

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 20750/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 892/2021

Karthikeyan

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. A. Suresh, S. Dhilipan, D. Selvan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was formally arrested on 12.11.2021 under PT Warrant for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 892/2021 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 was originally arrested on 21.10.2021 by the respondent police in Crime No. 1192/2021 and he was granted bail on 15.11.2021 in that case. In the meanwhile, this petitioner was arrested in this crime number under PT Warrant. False case has been foisted on him with intention to detain the petitioner for ever in the prison. He is in custody from 12.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner and defacto complainant are friends. During the course of wordy quarrel, after heated argument, this petitioner attacked the complainant using knife and caused cut injury on his neck and also attacked using hands.

5. According to CPP, injured was discharged from the hospital after 8 days inpatient treatment and this petitioner is having one previous case.

6. Occurrence took place on 6.7.2021. This petitioner was originally arrested on 21.10.2021 in Crime No.1192/2021 and formally arrested in this case on 12.11.2021. It is reported that Injured was discharged from the hospital. 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. 20750/2021

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21126/2021

in

CCB, Team XII Crime No. 140/2021

D. Prithiviraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Bank Fraud Investigation,
CCB, Team XII,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Mr. R. Rathnakumar, 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 23.9.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 120-B, 409, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC in Crime No. 140/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is only a HR Manager of a company, namely IV Support Technologies Pvt. Ltd. He had not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint. He is in custody from 23.9.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner pretending himself as HR Manager of a company, petitioner and others framed a scheme called different candidates for interview and obtained their KYC particulars and by utilising the same, opened account with the HSBC Bank and also obtained Credit cards for the said accounts and looted the bank money by using the Credit Cards to the tune of Rs.1.5 Crores.

5. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No.358/2021 dated 28.11.2021. It is further submitted by the CPP that the actual amount looted by the petitioner and others in a similar way with another bank also to be unearthed.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order and the objection made by the CPP that similar way of criminal activities of the petitioner with another bank also to be unearthed, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this juncture.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21209/2021

in

P-5 MKB Nagar P.S. Crime No. 1160/2021

Mageshkumar

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. A. Elumalai, S. Shanmugam, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.10.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 1160/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 10.10.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused demanded money from the defacto complainant for consuming liquor. On his refusal, the accused attacked him using beer bottle repeatedly on his head and caused head injury and he was admitted to hospital for treatment.

5. According to CPP, 15 sutures were made on the head of the victim due to the attack made by this petitioner. However, he submits that now, injured has been discharged from the hospital and that this petitioner has no previous case.

6. It is reported by the CPP that victim was discharged from the hospital. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. He is in custody for the past 50 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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. 21209/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21404/2021

in

S.C.No.140/2014

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

Rajesh

.. 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. S. Vellidoss, 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 20.9.2021 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 302 r/w. 120B and 149 of IPC in S.C.No.140/2014 on the file of I Additional Sessions Court, Chennai, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody from 20.9.2021 for about two months and hence prays for bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the present case is pending from the year 2014. NBW was issued on 9.12.2019. The accused in this case are absconding themselves one after another and hence the case could not be proceeded further. Apart from that, this petitioner is having one more case in S.C.No.202/2018 and in that case also, he is absent from 4.4.2019 and thus objects granting bail.
5. On perusal of both case records, it appears the petitioner herein is A3 in S.C.No.140/2014 on the file of I Additional Sessions Court, Chennai. As against him

warrant is pending from 9.12.2019. Another case is pending before this Court in S.C.No.208/2018. He is A1 in the said case, wherein he is absconding from 4.4.2019. The explanation offered by the petitioner for his absence is not satisfactory. The accused are deliberately absconding from appearing before the Court. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 19.11.2021 and no change in circumstance is reported. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the 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**

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21405/2021

in

K-11 CMBT P.S. Crime No. 580/2021

Guna

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-11 CMBT Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 392 IPC in Crime No. 580/2021 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. He is aged 18 years. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 15.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.500/- from him at knife point.

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

6. The petitioner is in custody for the past 16 days. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Considering the age of the petitioner 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me 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. 21405/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21406/2021

in

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

Kuttiyan @ Mohan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Venkatesan, T. Umamaheswaran, D. Mancy Devadoss, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 452, 364A, 397, 506(ii) r/w 120(B) IPC in Crime No. 332/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He was implicated in this case only based on the confession statement of A1. He has no nexus with the other accused. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. Co-accused/A3 was granted bail and another accused was granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No. 22077/2021 dated 24.11.2021 and Crl.O.P.No. 20288/2021 on 2.11.2021. Further another accused A2 was granted bail by this court on 26.11.2021 in Crl.M.P.No. 20789/2021. Investigation is almost completed. This petitioner is in custody from 17.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

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

5. According to CPP, Originally, the case was registered as "Man Missing" and subsequently, on investigation, it was altered to 397 and 506(ii) IPC as well as 364(A) of

IPC. Now, the victim was secured and handed over to his son/defacto complainant and co-accused were granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court as well as by this court on 26.11.2021.

6. Co-accused were granted bail and anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court. 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 duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21406/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21410/2021

in

G-3 Kilpauk P.S. Crime No. 341/2021

Daniel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-3 Kilpauk Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 26.8.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 394 r/w sec. 393 and 398 IPC in Crime No. 341/2021 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. False case has been registered against the petitioner with an ulterior motive. He is aged 19 years. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 26.8.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with three other accused waylaid the defacto complainant while he returning from his work and demanded money and cell phone from him. On his refusal, the accused attacked the defacto complainant using knife and caused injury to him.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 2 previous cases.

6. Though the petitioner is having two previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in custody for more than three months. Investigation might have been

completed by this time. Considering the age of the petitioner and long duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in the open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21410/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21414 of 2021

in

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

Kannan

.. Petitioner/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 in the presence of M/s. V. Karthick, S. Raj, A.G. Abdul Kareem, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

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

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was a wordy quarrel over parking of vehicles. There was a wordy altercation between two groups. However an exaggerated complaint has been given. Co-accused were granted bail by this court on 26.11.2021. The petitioner is in custody from 7.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the accused was remanded only on 8.11.2021. Whatever it be, on perusal of the records, the dispute arose over parking of vehicles without giving way for other vehicles, which culminated into clash between two groups. AR copy available in the Case Diary would go to show simple injuries to one Jayakumar and one Jayavel. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21414 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 21415 of 2021

in

C.C.No.2889/2021

(on the file of XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)

in

E-4 Abiramapuram P.S. Crime No. 17/2021

Jamal @ Jamaludeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who were arrested on 11.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 @ 427, 457 and 380 IPC in Crime No.17/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Investigation is completed and charge sheet also filed in C.C.No.2889/2021. The petitioner is in custody from 11.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the accused was remanded on 16.7.2021. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 25 previous case. As far as this case is concerned, this petitioner break open the left side window of the defacto complainant's car when it was parked in her friend's house, and

stolen away cash bag which contains Rs.2,50,000/- and a wallet contains cash Rs.3000/-.

5. Investigation is completed and charge sheet has been filed in C.C.No.2889/2021. This petitioner is in custody for more than 4 months. Considering the long duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21415 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

CrI.M.P.No. 21416 of 2021

in

C.C.No.2891/2021

(on the file of XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai)

in

E-4 Abiramapuram P.S. Crime No. 710/2021

Jamal @ Jamaludeen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who were arrested on 11.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 379 @ 427, 457 and 380 IPC in Crime No. 710/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Investigation is completed and charge sheet also filed in C.C.No.2891/2021. The petitioner is in custody from 11.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the accused was remanded on 16.7.2021. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 25 previous case. As far as this case is concerned, this petitioner break open the left side window of the defacto complainant's car when it was parked and locked near Greenways Extension V2 and stolen away Mac laptop 2 nos, surface laptop 1, Hard disk-2, passports-2

nos, SD Drive 1, laptop charger 2, 1 mouse, DSE 2 nos and also personal documents of the defacto complainant.

5. Investigation is completed and charge sheet has been filed in C.C.No.2891/2021. This petitioner is in custody for more than 4 months. Considering the long duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 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 XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

CrI.M.P.No. 21416 of 2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No. 21417/2021

in

N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Crime No. 741/2021

Deepath

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.741/2021 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 was granted bail by this court on 23.11.2021. He is in custody from 3.11.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.700/- from him at knife point.
5. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 6 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.
6. It is reported by the CPP that co-accused was granted bail by this court. Though the petitioner is having some previous cases, as far as this case is concerned, he is in

custody for the past 28 days. 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 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 XVI 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 XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 21417/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

CrI.M.P.No.17233/2021

in

D.1, Triplicane P.S. Cr.No.not known of 2021

1. S. Saimohan Ram
 2. Kamatchi @ Sangeetha
 3. Parthiban @ Sarangadharan Raja
- .. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D.1, Triplicane Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. L. Christopher, D. Kumar, S. Vijaya Mahendran, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.406, 420 of IPC in Crime No.not known of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, respectively seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. According to learned CPP, the case has been registered in Cr.No.986/2021 u/s.406 and 420 IPC. Recording the same, this petition is dismissed with liberty to file a fresh petition with crime number.

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**

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

CrI.M.P.No.21052/2021

in

J.6, Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Cr.No.not known of 2021

M. Vimal

.. 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. T. Anbazhagan, P. Charles, 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 of IPC in Crime No. not known of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, respectively seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. According to learned CPP, the case has been registered in Cr.No.857/2021. Recording the same, this petition is dismissed with liberty to file a fresh petition with crime number and proper section.

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21328/2021

in

K.9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar P.S. Cr.No.1142/2021

Diwakar

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. S. Chinnaraja, G. Sivakumar, S.K. Masthan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 341, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Cr.No.1142/2021 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. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. Dispute due to previous enmity. According to learned CPP, this petitioner has one previous case. As far as this case is concerned, injured has been discharged from the hospital. 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 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. 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, K.9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.21328/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21329/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.19217/2021

in

P.2, Otteri P.S. Cr.No.1382/2021

Siva Shankar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State 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. Mohammed Aasif, 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.19217/2021, dt:1.11.2021.
2. Heard both sides.
3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.19217/2021 on 1.11.2021 with some conditions. One such condition is that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.
4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for 19 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21330/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.18191/2021

in

K.3, Aminjikai P.S. Cr.No.811/2021

Vignesh @ oorugai Bottel @ Vicky

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
K.3, Aminjikai Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18191/2021, dt:20.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.18191/2021 on 20.10.2021 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 for 32 days. Considering the period of compliance, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. Petition is allowed. Condition relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21331/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.13810/2021

in

Crime No. not known of 2021

Perumal

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Addl. Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Prevention of Crime against Women Branch,
O/o. The Commissioner of Police, Vepey,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Surya Vetrikondan, M. Kavikannan, 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.13810/2021, dt:27.10.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13810/2021 on 27.10.2021 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. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been complying the condition from 16.11.2021 to till date. He is aged 70 years and finds it difficult to comply the condition. Hence, prays for relaxation. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition till 28.11.2021. Considering the representation of the petitioner's counsel and 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**

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21332/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.20143/2021

in

CCB, Cr.No.164/2021

1. M.K. Suresh

2. Maheswari

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Team V Forgery Investigation Wing,
O/o. The Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai.

.. Respondent/Complainant.

The petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Mohanakrishnan, A Thirumaran, E. Ashok Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. Petitioners seeks modification of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.20143/2021, dt:16.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.20143/2021, dated 16.11.2021 for the offence u/s.420, 465, 467, 468 r/w. 34 of IPC with direction to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition only for 6 days.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners expressed some difficulty in appearing before the respondent police. It is alleged that the petitioners were made to wait till the evening. Considering the said representation, this court is inclined to modify the condition directing

the petitioners to appear before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB and CBCID Cases daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders instead of respondent police.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. Learned Metropolitan Magistrate,
CCB and CBCID Cases, Chennai.
2. The Inspector of Police, CCB Team V,
Forgery Investigation Wing, Vepery, Chennai.

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

CrI.M.P.No.21059/2021

in

CrI.M.P.No.11409/2021

(on the file of XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai)

in

R.6, Cr.No.485/2021

Santhoshkumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by
The Inspector of Police,
R.6, Kumaran Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Ramkumar, K.C. Jai Prakash, Counsel for the petitioner and the CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks modification of the condition imposed by the XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate in CrI.M.P.No.11409/2021, dt:8.11.2021.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by the learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate in CrI.M.P.No.11409/2021 on 8.11.2021 for the offence u/s. 392 IPC with condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.5,000/- along with two sureties each for a likesum and also to deposit a sum of Rs.15,000/- to the credit of the above crime number and also to appear before the respondent police daily twice at 10.00 a.m and 6.00 p.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is in custody from 25.10.2021 for more than a month. He is ailing from poor family and therefore, he is unable to arrange funds to comply the condition of deposit of Rs.15,000/- and hence prays to modify the condition of deposit amount and seeks direction only to appear before the respondent police twice a day.

5. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with another accused committed theft of gold chain weighing 3 sovereigns from the defacto complainant. Considering the nature of offence, the learned Magistrate has imposed the condition to deposit Rs.15,000/-. Any how, considering the representation of the petitioner's counsel, this court is inclined to modify the said condition to deposit Rs.5,000/- to the credit of the above crime number, instead of Rs.15,000/-. Accordingly petition is allowed.

Delivered by me in 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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.21362/2021

in

Crl.R.C.No.122/2021

against

M.P.No.12/2021

in

Na.Ka.No.188/Exe.Mag./DCP Mylapore District/2021

in

D-3, Ice House P.S. SL.No.43/2021 U/s 110 of Cr.P.C.

Harish

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent /
Accused

Vs.

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Deputy Commissioner
of Police, Mylapore District, Chennai.

2. The State represented by
Inspector of Police,
D-3, Ice House Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/
Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.M.Rajavelu and S.Sarala, Counsel for the petitioner and upon hearing the petitioner's side and upon perusing the records, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the revision petition.

2. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.12/2021 in Na.Ka.No.188/Exe.Mag./DCP Mylapore District/2021 in D-3, Ice House P.S. SL.No.43/2021 on the file of the 1st respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 151 days for violation of bond executed u/s 110 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 29.10.2021.

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

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the accused will not abscond and would be available to undergo the sentence, if the appellate Court confirms the order passed by the Executive Magistrate. As already stated supra, the Petitioner / Accused was ordered to undergo imprisonment for a period of 151 days and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioner has to serve the sentence during the pendency of the revision.

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

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

9. The Revision is posted on 23.12.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mylapore District, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.21363/2021

in

C.A.No.187/2021

in

C.C.No.3229/2013

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

Selvam

....Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

State,

Represented by

The Sub-Inspector of Police,

K-11, CMBT Police Station,

Chennai.

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.B.Rajkumar Ashok Singh, B.Mahanderan, D.Gopinath, Counsel for the petitioner and upon hearing the petitioner's side, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.

2. The Petitioner / Appellant herein is the accused in C.C.No.3229/2013 on the file of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai. On 20.11.2021 judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner was convicted u/s 324 of IPC and sentenced to undergo three years S.I. each.

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

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

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

7. The appeal has been made over to V Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.

8. The appeal is posted to 23.12.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021.

Crl.M.P.No.21418/2021

in

C.A.No.188/2021

in

C.C.No.444/2013

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

1. Audio Media Education Pvt. Ltd.,
Represented by its Director,
T.Selvakumar,
46, Beemanna Second Street,
Dr.Ranga Road, Alwarpet, Chennai-600018
Also at
No.167, Eldams Road,
Flat No.101, "Eldams Square",
Alwarpet, Chennai-600018.
2. T.Selvakumar,
Director,
M/s.Audio Media Education Pvt. Ltd.,
46, Beemanna Second Street,
Dr.Ranga Road, Alwarpet, Chennai-600018
Also at
No.167, Eldams Road,
Flat No.101, "Eldams Square",
Alwarpet, Chennai-600018.
3. Navaneetha Selvakumar,
Director,
M/s.Audio Media Education Pvt. Ltd.,
46, Beemanna Second Street,
Dr.Ranga Road, Alwarpet, Chennai-600018
Also at
No.167, Eldams Road,
Flat No.101, "Eldams Square",
Alwarpet, Chennai-600018.

...Petitioners/Appellants/Accused

Vs.

M/s.Redington (India) Pvt. Ltd.,
Represented by its Senior Legal Executive,
M.Sundarrajan,
SPL Guindy House, No.95, Mount Road, Guindy,
Chennai-600032.

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, in the presence of M/s.Venkatesh Mahadevan, Dhakshayini Venkatesh, M.Sunil Zahariah and Velvizhi.V., Counsel for the petitioner, upon hearing the petitioner's side, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.

2. The Petitioners / Appellants herein are the accused in C.C.No.444/2013 on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai. On 22.11.2021, judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioners were found guilty u/s.138 of N.I. Act and sentenced to undergo six months simple imprisonment and to pay the amount covered under the cheque as compensation to the complainant.

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

5. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal and the submission made by the petitioners' counsel.

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

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

8. Accordingly, the sentence of imprisonment imposed on the 2nd and 3rd petitioners by the lower Court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the 2nd and 3rd petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-V, Saidapet, Chennai. Further the petitioners shall deposit 20% of the cheque amount to the credit of C.C. number on the file of the Trial Court within sixty days from the date of this Order.

9. The appeal has been made over to V Additional Sessions Court, Chennai.
10. The appeal stands posted to 23.12.2021.

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

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

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November 2021

Crl.M.P.No.18626/2021

And

Crl.M.P.No.18734/2021

(intervene petition)

in

F.3, Nungambakkam P.S. Cr.No.656/2021

1. Kasthuri
2. B. Sasi Kumar
3. B. Vijaya Kumar

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F.3, Nungambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Pandian, A. Radha, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and of M/s. S. Ilavarasan, Counsel for the intervener and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.406, 420, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.656/2021 on the file of the respondent police, respectively seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners received Rs.17 lakh and agreed to sell their property for Rs.85 lakh. The amount received as advance is only Rs.17 lakh. When the 1st petitioner was suffering from Covid 19, they approached the defacto complainant to complete the sale. The defacto complainant has not paid further payment and insisted for repayment advance amount. Since then there exists dispute between them. The dispute is civil in nature. Even for repayment of the

advance amount some cheque leaves were obtained by the defacto complainant. In fact, they are threatening the petitioners as if they will proceed against the petitioners on the basis of the cheques and thus prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. The intervener also submits that though there was a sale agreement and receipt of advance amount of Rs.17 lakh, the petitioners have not executed the Sale Deed as well as failed to return the advance amount inspite of referring the matter to Mediation and thus objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the records, it appears there was an agreement for sale and payment of advance amount. Transaction is prima facie civil in nature. It is open to the parties to approach the proper Civil Court either to ask for return of money or for specific performance. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today, in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The learned XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The CPP
3. The Inspector of Police, F.3, Nungambakkam P.S. Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.18626/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21208/2021

in

K-2, Aynavaram P.S. Crime No.668/2021

B.Panner Selvam

.. 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 in the presence of M/s.L.Thiyagaiya, G.V.Bharathy and P.Jayachandran, 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 22.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 323, 397, 294(b) and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.668/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Over a wordy quarrel, the defacto complainant gave an exaggerated complaint with false allegation and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 397 IPC. The duration of custody is very short and seriously objects granting bail.

4. Considering the short duration of custody and nature of offence, 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.**

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21211/2021

in

K-4, Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No.702/2021

1. Bharath
2. Vijay Varma

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-4, Anna Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.C.Emalias, V.Thillai Kumar, R.Pavithra, K.Kumari and M.Deepa, 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 16.11.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.702/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are in custody for about two weeks. They have been falsely implicated in this case and prays for bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the 1st petitioner is an ex-employee of ICICI Bank and he used to identify the inactive accounts and if there is any balance in the inactive account, with the aid of his relative Vijay Varma, managed to withdraw funds from the accounts and while doing so, they have been caught red handed and seriously objects granting bail.

4. On perusal of the C.D. and other connected records, it appears the petitioners identified the account of one Balasubramanian and gave a requisition on the forged letterhead demanding for cheque-book and after getting the cheque-book, they have withdrawn Rs.2 lakhs from the said account. In view of the SMS received by the customer,

he had complained to the Bank and the petitioners' involvement in the crime came to light. They were in custody for a short duration. There are chances for similar withdrawal of money from other accounts and it has to be traced only during the course of investigation. Since the investigation is at the budding stage, 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.**

Tuesday, the 30th day of November, 2021

Crl.M.P.No.21132/2021

and

Crl.M.P.No.21491/2021

(Intervene Petition)

in

CCB Cr.No.192/2021

Dr.R.Manivannan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.S.Arivazhagan, M.Venkatesh and N.Sivakumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and of M/s.G.Vijayakumar, V.Sundarraman, Lakshmi Vijayakumar and B.Sindhiya, Counsel for the intervener and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 420 of IPC in Cr.No.192/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a Doctor, who had obtained loan from the State Bank of India. He was running a hospital. Due to Corona, he is unable to repay the instalments. The loan becomes N.P.A. The S.B.I. brought the property for auction. At this juncture, there was a talk for one-time settlement. The present defacto complainant entered into a sale agreement with the petitioner to purchase the property mortgaged with S.B.I. and clear-off the dues to the Bank. However, though he had made part payment of Rs.2 crores, the balance had not been paid. The dispute is purely civil in nature. The complaint has been given as if the property was

mortgaged with the Bank was attached by the Kotak Mahindra Bank by the Court. In order to make a civil dispute to criminal colour, the present complaint has been given as if the petitioner had cheated the defacto complainant by not disclosing the attachment by Kotak Mahindra Bank. In fact, he had not mortgaged any property with the Kotak Mahindra Bank. On the other hand, he had obtained personal loan from Kotak Mahindra Bank. Now, it appears for the said loan, they have managed to get attachment order through court in respect of the property mortgaged with S.B.I. The alleged attachment is not within the knowledge of the petitioner. The petitioner is a Doctor by profession. He is prepared to cooperate for investigation. In fact, he had appeared before the police and gave statement also. There is no criminal offence by the petitioner and prays for anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submits that without disclosing the pre-existing encumbrance, the petitioner agreed to sell the property. Subsequently, it came to light that the property already encumbered with some other institutions. Deliberately, the petitioner burked the encumbrance over the property, which resulted in cheating and thus, he seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

4. On perusal of the C.D., it appears that there were sale agreements in favour of the defacto complainant in respect of two properties, one is at Arumbakkam and another one is at E.C.R. A one-time settlement was arranged between the Bank and the petitioner to get the loan cleared and the petitioner executed the sale agreements in favour of the defacto complainant. Though there was some payment to the Bank and to the petitioner, subsequently, the deal had not been completed because of some attachment by the Kotak Mahindran Bank. There are chances for ignorance of attachment order by the petitioner. Further, more or less the dispute is civil in nature. It is the bounden duty of the defacto complainant to verify the encumbrance before entering into the agreement. In fact, even at the time of entering into the agreement, there is a charge with S.B.I. and default in payment by the petitioner. Under such circumstances, knowing fully well about the financial condition of the petitioner, sale agreements were entered into, for which, the remedy is primarily civil in nature. Citing some other attachment by some other institutions, we cannot conclusive held it is a fraud committed by the petitioner. Further, it appears chances for absconding is less. Hence, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

SS

Crl.M.P.No.21132/2021