Tube Channel and they are friends. The petitioner used to borrow money from the defacto complainant and returned back the same. He never cheated her. An exaggerated complaint has been given. He was granted bail in another Cr.No.49/2021 by this Court. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioner developed relationship with the defacto complainant through social media introducing himself as Nishanth and obtained cash of Rs.2,89,500/- on various occasions for the medical expenses of his father

and cheated her. He further submits that the petitioner is having previous cases of similar nature. He is detained under Act 14/1982 vide order dated:28.11.2021 in Detention Order No.356/BCDFGISSSV/2021 and thus seriously objects grantin bail.

5. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order and the objection made by CPP, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at present

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge.

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20633/2021

in

C-3 Seven Wells P.S. Crime No. 1174/2021

1. Radha @ Radhakrishnan
2. Gopal @ Hemachander
3. Mohamed Farith
4. Sabari @ Shanmugam
5. Vijayan @ Pura Vijayan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C-3 Seven Wells Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Muthamizh Selvakumar, S. Esakimuthu, A. Muralidharan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 27.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 394, 397 IPC in Crime No. 1174/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he is not pressing this application as against the 1st petitioner since he was already granted bail by this court on 24.11.2021 in Crl.M.P.No.20501/2021.

4. As far as other petitioners are concerned, the counsel submits that these petitioners are innocent. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners have no bad antecedents. Co-accused was already granted bail by this court on 24.11.2021. The petitioners are in custody from 27.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

5. The case of the prosecution is that these petitioners along with other accused snatched the defacto complainant's hand bag from him which contains cash Rs.80,000/- at knife point and escaped from the spot in a two wheeler.

6. According to CPP, the petitioners have no bad antecedents and that the property involved in this case has been recovered.

7. It is reported by the CPP that the property involved in this case has been recovered. No previous case is reported as against the petitioners. 1st petitioner was already granted bail by this court on 24.11.2021. The petitioners are in custody for the past one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners 2 to 5 alone subject to condition.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners 2 to 5 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 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 petitioners 2 to 5 shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioners 2 to 5 shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioners 2 to 5 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 2 to 5 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 2 to 5 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 2 to 5 thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

9. As far as the 1st petitioner is concerned, this petition is dismissed as not pressed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 20633/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20793/2021

in

CCB Crime No. 119/2008

Padinjaraveetil Ravindran @ K. Ravindran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 6.11.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 465, 468, 471 and 420 r/w 120(B) IPC in Crime No. 119/2008 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is aged 73 years. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Prime accused is one Rafeeq Erikkil Thavath. As per the prosecution case, he had obtained loan fraudulently from the bank. The case is of the year 2008. Investigation is almost over. This petitioner is suffering from various disease. He is in custody from 6.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP filed a written objection stating that with great difficulty, this petitioner has been secured by the police after 13 years. The documents filed by the petitioner and prime accused were all found to be forged one. In fact, the sale consideration was paid to the petitioner by the bank directly by Pay Order. So, he cannot claim ignorance and prays for dismissal of the bail application.

5. On perusal of the Case Diary, it appears that this petitioner by suppressing the already mortgaged property to various financial institutions such as George Town Cooperative bank, HDFC bank, Repco bank and also to an individual, again sold the

property to the prime accused Rafeeq Errikkal Thavath by producing forged documents. The said Rafeeq Errikil Thavath colluded with the seller/the petitioner herein obtained loan by producing forged documents before the complainant bank and the loan amount for a sum of Rs.32,75,000/- was sanctioned in favour of Rafeeq for purchasing the property from the present petitioner. The said Rafeeq failed to repay the EMI from the beginning itself. In fact, out of the loan amount, Rs.28 lakhs was paid to this petitioner by way of pay order. The encumbrance certificate do not reflect the mortgage of the property with George Town Cooperative bank and other sales of the property to the individuals. The documents filed before the bank viz., Sale deed from housing board, Power Deed executed by the allottee of the housing board, Sale deed in favour of the present petitioner and his wife and the Sale deed in favour of the prime accused all are forged documents. So, those documents were produced fraudulently in order to get loan from the bank by the A1 Rafeeq colluded with this petitioner. All the documents including the Sale Deed executed by the petitioner in favour of Rafeeq are all bogus documents. Pay order was given in favour of the present petitioner all would go to show the involvement of the vendor as well as purchaser in cheating the bank. Though the case was registered in the year 2008, the prosecution is unable to secure the petitioner for the past 13 years. The arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner that this petitioner has no knowledge about the fraud is not convincing. The prime accused colluded with this petitioner and A3 with criminal intention and availed housing loan of Rs.32.75 lakhs by submitting fabricated title deeds and encumbrance certificate. Considering the gravity of offence, amount involved in this case, short duration of custody, time taken for the prosecution to secure the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21041/2021

in

H-4, Korukkupet P.S. Crime No.1634/2021

1. Logeswari
2. Inthira

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-4, Korukkupet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.M.Mohamed Riyas, M.Manimaran and A.Samson, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 21.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 315, 498A of IPC in Crime No.1634/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was a wordy quarrel in the death ceremony of the defacto complainant's father-in-law. The defacto complainant's husband married the defacto complainant and it is an inter-caste marriage. There was some misunderstanding between the two families. That being so, the father-in-law of the defacto complainant died due to illness. When the defacto complainant attended the 16th day ceremony, there was a wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners are women. They are in custody from 21.11.2021 and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of causing miscarriage. The case has been registered u/s 315 of IPC. Due to the assault made on the defacto complainant, the womb sustained injuries and died, which resulted in miscarriage. So, the cause for the miscarriage is the assault made by the petitioners and seriously objects granting bail.

4. On perusal of the records, it appears that the defacto complainant's father died on 19.10.2021. The 16th day ceremony was scheduled to be held on 5.11.2021. On 5.11.2021, when the defacto complainant and her husband came to the residence of her father-in-law, there was an assault by the petitioners on the defacto complainant. The A.R. copy available in the C.D. would go to show admission of the defacto complainant into the hospital with abdominal pain due to the assault by four known family members. On the same day, which resulted in miscarriage of child. The medical certificate is also available in the C.D., which was given by the Doctor as if at the time of admission on 5.11.2021 at 8.15 p.m., the foetus's heart sound is absent, which culminated into medical termination of pregnancy. The accused are in short duration of custody. Considering the gravity of offence and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20863/2021

and

Crl.M.P.No.21145/2021

(Intervene Petition)

in

K-11, C.M.B.T. P.S. Crime No.527/2021

A.Sivaraman

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-11, C.M.B.T. Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.D.Vivekanandan, P.M.Syed Abuthahir, E.Suganthan and U.Devasenathipathi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and of M/s.RRN Legal, R.Alvin Manoj Raj, R.Aneesan, N.Alagu Narayanan, MGS Rajarajan and M.Prakash Kumar, Counsel for the intervener and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 20.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 420 of IPC altered to 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.527/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He handed over the money received by him to the prime accused. He is in custody from 20.10.201, more than 40 days and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP and the counsel appearing for the intervener submits that number of persons were cheated under the guise of providing employment in Railways. In fact, the amount was deposited into the petitioner's relative's account. There are ample evidence to connect the accused to the crime and seriously objects granting bail.

4. On perusal of the C.D., it appears the amounts were deposited into the account of one Saravana Traders. Prosecution claims that the said Saravanan is a close relative of the

petitioner. The amount deposited into the account for getting employment, not for any other business deal. Apart from the defacto complainant, some more persons were also cheated in the same manner. Considering all those circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Monday, the 29th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.20946/2021

in

W-24, A.W. P.S. Crime No.7/2021

Dr.S.Vetriselvan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-24, All Women Police Station, Teynampet,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.C.Arun Kumar, R.Nishanthi, S.Gopinath and K.Pon Arvind, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 376 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.7/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a Doctor by profession. The defacto complainant is also a Doctor. There was a complaint of sexual assault by his colleague falsely for the reasons best known to her. There is no chance for absconding. There is a Vishaka Committee enquiry. Without any finding, the present complaint has been given by the defacto complainant u/s 376 and 506(i) of IPC. Even there is any sexual relationship, that should have been with consent. There was an inordinate delay in the complaint. The alleged occurrence was on 5.8.2021. Nearly after three months, this complaint has been given. Thus, he prays for bail.

3. On perusal of the C.D., it appears there was a complaint before the higher officials. After enquiry, the present complaint has been given by the defacto complainant. As per the Committee Report, a request was made to the police and judiciary to take appropriate action. So, it appears there was an adverse finding against the petitioner. The case is registered u/s 376 IPC. The petitioner was arrested on 18.11.2021 and he is in

custody only for 10 days. It appears he is a married man, involved in these sort of offence knowing fully well about the consequences. Considering the short duration of custody and sensational nature of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail.

4. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge.