

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

CrI.M.P.No. 17105/2023

in

P-2 Otteri P.S. Crime No. 215/2022

Sathish @ Sathishkumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T. Shanmugaboopathi, S. Vijayaraghavan, R. Anbazhagan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 506(ii), 397 IPC in Crime No. 215/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and a sitting Minister's daughter loved each other. Due to which, this petitioner's lover was forcibly sent to America and this petitioner was illegally detained in a remote house for two months in Thiruvallur District. After filing HCP petition by this petitioner's father before Hon'ble High Court, this petitioner was produced before the court and released from the illegal custody of the police. After that with great difficulty, this petitioner got married his lover in Karnataka State and started their matrimonial life. Due to the love, elopement and the intercaste love marriage, his friends and family members were also arrested and later released on bail. False case has been foisted on him due to vengeance. He has not committed any offence as narrated in the FIR. This petitioner was already arrested under

NBW in S.C.No.10/2021 on 9.5.2023 and produced before Magalir Neethimandram, Chennai. In this case, he has been formally arrested on 3.6.2023. Though this petitioner is having 11 previous cases, he was acquitted in two cases. Co-accused were already granted bail. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.6800/- from him and also caused injury to him.

5. Learned CPP submits that this petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 21.6.2023 by this court. Subsequently, this petitioner filed bail application before the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.O.P.No.14456/2023 and later it was withdrawn by him. Again, he moved bail application before this court. This petitioner is facing a case before Mahila Court, Chennai. This petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 9 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of accusation made against the petitioner, his bad antecedents, amount involved in this case is not yet recovered and the objection raised by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

CrI.M.P.No. 17475/2023

in

CCB ALGSC-1, Team XVII Crime No. 94/2023

Divya Chandrasekar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
ALGSC-1, Team- XVII,
Vepery, Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Senthil Nathan, C. Sakthivel, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 13.7.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 465, 467, 468, 471r/w 34 IPC in Crime No. 94/2023 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. A1 is her father, A2 is her mother and A3 is her brother. A2 her mother was died. A1 father of this petitioner had informed her and her brother A3 that the property situated at T.Nagar, Survey Nos.117/8, 118/5, 120/3 T.S.No.6530, was belonged to his father and was settled to his mother and all his brothers vide document No.212/1951. A1 informed the petitioner that after the demise of his elder brother, their family is trying to sell the property and had entered into a registered sale agreement with one Neelan. This petitioner's father is not interested in selling his share, he informed A3 and A4 that he wanted to execute GPA in favour of his wife (A2) and wanted them to sign he GPA deed. Believing his words, this peitioner and A3 have signed the deed of GPA. The encumbrance certificate from the

SRO, T.Nagar for the year 1.1.1949 to 31.12.1974 reflects that the property belong to her grandmother. The EC obtained from the T.Nagar SRO from 1.1.1975 to 21.3.2023 does not have any entry except the sale agreement executed by A1's elder brothers family. Hence, at the time of execution, the said property comprised in Survey Nos. 117/8, 118/5, 120/3 in TS No.6530 were free from encumbrances. This petitioner is innocent of the offence. She is no way connected with the forgery of any documents. She is a mother of two years old female child affected with Hiatus Hernia and undergoing treatment since 2018 onwards. She is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on her. She is in custody from 13.7.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is the eldest daughter of late Tr. Krishnamoorthy and one of the legal heir of the property comprising land and building at No.22/27, Krishna Rao Naidu Nagar, T. Nagar, Chennai-17 measuring 2 grounds 1900 sq.feet which has been purchased jointly by her grandfather Tr. M.S. Nadiu and father Krishnamoorthy from the sons of late Subramania Mudaliar viz., V.S. Seenivasan, V.S. Chandrasekaran, V.S. Jayavelu, V.S. Somasundaram vide registered doc. No. 1493/1975 dated 5.12.1975 at SRO, T. Nagar. The defacto complainant's grandfather during his life time had bequeathed his half share of the property under a Will to the petitioner's brother namely N. Govindarajan. Since the defacto complainant's father Krishnamoorthy died intestate, his share of the property has devolved on the legal heirs i.e., the defacto complainant's mother Leelavathy and petitioner and her four siblings, who are younger to her. In the meanwhile, it came to light that A1 Chandrasekar, who is the father of this petitioner, along with his brothers had already sold the subject property to the defacto complainant's father and grand father has once again executed a fraudulent General Power of Attorney in favour of his wife (A2) along with this petitioner and her brother vide doc. No. 613/2013 at SRO, T. Nagar and thereby created encumbrance over the subject property. This petitioner's father knowing fully well that he had already sold the subject property along with his brothers, had concealed the said document and had registered the settlement to the A1's mother Kaveriyammal family, showing as an earlier document that the said Subramania Mudaliar in the deed was during his life time. He claimed to have retained the right and since both

of them died, the heirs, the 1st accused along with his brothers wrongly stated in the document that the property was divided into ¼ share, the petitioner, her father, her mother and her brother jointly and severally gave the property to the 2nd accused. According to T. Nagar SRO, Doc. No.616/2013 the Power of Attorney has registered and usurped the said place and has made an encumbrance on the said property. Investigation is not yet completed. If the petitioner is released on bail, she may tamper the evidence. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Period of taking custodial interrogation is not yet over. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner and her brother believing her father's words, executed the general power of attorney in favour of A2, who is her mother. The EC obtained from the T.Nagar SRO from 1.1.1975 to 21.3.2023 does not have any entry except the sale agreement executed by A1's elder brothers family. Hence, at the time of execution, the said property comprised in Survey Nos. 117/8, 118/5, 120/3 in TS No.6530 were free from encumbrances. This petitioner is innocent of the offence. She is no way connected with the forgery of any documents. The petitioner being a lady, having two years old female child, she may be released on bail. He also cited a judgment reported in 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 577 Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI and another and argued that the first proviso to section 437 facilitates a court to conditionally release on bail an accused if he is under the age of 16 years or is a woman or is sick or infirm – this has to be applied while considering release on bail either by the court of Sessions or the High Court and prays to grant bail to the petitioner. However, according to CPP, this petitioner, her father, her brother all joined together with intention to grab the property, executed a general power of attorney in favour of her mother, knowing fully well that the said property was already sold by her father and his brothers to the defacto complainant's father Krishnamoorthy and grand father M.S. Naidu. Hence, the innocence pleaded by this petitioner cannot be accepted in execution of general power of attorney. The petitioner was arrested only on 13.7.2023. Period for taking custodial interrogation is not over and the Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential. Investigation is at preliminary stage. Hence, at this juncture, this court cannot consider the gender of the petitioner for releasing her. Further, releasing the petitioner at this stage is

not conducive for investigation. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17487/2023
in
CCD-1, Crime No. 81/2023**

Oluebube James

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCD-1, Chennai City,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Praveennath, R.A. Shinusha, S. Sankar, K. Natesh Pandi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 31.5.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 419, 420., 465, 467 IPC and sec. 66 r/w 43(j), 66C, 66D of I.T. Act 2008 in Crime No. 81/2023 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 noway connected with the alleged offence. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. The petitioner is a college student. Since the petitioner is a Nigerian National, he has been falsely implicated in this case based on the confession statement of A2. Except the confession statement, there is no material to connect the petitioner with the crime. The petitioner has been in custody from 31.5.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant company M/s. Indcon Structural Pvt. Ltd had bank account in Canara Bank, Thousand Light Branch and the same has been linked with the Airtel mobile number +91 9344038808. The accused had fraudulently obtained the defacto complainant's Airtel Sim card numbers

misusing their Airtel portal by hacking their company's email id and stolen the defacto complainant's Canara Bank Net banking credentials including user name, password, CVV, OTP and thereby impersonating the defacto complainant, committed 27 fraudulent transactions on 28.3.2023 and swindled an amount of Rs.17,30,259/- and transferred the same to 7 various bank accounts and withdrew the amount through ATM. Based on the complaint given by the General Manager of the defacto complainant company, case has been registered.

5. Learned CPP submits that during investigation it came to light that the amounts diverted have been traced out and it was found that the accused involved in the said offence are residing at Bangalore and A2 was identified and he was arrested and he gave statement about the involvement of A1 and A3/the petitioner herein in the offence of fraudulent transactions and swindled the amount of Rs.17.30 lakhs from the account of the defacto complainant company. Based on his statement, this petitioner/A3 and A1 were arrested and remanded to judicial custody. Mobile phones, laptops, 14 sim cards, Modem, 12 Debit cards, Memory Card were seized from the accused. Investigation is still going on. Amount is not yet recovered. The association of the accused with other Nigerian nationals have to be identified and their motive with involvement of cheating as gang operations etc are to be bring out. This petitioner is having link with A1 and A2. Hence, seriously objects granting bail.

6. It is a case of Sim Swap Scam by fraudulent transactions of Rs.17.30 lakhs from the bank account of the defacto complainant. The petitioner, who is alleged to the student of Business Management College has been indulged in the said fraudulent transaction by hacking the email Id and misusing the net banking credentials of the defacto complainant company and swindled an amount of Rs.17,30,259/- and diverted the same to 7 various bank accounts and withdrew the amount through ATM. According to learned CPP, investigation is not yet completed. The petitioner is a Nigerian National and if he released on bail, there is every possibility of his absconding. It is very difficult for the respondent police to secure the accused, who indulge in these types of crimes. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 30.6.2023. No change in circumstances was reported before this court. Considering the grave nature of allegations

against the petitioner, stage of the investigation and the objection raised by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No. 17601/2023

in

S.C No. 77/2023

(on the file of XXIII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

N-3 Muthialpet P.S. Crime No. 44/2019

Tamilselvan @ Rajan @ Rajesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
N-3 Muthialpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, M. Mohamadhu Ajar, G. Sundaresan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2023 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 392 r/w 397, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No. 77/2023 in Crime No. 44/2019 on the file respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was arrested on 22.6.2023 based on the NBW issued against him on 12.4.2023. This petitioner's wife was admitted to Govt. R.S.R.M. hospital for delivery and on 4.4.2023, she had delivered a female child. Since, no one is there to take care of his wife after delivery, he could not appear before the trial court on the date of hearing. The absence of the petitioner is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court. The petitioner is in custody from 22.6.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 12.4.2023 and it was executed on 22.6.2023. The petitioner was absent for two months. Now the case is pending for framing of charges. If he is released on bail, the further proceedings of the case will be stalled. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 12.4.2023 and it was executed on 22.6.2023. According to the counsel for the petitioner, this petitioner's wife delivered a female child on 4.4.2023 and since this petitioner is the only person to take care of his wife, he could not appear before the trial court on the hearing date. Admittedly, this petitioner's wife delivered a female child on 4.4.2023. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 12.4.2023. Why this petitioner was absent on the date of issuance of NBW, i.e., on 12.4.2023, is not explained. Even thereafter, he has not chosen to surrender and file a petition to recall the warrant till his arrest. The reason stated by the petitioner is not convincing. Now, the case is pending for framing of charges. Considering the above facts and stage of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No. 17603/2023

in

S.C No. 365/2022

(on the file of V Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 669/2022

Vijay

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Balaji, M. Dinesh, S. Rajesh, C. Jeevitha, M. Mahendran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.7.2023 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in S.C.No. 365/2022 in Crime No. 669/2022 on the file respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was arrested on 11.7.2023 based on the NBW issued against him on 25.1.2023. This petitioner has no knowledge about in which court the case has been made over. No summons were received by the petitioner about the hearing date. Due to which, the petitioner could not appear before the trial court on the date of hearing. Hence, NBW was issued against him. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 25.1.2023 and it was executed on 11.7.2023 . The petitioner was absent for six months. The petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 15 previous cases. If he is released on bail, the further proceedings of the case will be stalled. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 25.1.2023 and it was executed on 11.7.2023. The petitioner was absent for 6 months. No acceptable reason stated by the petitioner for his absence on 25.1.2023 and thereafter, he has not chosen to recall the warrant. The reason stated by the petitioner is not convincing. Considering the above facts and stage of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No. 17616/2023

in

PRC No.24/2023

(on the file of II Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

in

D-2 Anna Salai P.S. Crime No. 342/2022

Kamesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-2 Anna Salai Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, M. Dhilipan, T. Kanimozhi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 7.7.2023 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC r/w 34 IPC in PRC.No. 24/2023 in Crime No. 342/2022 on the file respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to the illness of the petitioner, he could not appear before the committal court on the hearing date. Hence, NBW was issued against him on 28.3.2023. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 28.3.2023 and it was executed on 7.7.2023 . The petitioner was absent for 4 months. After much effort he

has been secured by the police. If he is released on bail, the further proceedings of the case will be stalled. Now the case is pending for framing of charges. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 28.3.2023 and it was executed on 7.7.2023. The petitioner was absent for 4 months. No acceptable reason stated by the petitioner for his absence on 28.3.2023 and thereafter, he has not chosen to recall the warrant till his arrest. The reason stated by the petitioner is not convincing. Considering the above facts and stage of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

CrI.M.P.No. 17618/2023

in

H-3 Tondiarpet P.S., Crime No. 166/2023

Anandhan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-3 Tondiarpet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Nithiyavel, K. Sarathkumar, G. Kameshwaran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.7.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 436 IPC in Crime No. 166/2023 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 by the prosecution. He was not at all present at the scene of occurrence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. No one sustained injury. No damage caused. The petitioner is in custody from 11.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner/A3 along with five other accused thrown petrol bomb on the defacto complainant's house and caused damage to the compound wall. He further submits that

this petitioner is having one previous case. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the serious nature of offence, short duration of custody and the fact that investigation is at preliminary stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of June, 2023**

Crl.M.P.No. 17619/2023

in

K-2 Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No. 201/2023

1. Vignesh
2. Sathis

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Ganesha Moorthy, A. Regan, A. Madhan Kumar, D. Israle, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 10.6.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC in Crime No. 201/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The 1st petitioner is the son of the deceased Sugumar and the 2nd petitioner is the very close relative of the 1st petitioner. The deceased Sugumar is a mentally disordered person and he was alcohol addict. He always behaved rudely with the family members. Moreover, in the year 2020, the deceased was convicted in a criminal case on the file of respondent police and in the month of February 2023, he was released on bail after completion of sentence of three years. Further the deceased Sugumar was also suffering from chronic Fits. On 8.6.2023, at night hours, the deceased came to the house in drunken mood and he went to terrace for

sleeping. Thereafter on 9.6.2023, at about 4.00 a.m. when the 1st petitioner's mother Latha went to terrace floor, she found that her husband was found unconsciously with a injury on his forehead. His mother lodged a complaint before the respondent police on 9.6.2023. Base on her complaint, these petitioners were arrested on suspicion. These petitioners are no way connected with the alleged offence and they have no enmity or motive to kill the deceased. The 1st petitioner is aged about 24 years and he was married before 7 months and he is working as A/C mechanic. The 2nd petitioner is aged about 23 years and he was also married 10 days before his arrest and he is working in a private company. Investigation is almost completed. The petitioners are in custody from 10.6.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant, who is the mother of the 1st petitioner lodged a complaint stating that on 9.6.2023, at about 4.00 a.m. early morning when she went to terrace of her house, and found that her husband Sugumar was found unconsciously with injury in his forehead and immediately, he was taken to Govt. KMC hospital . The doctors had examined and informed them that he was brought dead. Initially, case was registered u/s.174 Cr.P.C. During investigation it came to light that due to family dispute, the deceased was murdered by these petitioners by strangulating his neck and due to breathing trouble, he was died. Subsequently, it was altered in to sec. 302 IPC. When the accused were enquired, they have also confessed that they have murdered the deceased. Investigation is not yet completed. If the petitioners are enlarged on bail, chances for absconding is more. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The 1st petitioner is none other than the son and the 2nd petitioner is close relative of deceased. Defacto complainant is mother of A1 and wife of deceased. The petitioners are in custody for the past 45 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the close relationship between the petitioners and the defacto complainant and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in 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. 17619 / 2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

CrI.M.P.No. 17620/2023

in

N-2 Kasimedu P.S. Crime No. 183/2023

Dinesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Nithiyavel, G. Kameshwaran, K. Sarathkumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 12.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 399 & 402 IPC in Crime No. 183/2023 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 has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused were already released on bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody from 12.7.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused unlawfully assembled with deadly weapons and planned to commit dacoity. He further submits that this petitioner is having 4 previous cases.

5. No offence committed. Co-accused were already granted bail by this court. The petitioner is in custody for the past 13 days. According to CPP, the petitioner is having 4 previous cases. However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on 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 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 learned Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 17620 / 2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

Crl.M.P.No. 17621/2023

in

Railway Police, Perambur Crime No. 98/2023

Joshwa @ Lawrance

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Railway Police, Perambur,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. G. Sivakumar, K. Sujankumar, S.K. Masthan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 27.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 392 and 414 IPC in Crime No. 98/2023 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 by the prosecution. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Nothing has been recovered from this petitioner. Property has been recovered from other accused. The petitioner is in custody from 27.6.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that when the defacto complainant and her family members travelled in Mumbai Express train and when the train was moving from perambur to Vyasdarjadi, this petitioner/A3 along with three other accused entered into her coach and robbed 9 sovereigns of gold jewels from the defacto complainant and get down at beach station on running train. Investigation is pending. Earlier bail

application of this petitioner was dismissed on 13.7.2023 and that there is no change in circumstance. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence, the accusation made against the petitioner, no change in circumstance was reported before this court after the dismissal of arlier bail application and that investigation is not yet completed, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No. 17622 / 2023

in

B-2 Esplanade P.S. Crime No. 100/2023

Pasupathi Pandian

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. M. Dinesh, K. Kumara Desigan, B.Ram Prabu, P. Maniraj, P. Athilgan, A. Feroskhan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 11.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 363, 392, 506(i)IPC in Crime No. 100/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The alleged offence has been committed by A1 and A2 and the amount were recovered from them alone. Based on the confession statement of A3, this petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. This petitioner is no way connected with the offence committed by A1 and A2. There is no recovery from this petitioner. Co-accused/A3 was already released on bail by this court. The defacto complainant in his complaint stated that only one person involved in the offence. This petitioner has repaid Rs.7 lakhs to A2. The petitioner is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. He is in custody from 11.6.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant, at the instruction of his owner Mr. Balakrishnan, who is employed in Singapore, collected a sum of Rs.30 lakhs

from one Nawaz, shop owner at China Bazar at about 9.00 p.m. on 13.5.2023 and was proceeding to his room in his two wheeler and at that time, Senthilkumar/A1/Grade I Police waylaid him and kidnapped him to Armed Force Ground at Egmore, wherein A1 assaulted the defacto complainant and committed theft of Rs.30 lakhs and escaped from the scene of occurrence. Based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, the case has been registered. Learned CPP submits that during investigation it came to light that A1, police personnel along with other accused including this petitioner/A4 committed theft of Rs.30 lakhs. This petitioner had received a sum of Rs.7 lakhs towards his share and thereafter returned the same to A2 and absconded himself. Out of the stolen property, cash Rs.21,12,500/- and jewels weighing 53 grams were recovered. Balance amount is yet to be received. Investigation is not yet completed. The petitioner was arrested recently. This petitioner is the brain behind the crime and he only hatched the plan. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he will abscond and there is every possibility of tampering of evidence. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. According to CPP, out of stolen amount Rs.30 lakhs, so far Rs.21,12,500/- and jewels weighing 53 grams were recovered. It is also submitted that though this petitioner has received Rs.7 lakhs towards his share, it is admitted by the CPP that he returned the amount Rs.7 lakhs to A2. The petitioner is in custody for the past 45 days. Co-accused/A3 was granted bail by this court. Major portion of amount has been recovered. Substantial portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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 VII 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 learned Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 17622 / 2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 24th day of July , 2023

CrI.M.P.No. 17623/2023

in

E.1, Mylapore P.S. Crime No.153/2023

Sathish @ Olli Sathish

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

The State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E.1, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, M. Mohamadhu Ajar, G. Sundaresan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 9.4.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.153/2023 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. The victim and the petitioner's wife had illegal relationship and due to which there exists dispute. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. An exaggerated complaint has been given. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 9.4.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant's brother with broken bottle on his neck. The victim sustained grievous injuries and admitted to the hospital and had taken treatment for

10 days and later got discharged. Charge sheet has been filed. The petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 23 previous cases. Hence, he seriously objects granting bail.

5. Considering the bad antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

CrI.M.P.No. 17624/2023

in

V-1 Villivakkam P.S. Crime No. 202/2023

I. Vinoth

.. 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 in the presence of M/s. G. Sonai Bothi Rajan, T. Vinoth Kumar, J. Jaikumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.7.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 397 IPC in Crime No. 202/2023 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 by the prosecution. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody from 4.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.500/- from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases. However, he submits that out of Rs.500/-, Rs.200/- has been recovered.

5. Considering the submission made by the CPP and the duration of custody of the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on 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 XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 17624 / 2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

Crl.M.P.No. 17626/2023

in

H-1 Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 272/2023

Vignesh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. V. Vasanth, K. Yuvaraja, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 14.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 399 & 402 IPC in Crime No. 272/2023 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 14.7.2023 . Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused unlawfully assembled with deadly weapons and planned to commit dacoity. This petitioner is having one previous case.

5. No offence committed. The petitioner is in custody for the past 11 days. Considering the nature of offence and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 17626 / 2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023**

Crl.M.P.No. 17627/2023

in

H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 318/2023

1. Vignesh
2. Akash @ Thuppakki Akash .. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-5 New Washermenpet 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, S. Divakar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 14.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 318/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 14.7.2023 . Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.370/- from him at knife point. The 1st petitioner is having 4 previous cases and the 2nd petitioner is having 5 previous cases.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 11 days. Considering the duration of custody of the petitioners, this court is inclined to grant bail to them subject to condition.

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

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

(b) the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me in open court today.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 17627 / 2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge

Monday, the 24th day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No. 17625/2023

in

S.C No. 402/2023

(on the file of XIX Additional Sessions Judge , Chennai)

in

H-4 Korukkupet P.S. Crime No. 176/2022

Gowtham

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Mohan Raj, M. Pugazhendhi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.6.2023 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 399 IPC in S.C.No.402/2023 in Crime No. 176/2022 on the file respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to the illness of the petitioner, he could not appear before the committal court on the hearing date. Hence, NBW was issued against him on 5.6.2023 by the XV Metropolitan Magistrate. Thereafter, the case has been committed to the court of sessions and made over to XIX Additional Sessions Court, Chennai. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. Hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 5.6.2023 and it was executed on 30.6.2023 . The next hearing date is 4.8.2023. If the petitioner is released on bail, the further proceedings of the case will be stalled. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 5.6.2023 and it was executed on 30.6.2023. No acceptable reason stated by the petitioner for his absence on 5.6.2023 and thereafter, he has not chosen to recall the warrant till his arrest. The reason stated by the petitioner is not convincing. Considering the above facts and stage of the case, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge