

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11347/2021**

**&**

**Cr.M.P.No.11384/2021**

**(intervene petition)**

**AND**

**Crl.M.P.No.11346 of 2021**

**&**

**Crl.M.P.No.11385/2021**

**(intervene petition)**

**in**

**CCB, Cr.No.126/2021**

P.K. Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.11347/2021

Maria Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.No.11346/2021

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch, Team V,  
Forgery Wing, Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

For Petitioners : Learned Senior Counsel Mr. N.R. Elango  
for M/s. Ganesh Rajan, J. Asokan, N. Gandhi,  
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11347/2021 And  
for M/s. V. Vignesh, S. Aswinraj,  
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11346/2021

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor in both the petitions.

For Intervener : Learned Senior Counsel A.R.L. Sundaresan  
for M/s. M. Mohammed Rafi, J.H. Batcha, R. Joe Anand,  
S. Aishwarya, Advocates in both the intervene petitions.  
(Crl.M.P.No.11384 and 11385 of 2021)

Both the petitions came on 9.7.2021 before me for hearing, upon hearing above said Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 19.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 409, 420, 465, 468 r/w.34 and 109 IPC in Cr.No.126/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, learned CPP and learned Senior Counsel for the intervener were heard through Video Conference.

3. Earlier petition was dismissed by this Court vide detailed order dated 1.7.2021 in CrI.M.P.Nos.11033 and 11034 of 2021. Now, once again they moved for bail with the present applications.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that earlier petitions were dismissed by holding that there was a earlier Memorandum of Understanding with one Ashok Sachdev in respect of Perumbakkam property and so, there was deception at the time of entering into Joint Development Agreement dated 12.7.2018 with the defacto complainant herein. But in fact, it is not so. The Perumbakkam property is not the subject matter of Memorandum of Agreement with Ashok Sachdev. So, there was no intention to deceive the defacto complainant at the time of entering into the Joint Development Agreement. He submits the agreement between the Ashok Sachdev and petitioner/P.K. Ramesh to substantiate the same. He further submits that the accused are in custody from 19.6.2021 for more than 3 weeks. There are change of circumstances and the Maria Ramesh(petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11346/2021) is a woman. She is noway connected with the agreement between the defacto complainant and the petitioners' company. She is only the Director of the company. She had no active role in the transaction. Considering the gender, he prays for bail for her(Maria Ramesh) atleast.

4. Since the matter has been dealt in the earlier order in detail, the scope for this petition is very limited, as to, *Whether the Perumbakkam property is the subject matter of Memorandum of Understanding entered into with Ashok Sachdev?* The copy of the earlier agreement between Ashok Sachdev, P.K. Ramesh and one S. Ravindranathan dated 19.6.2013 is filed by the petitioners themselves. On perusal of the same, it appears the

Memorandum of Friendly Understating is relating to 1.5 Acres of land at OMR as well as 6 Acres of land at Perumbakkam. When it was confronted with the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, he invites this Court's attention to the clauses thereon. Petitioner/P.K. Ramesh(Crl.M.P.No.11347/21) was allowed to raise loan even as per the said agreement. One such arrangement is with the defacto complainant. In fact, both Ashok Sachdev and the present defacto complainant failed to perform their part of the contract, which resulted in all sorts of financial strain to the petitioners' company etc., Though such an argument appears to be forceful, the factum of arrangement with Ashok Sachdev was not brought to the notice of the defacto complainant according to them. So, the deception at the time of inception is prima facie made out. Under such circumstances, this court is not inclined to accept the argument now advanced as if the agreement with Ashok Sachdev is not relating to the Perumbakkam property. With reference to the duration of custody, no doubt, the petitioners are in custody from 19.6.2021. However, the amount involved is huge in nature. Investigation is at the budding stage. But, Maria Ramesh/petitioner in Crl.M.P.11346/21 is not a signatory to any of the contract. There are chances for innocence on the part of Maria Ramesh. Considering the gender and the possibility of innocence and considering the duration of her custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to Maria Ramesh alone. In respect of P.K.Ramesh(petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11347/21), this court is not inclined to grant bail since there is no change of circumstance.

5. Accordingly, the Maria Ramesh/petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11346/21 alone is ordered to be released on bail on her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate for exclusive trial of CCB and CBCID 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.

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

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

(e) the above named 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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

6. As far as P.K.Ramesh/petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.11347/21 is concerned, petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

1. The learned Metropolitan Magistrate,  
for exclusive trial of CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison(Women), Puzhal.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11346/2021 bail granted

Crl.M.P.No.11347/2021 dismissed.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11163 and 11439 of 2021**

**in**

**P.R.C.No.107/2021**

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

**in**

**K-10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.199/2021**

Prasanth .. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.11163/2021

Raagu @ Ragavendran .. Petitioner/Accused in  
Crl.M.P.11439/2021

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant in  
both the petitions.

For Petitioner : M/s. T.Palani, V.Suresh and M.Thirulokchandar,  
Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11163/2021

For Petitioner : M/s. R. Sasikumar, V. Manimaran, S. Thiyagarajan,  
A. Tamilselvan, Advocates in Crl.M.P.No.11439/2021

For Respondent : Learned City Public Prosecutor in both the petitions.

Both the petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 9.4.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 302 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.199/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are noway connected with the alleged offence. Even as per the F.I.R., there is no overtact against the petitioners. The petitioners are in custody from 9.4.2021 and prays for bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that there was dispute between two rival groups. On the occurrence day, the accused went to the house of the victim and assaulted him with knife. He died on the spot. Charge sheet has been filed and numbered as PRC.No.107/2021 on the file of V Metropolitan Magistrate Court and is pending at the stage of committal. The prosecution is taking speedy steps for conducting trial. If the petitioners are released on bail at this stage, there is every possibility of their abscondance and the case proceedings would be stalled and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than 3 months. Investigation over. Already charge sheet has been filed and is pending in P.R.C.No.107/2021. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

(c) the petitioners shall appear before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Chengalpattu daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

**CrI.M.P.Nos.11163 and 11439 of 2021**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11214/2021**

in

**D.2, Anna Salai P.S. Cr.No.593/2021**

Karthick

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,(L&O)  
D.2, Anna Salai Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. U. Yuvaraj, D. Gopi Krishnan, A. Vinoth Kumar, P. Praveen Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.593/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the victim is petitioner's friend. There was a wordy quarrel. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner attacked the defacto complainant with knife and the victim sustained cut injuries. He further submits that the petitioner is having one previous case and objects granting bail.

5. Petitioner has been in custody for about 4 weeks. According to learned CPP, the petitioner is having one previous cae. However, Considering the duration of custody

and the fact that injured has been discharged, 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 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.

(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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11214/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11389/2021**

in

**K.1, Sembium P.S. Cr.No.808/2021**

Chandrasekar @ Chandru

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A.K.L. Jayakamal Rayudu, D. Gopi Krishnan, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinoth Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 336, 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.808/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in the present two cases for statistical purpose. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 25.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded Rs.10,000/-, that on his refusal, the accused at knife point robbed cash Rs.1,400/-. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is involved in 3 cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 18 days. Today he moved bail petitions in two cases. According to learned CPP, except the present two cases, he is also involved

in yet another case. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties 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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11389/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11390/2021**

in

**K.1, Sembium P.S. Cr.No.898/2021**

Chandrasekar @ Chandru

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. A.K.L. Jayakamal Rayudu, D. Gopi Krishnan, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinoth Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 25.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.898/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in the present two cases for statistical purpose. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 25.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money, that on his refusal, the accused at knife point robbed cash Rs.1,200/-. He objects granting bail stating that the petitioner is involved in 3 cases.
5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 18 days. Today he moved bail petitions in two cases. According to learned CPP, except the present two cases, he is also involved

in yet another case. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties 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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11390/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**  
**Crl.M.P.No.11433/2021**

**in**

**F-2, Egmore P.S. Crime No.517/2021**

1. Araiyadi @ Shanmugam  
2. Suresh

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F-2, Egmore Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. M.Hussaini Basha, I.Gowri Shankar and Shaik Abu Thahir, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 5.7.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a) and 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No.517/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioners and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is 100% disabled person. He was not involved in any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. They are in custody from 5.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioners were found in possession of 58 quarters bottles. 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having three previous cases and 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having four previous cases on their credit. The date of arrest is only on 5.7.2021 and their earlier petition was dismissed only on 7.7.2021 and there is no change of circumstances and thus objects granting bail.
5. The petitioners were arrested on 5.7.2021 and their earlier petition was dismissed only on 7.7.2021 and they are also having bad antecedents. However, according to petitioners' counsel, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is suffering from 100% disability and also furnished

Disability Certificate. Considering the disability of the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to Araiyaadi @ Shanmugam(1<sup>st</sup> petitioner) alone subject to condition. In respect of 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner/Suresh is concerned, this court is not inclined to grant bail since there is no change of circumstance.

6. Accordingly, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner shall appear before the respondent police as and when required.

(c) the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

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

7. As far as the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is concerned, petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11433/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**  
**Crl.M.P.No.11434/2021**

in

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

Dinesh @ Vendakai Dinesh

.. 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, upon hearing M/s.P.Thinesh, T.Sundarbabu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.6.2021 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 325, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.305/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. The counsel for the petitioner and the CPP were heard through Video Conference.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offence. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 10.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.
4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to dispute in supplying drugs, the petitioner and others attacked the defacto complainant and caused severe bleeding injury on his nose. Due to the said assault his teeth was broken. He further submits that the petitioner is having 7 previous cases and thus objects the grant of bail.
5. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month. According to learned CPP, this petitioner is having 7 previous cases. However, the injured has been discharged from

the hospital and co-accused were also granted bail by this Court. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned 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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.11434/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11435/2021**

**in**

**D-3, Ice House P.S. Crime No.343/2021**

Kishore Kumar

.. 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, upon hearing M/s. P.Thinesh, T.Sundarbabu, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 7.7.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 452, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.343/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Both the petitioner and the victim are friends. The victim sustained only simple injury and he was discharged from the hospital on the same day. An exaggerated complaint has been given. This petitioner is in custody from 7.7.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity between the defacto complainant and A1/Prasath, this petitioner accompanied with A1 trespassed into the defacto complainant's house on 3.7.2021 in the early morning at 2.30 a.m. and attacked him using knife and caused multiple cut injuries on his neck, shoulder, fingers and backside of the body. Victim was taken to hospital and he has been given treatment and

also sutures were made. He further submits that the petitioner was arrested recently and that investigation is pending and co-accused bail petition was dismissed on 8.7.2021 and thus objects granting bail.

5. It is a case of 307 IPC. The petitioner was arrested only on 7.7.2021. The period for taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Co-accused also is in custody. Considering the nature of offence, the injuries inflicted on the victim and short duration of custody, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**Crl.M.P.No.11436/2021**

in

**K.1, Sembium P.S. Cr.No.895/2021**

AmulRaj

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. G. Sonai Bothi Rajan, S. Senthil Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 24.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 394, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.895/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is not at all present in the scene of occurrence. Since the petitioner happens to be the friend of A1 and A2, he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He is in custody from 24.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and his friend and demanded money, that on their refusal, the accused at knife point robbed cash Rs.500/- and a cellphone from the defacto complainant and also a Samsung mobile phone from the defacto complainant's friend. He objects granting bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 19 days. Considering the duration of custody and the fact that the petitioner has no bad antecedent as reported by learned CPP, 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 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 above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

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

Delivered by me today.

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

Copy to :

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

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.11436/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021  
Crl.M.P.No.11437/2021**

**in**

**K.10, Koyambedu P.S. Crime No.544/2021**

Gopi

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. E. Senthilnathan, S. Sundaramoorthy, C. Srinivasan, C.S. Rajalakshmi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 392 IPC in Crime No.544/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. This petitioner is in custody from 16.6.2021 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused came in a two wheeler snatched the mobile phone from the defacto complainant. He further submits that the cellphone was recovered from this petitioner and thus seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, the conduct of the petitioner and the fact that property was recovered from this petitioner as reported by learned CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021**

**CrI.M.P.No.11443/2021**

in

**K.8, Arumbakkam P.S. Cr.No.866/2021**

M. Injjhasi Moses

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K.8, Arumbakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing M/s. S. Sathia Chandran, R. Gobika, J. Povas, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2021 for the offence punishable under Section 307, 302 IPC in Cr.No.866/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner and his friends went to the Gold Guest House only to celebrate his friend's birthday. In fact, the defacto complainant shouted at the petitioner and others and picked up quarrel and there occurred wordy quarrel. This petitioner is noway connected with the murder of the deceased. Petitioner is working as a cook in SRM University Canteen and he is the sole bread winner of his family. Petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2021 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that there was a clash between two groups who stayed in the adjacent rooms in the Gold Guest House. In pursuance of the same, when the defacto complainant and his friends came out of the guest house, the

accused including this petitioner started to attack the defacto complainant and his friends and one Badrish(now deceased) was attacked with hallow block stone on the head and he died in the hospital due to the head injury. Learned CPP seriously objects granting bail stating that investigation is at the budding stage and all the accused are inside the jail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. A valuable life has been lost. The petitioner was arrested only on 18.6.2021. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that investigation is at the budding stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.11399/2021**

in

**J-4, Kotturpuram P.S. Crime No.515/2021**

Nagaraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
J-4, Kotturpuram Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 341, 294(b), 392, 397, 323, 336, 427 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.515/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is A1. He along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.700/- from him at knife point. The petitioner is having four previous cases. Arrested accused are still in custody and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The petitioner is the named accused. Arrested accused are in custody. The petitioner is having four previous cases. Considering the nature of case and antecedents, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

**Principal Sessions Judge**

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.Nos.11401, 11402 and 11403/2021**

in

**H-1, Washermenpet P.S. Crime No.1922/2021**

Ratchagamoorthy

.. Petitioner in  
Crl.M.P.No.11401/2021 / Accused

Saravanan @ Vijayakanth

.. Petitioner in  
Crl.M.P.No.11402/2021 / Accused

Boobhal

.. Petitioner in  
Crl.M.P.No.11403/2021 / Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.  
in both the petitions.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioners M/s.R.Thulasi Manikandan and R.Rajadurai and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 148, 341, 294(b) and 307 of IPC in Crime No.1922/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners' side have also lodged a complaint and counter-case in Cr.No.1923/2021 was registered. In the said case, the defacto complainant herein and others were granted bail and anticipatory bail by this court. The petitioners apprehend arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that when the defacto complainant and others were coming near Bojarajanagar, the petitioners picked up quarrel with them and

assaulted them with knife and caused injuries to them. The petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11401/2021 is having 9 previous cases and petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11402/2021 is having two previous cases and petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.11403/2021 is having 11 previous cases.

5. Case and counter case were registered. In the counter-case in Cr.No.1923/2021, the defacto complainant herein and others were granted bail and anticipatory bail by this court. Considering the counter-case and injuries on both sides, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police 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.

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

Copies to:

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

SS

CrI.M.P.Nos.11401, 11042 and 11403/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.11404/2021**

in

**B-2, Esplanade P.S. Crime No.584/2021**

N.Sridhar @ Sheeba

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.584/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. Arrested accused were released on bail by the Magistrate. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and defacto complainant are vendors using pushing carts. On the occurrence day, there was traffic in the occurrence place and at that time, the petitioner and others picked up quarrel with the defacto complainant and assaulted him with hands.

5. Dispute over pushing of vending carts on traffic jam. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of offence, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 receipt of a copy of this order, before the VII 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.

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

Copies to:

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

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11404/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.11136/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.112/2021**

**(On the file of the learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, (E.O.II), Chennai.)**

**in**

**R.R.No.9/2021**

Aslam Basha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

The Superintendent of GST and Central Excise,  
Enforcement and Compliance Management Section,  
Chennai Outer GST and Central Excise Commissionerate,  
Newry Towers, No.2054-1,  
II Avenue, Anna Nagar,  
Chennai-600040.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.Maheswari Sugumaran and SPP for respondent, this court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks modification of condition imposed by the learned Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, (E.O.II), Chennai in the bail order passed in Crl.M.P.No.112/2021, dt: 10.5.2021.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted bail by the learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.112/2021 on 10.5.2021 with condition that the petitioner shall deposit a cash security of Rs.1,00,000/- and execute own bond of Rs.25,000/- with two sureties for a likesum each and out of the two sureties one of the surety to be a Government Employee and sureties have to be produced within one month from the date of lifting of lockdown. The petitioner has deposited Rs.1 lakh and he was released on 11.5.2021. The petitioner has tried his best to get Government surety, however, he could not comply the condition. Thus, prays to modify the condition to produce Government surety.

4. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the petition stating that the total amount of tax availed is more than Rs.22 crores. It is a grave case. If the condition is modified, the petitioner may abscond.

5. Considering the gravity of offence, the trial court has imposed the condition to produce one Government Servant as surety. The said condition is not so onerous. There is no acceptable reason for modifying the said condition. Hence, this court is not inclined to modify the condition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. The Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, (E.O.II), Chennai.
2. SPP, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of GST and Central Excise,  
Enforcement and Compliance Management Section,  
Chennai Outer GST and Central Excise Commissionerate,  
Newry Towers, No.2054-1,  
II Avenue, Anna Nagar,  
Chennai-600040.

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.11137/2021**

**in**

**Crl.M.P.No.113/2021**

**(On the file of the learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, (E.O.II), Chennai.)**

**in**

**R.R.No.9/2021**

M.G.Mohammed Anas

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

The Superintendent of GST and Central Excise,  
Enforcement and Compliance Management Section,  
Chennai Outer GST and Central Excise Commissionerate,  
Newry Towers, No.2054-1,  
II Avenue, Anna Nagar,  
Chennai-600040.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.Maheswari Sugumaran and SPP for respondent, this court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks modification of condition imposed by the learned Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, (E.O.II), Chennai in the bail order passed in Crl.M.P.No.113/2021, dt: 10.5.2021.

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

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted bail by the learned Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.113/2021 on 10.5.2021 with condition that the petitioner shall deposit a cash security of Rs.1,00,000/- and execute own bond of Rs.25,000/- with two sureties for a likesum each and out of the two sureties one of the surety to be a Government Employee and sureties have to be produced within one month from the date of lifting of lockdown. The petitioner has deposited Rs.1 lakh and he was released on 11.5.2021. The petitioner has tried his best to get Government surety, however, he could not comply the condition. Thus, prays to modify the condition to produce Government surety.

4. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the petition stating that the total amount of tax availed is more than Rs.22 crores. It is a grave case. If the condition is modified, the petitioner may abscond.

5. Considering the gravity of offence, the trial court has imposed the condition to produce one Government Servant as surety. The said condition is not so onerous. There is no acceptable reason for modifying the said condition. Hence, this court is not inclined to modify the condition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. The Addl. Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, (E.O.II), Chennai.
2. SPP, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of GST and Central Excise,  
Enforcement and Compliance Management Section,  
Chennai Outer GST and Central Excise Commissionerate,  
Newry Towers, No.2054-1,  
II Avenue, Anna Nagar,  
Chennai-600040.

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

Crl.M.P.No.11405/2021

in

Crl.M.P.No.9148/2021

in

C.A.No.111/2021

in

C.C.No.908/2016

(on the file of the XX Metropolitan Magistrate, Allikulam Complex, Chennai)

G.Chidambaram

...Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

Raja

....

Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.M.Senthilkumar, G.Ganapathy, B.Sridhar and M.Madhankumar, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks extension of time granted in Crl.M.P.No.9148/2021, dt: 29.4.2021.
2. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.9148/2021, dated 29.4.2021 this court suspended the sentence imposed on the petitioner with condition to deposit 20% of the cheque amount before the trial court within 60 days from the date of the order. Now, the present petition has been filed to extend the time.
3. As per the affidavit, due to Covid-19, the petitioner could not able to mobilise the amount, thus, he prays for extension of time.
4. The order was passed on 29.4.2021. Considering the lock down, this court is inclined to grant 30 days further time to deposit the amount.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Time is extended for a further period of 30 days to deposit the amount before the trial court.

Delivered by me in open court today.

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

Copt to:

1. The XX Metropolitan Magistrate, Allikulam Complex, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrL.M.P.No.11361/2021**

in

**CCB Crime No.131/2021**

1. V.Baskaran
2. B.Prabavathy
3. Vani

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch (CCB-1),  
Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.J.P.Rajesh, K.G.Senthil Kumar and J.H.Magesh and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406, 420, 465, 468 r/w 34 of IPC in Crime No.131/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that as per the prosecution case, one Nandhini, with the assistance of other accused Reshma Davood, Mohammed and Arun Saiju, has cheated number of persons under the guise of getting Government employments. In pursuance of the said complaint given by one Anandhi, those four were arrested and remanded to custody. The present petitioners were arrayed as A5 to A7. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioners are parents of Nandhini and the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner is the sister of Nandhini. They have no part in the alleged transaction by Nandhini and others. Since the petitioners happens to be the close relatives of Nandhini, they have been deliberately implicated as accused. They apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Further, he submits that the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner, sister of Nandhini is a married woman. Her husband is working in Marashtra and she is living permanently with him in Maharastra. For delivery, she came to

her parents house. She too has been deliberately implicated in this case. She is having a tender child and prays for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of Job-racketing. Nandhini and others cheated number of persons to the tune of Rs.4.15 crores. By receiving huge sum for getting employment in the Government Sectors, not only they have issued bogus appointment orders, they have also given training etc. Further, he submits that in fact the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner, the father of Nandhini also received some payment through Bank account. He too played a vital role in the misdeeds. The other petitioners also received some amount in the absence of Nandhini in the home and seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. On perusal of the C.D., in the complaint, it has been stated that in the absence of Nandhini, the defacto complainant has given amount to the petitioners also. As far as the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is concerned, there are document to show the transfer of funds to his Bank account. He cannot plead ignorance prima facie. The petitioners 2 and 3 are women. The 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is house-wife and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner is a married woman, came to the parents house for the purpose of delivery. There is no documents available in the C.D. to connect them with the misdeed committed by other accused. Further, on perusal of the C.D., it appears the main accused is Reshma Davood. Nandhini acted as an agent, collected money and handed over to Reshma Davood. A4 is the husband of Nandhinig. A1, A2 and A4 were arrested. A3 is at large. Since the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having bank transaction against him, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner. Considering the fact that 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is house-wife and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner, sister of Nandhini, who was married to some other person and residing at Maharashtra, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to petitioners 2 and 3.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners 2 and 3 are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners 2 and 3 shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the petitioners 2 and 3 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 2 and 3 shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the petitioners 2 and 3 shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners 2 and 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 2 and 3 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 2 and 3 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 2 and 3 thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is concerned, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today.

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

Copies to:

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

SS

Crl.M.P.No.11361/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrI.M.P.No.11400/2021**

in

**K-6, T.P.Chathiram P.S. Crime No.130/2021**

Ramesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

K-6, T.P.Chathiram Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.130/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. Arrested accused was released on bail by the Magistrate. The petitioner apprehends arrest and prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and two others were consuming alcohol near Vinayagar Temple. When the same was questioned by defacto complainant, the petitioner and others assaulted him with hands and packet knife and caused injury on his jaw.

5. Dispute over taking alcohol in a public place. When it was questioned by the defacto complainant, it appears the petitioner and others assaulted him. No serious injury is found in the A.R. copy. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 receipt of a copy of this order, before the 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.

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

Copies to:

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, K-6, T.P.Chathiram Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.11400/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru R. Selvakumar, B.A., M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**CrL.M.P.No.11406/2021**

in

**V-1, Villivakkam P.S. Crime No.625/2021**

Raja

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.R.Sankarasubbu, A.Ramesh and P.Loganathan and CPP for respondent, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323, 506(ii) and 307 of IPC in Crime No.625/2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an exaggerated complaint has been given. No offence u/s 307 IPC is attracted. The petitioner and counter-parties appeared before the Villivakkam Police for enquiry in connection with the earlier complaint given by defacto complainant against the petitioner's family. While returning, the present occurrence took place, in which, the defacto complainant's husband Saravanan was assaulted.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that it is a case of 307 IPC and objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The petition was filed for the offences u/s 294(b), 323, 506(ii) and 307 of IPC stating that the F.I.R. has been blocked in the internet. On perusal of C.D., the case has been registered for the offences u/s 294(b), 323, 506(ii) of IPC and u/s 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act. Further, it appears the defacto complainant's husband Saravanan was assaulted. The A.R. copy would go to disclose that he was under

the influence of alcohol. The earlier complaint itself is that Saravanan under the influence of alcohol, quarreled with the present petitioner's family person, in which, Saravanan was assaulted. Again, on the date of enquiry before the police also, the said Saravanan was under the influence of alcohol and quarreled with the petitioner. The fact that the injured was under the influence of alcohol would go to show that he be the cause for the incident. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering all those circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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 receipt of a copy of this order, before the XIII 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.

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

Copies to:

1. The XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, V-1, Villivakkam Police Station, Chennai.

SS

CrI.M.P.No.11406/2021

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.11458/2021**

**in**

**C.A.No.133/2021**

**in**

**C.C.No.1869/2012**

(on the file of the Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-I, Egmore, Allikulam Complex, Chennai)

Prashant B.Chaudhary

...Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

G.R.Ashok,  
Proprietor, M/s.Vinayak Traders,  
No.140, Old No.947,  
Poonamallee High Road,  
Chennai-600084.  
Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

....

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.GGS Law Associates Mr.J.Jothi, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.
2. The counsel for the petitioner was heard through Video Conference.

3. The Petitioner / Appellant herein is the accused in C.C.No.1869/2012 on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-I, Chennai. On 20.4.2021, judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioner was found guilty u/s.138 of N.I. Act and sentenced to undergo one year simple imprisonment and to pay the cheque amount with interest of Rs.47,50,000/- as compensation to the complainant within 8 weeks, in default, to undergo 8 weeks S.I.

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

5. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal and the submission made by the petitioner's counsel. The trial court suspended the sentence for 30 days.

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

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

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

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

10. The appeal stands posted to 12.8.2021.

Delivered by me today.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

**Copy to**

The Metropolitan Magistrate, FTC-I, Egmore at Allikulam Complex, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Monday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2021.**

**Crl.M.P.No.11457/2021**

in

Crl.R.C.No.52/2021

against

M.P.No.5/2021

in

R.C.No.90/Sec.Pro/DCP Triplicane/2021

Arun @ Arun Kumar

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Respondent

/

Accused

Vs.

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

2. The Inspector of Police,  
F-4, Thousand Lights Police Station,  
Chennai.

Respondents/Respondents/Petitioners/

..

Complainant

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner M/s.C.Jagan, E.Vignesh and S.Ajith 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 counsel for the petitioner was heard through Video Conference.

3. The Petitioner herein is the accused in M.P.No.5/2021 in R.C.No.90/Sec.Pro/DCP Triplicane/2021 on the file of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and he was convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 260 days for violation of bond executed u/s 107 of Cr.P.C. as per the order dated 17.6.2021.

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 preferred 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 260 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.

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

9. The Revision is posted on 12.8.2021.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Sd/-R.Selvakumar

**Principal Sessions Judge.**

**Copy to :**

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

ss