

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17049/2023**

in

**P-6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 310/2023**

J. Shivaji Krishnamoorthy @  
Krishnamoorthy

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition came before me on 18.7.2023 for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Prabudoss, M. Shankar, 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 18.6.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 153, 294(b), 504, 505(i)(b), 505(2) of IPC in Crime No.310/2023 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 petitioner is the spokesperson of DMK party. He used to speak about the political issues and make awareness to the public. During that time to attract the public attention, he use to make some jokes and illustrate the inability of the Ex-government politicians. But this was wrongly understood by the complainant. There is no motive to make any friction among any groups or to insult any one. No rumor was spread by the petitioner. The petitioner has given his speech in a public meeting which was held on 16.6.2023. The Sub Inspector of Police, who was on patrol duty at the venue has chosen to lodge the complaint only on 18.6.2023 after seeing the video downloaded through social media. No other complaint was given by the affected parties. The offence u/s. 504 and 505 does not attract. The petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that during the public meeting held on 16.6.2023 at Erukkancheri, Chennai this petitioner had spoken derogatory and defamatory statements about the Governor of TamilNadu State, Ex-Chief Minister Edapadi Palaniswamy, Ex-Minister Jayakumar, the State Secretary of BJP and Actress and thereby promoting enmity among the opposite party members and causing disturbance to the public peace. Investigation is pending. The petitioner is also involved in previous case of similar nature. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 3.7.2023 and that there is no change in circumstances. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner was arrested on 18.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 153, 294(b), 504, 505(i)(b), 505(2) of IPC. The accusation made against the petitioner is that he has made derogatory and defamatory statements of high dignataries and party members which may provoke breach of peace and promote enmity among people. Punishment for the offence u/s.153 IPC is imprisonment for 3 years or with fine or with both. Punishment for the offence u/s.504 IPC is imprisonment of two years and punishment for the offence u/s.505(2) IPC is imprisonment may extend to 5 years and shall also be liable to fine. Therefore, all the offences are below 5 years of imprisonment and the offences are triable by Magistrate. The petitioner is a senior citizen aged 63 years and due to his age factor, he is said to have been suffering from age related illness. The petitioner is in custody for the past 33 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Earlier bail applications were dismissed twice. Considering the age of the petitioner and the period of incarceration undergone by him, this court is inclined to grant bail to him with stringent condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five thousand only) with two sureties, each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the 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 involve in such activities in future.**

(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 in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

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

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 17049 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17245/2023**

in

**D-5 Marina P.S. Crime No. 132/2023**

Saleem

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
D-5 Marina Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition came before me on 19.7.2023 for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Sarath Kumar, K. Vignesh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 2.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 341, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 132/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that false case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner is in custody from 2.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner along with other accused went to defacto complainant's shop and demanded rowdy mamool from him. On his refusal, the accused forcibly robbed Rs.500/- from him and escaped from the spot. Hence, the complaint.

5. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982 as per the Detention Order No. 320/2023 dated 18.7.2023. It is further submitted by the CPP that

the petitioner is a habitual offender and he also involved in several other cases of similar nature.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been in custody as per the detention order and that the petitioner is accused in several other cases, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this juncture.

7. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17341/2023**

in

**R-2 Kodambakkam P.S. Crime No. 131/2023**

Nandhakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
R-2 Kodambakkam Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Arun Kumar, R. Nagaraj, 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 18.6.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 397 IPC in Crime No. 131/2023 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. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 18.6.2023 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 mobile phone from him at knife point. This petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 7 previous cases. However, he submits that the property involved in this case has been recovered.

5. The property involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 7 previous

cases. 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 XVII 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 XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 17341 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.Nos. 17463 and 17564 / 2023**

in

**P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 256/2023**

Sonaram Gurjar

.. Petitioner/Accused.

in Crl.M.P.No.17463/2023

Mohd Kashif

.. Petitioner/Accused

in Crl.M.P.No.17564/2023

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.  
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Kumaravelu, M. Suresh, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No.17463/2023 and of M/s.A. Sathya, Counsel for the petitioner in Crl.M.P.No. 17564/2023 and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 28.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 25(1-A), of Arms Act 1959 and u/s. 109, 115, 120-B IPC in Crime No. 256/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent of the offence. It is alleged in the complaint that these petitioners were found in possession of country pistol while vehicle check conducted by the respondent police. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Without proper enquiry, the respondent police implicated them in this case. Co-accused A4 to A6



were already granted bail by this court. The petitioners are in custody from 28.6.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 28.6.2023, the Sub-Inspector of police attached to P-1 Pulianthope Police station lodged a complaint stating that on 28.6.2023, when they were at vehicle check near Perambur Barracks Road and Kohinoor Hotel junction these petitioners came in a two wheeler and two persons came in a Scooter were waylaid and on enquiry and search, the police seized 2 country made guns with 5 rounds bullets from A1 Mukesh Gurjar and on enquiry, A1 revealed that A4 Mahipal Singh's daughter was eloped with one Pavesh to Rajasthan and therefore, A4 wanted to do away the said Pavesh and engaged these petitioners to eliminate him for which they demanded Rs.5 lakhs from A4 Mahipal Singh and received Rs.1 lakh as initial payment and went to Rajasthan. But, the said Pavesh returned to Chennai. Since they could not murder Pavesh in Rajasthan, they decided to murder him at Chennai after receiving the balance amount of Rs.4 lakhs from A4 and as per their plan they were going in their two wheeler with deadly weapons and at that time, the police intercepted them and arrested. From A1 to A3, the police seized 2 nos. of Pistol, 5 bullets mobile phone and a two wheeler. These petitioners hail from Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan. If they are released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Investigation is still pending. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioners is that these petitioners were engaged as hooligans by A4 to eliminate one Pavesh since his daughter eloped with him to Rajasthan. When these petitioners came in a two wheeler with pistol and guns, they were intercepted by the police and the deadly weapons were seized from them. Co-accused A4 to A6 were already granted bail by this court on 4.7.2023 since they are not present at the scene of occurrence and no weapons have been recovered from them. Whereas, two country gun and 5 bullets were recovered from these petitioners during vehicle check by the respondent police. The possession of deadly weapons is not properly explained by the petitioners. Therefore, these petitioners cannot claim parity with co-accused who were granted bail by this court. These petitioners' earlier bail application was dismissed on 12.7.2023. No change in circumstances was reported. Investigation is still going on. The

petitioners are hails from Rajasthan. If they are released on bail, it will be very difficult to secure them again. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

6. Hence, both the petitions are 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**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.Nos. 17465 & 17484 / 2023**

in

**P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 353/2023**

Karthick

.. Petitioner/Accused.  
in CrI.M.P.No.17465/2023

Vimalraj

.. Petitioner/Accused  
in CrI.M.P.No.17484/2023

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.  
in both the petitions

The above petitions are coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Ajithkumr, G. Vignesh, Counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.17465/2023 and of M/s. K. Madhan, S. Dinesh Kumar, A. Krishnamoorthy, A. Saravanan, Counsel for the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No. 17484/2023 and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

**COMMON ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 10.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 353/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the petitions submits that the petitioners are innocent of the offence. 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 10.7.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with two other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.200/- from him at knife point. He further submits that each petitioner is having one previous case.

5. The petitioners are in custody for the past 12 days. Considering the nature of offence and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners on 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the 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 X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.Nos. 17465 & 17484 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17466/2023**

in

**D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 137/2023**

Balaji

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Thinesh, G.D. Pon Prabhakaran, 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 294(b), 341, 397, 336, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 137/2023 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. Victim was discharged from the hospital. Though the petitioner is having 12 previous cases, in four cases he has been acquitted. The petitioner is in custody from 31.5.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant using beer bottle and robbed Rs.450/- from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 12 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of 12 previous cases which are pending against the petitioner, he was acquitted in four cases and still the petitioner is having 8 previous cases and produced proof to show that this petitioner was acquitted in four cases . The petitioner is in custody for more than 1 ½ months. 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 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 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 17466 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No. 17467/2023**

in

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

M. Senthil Kumar

.. 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. K. Saravanan, P. Sathish, 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 16.5.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 363, 392 and 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 of the offence and he has been arrayed as 1<sup>st</sup> accused. The 2<sup>nd</sup> accused is the friend of the present accused. He requested the petitioner to help him to recover the amount given to the defacto complainant. Based on his request, the petitioner collected the money and gave it to 2<sup>nd</sup> accused. This petitioner is working in the police department for more than 10 years. Co-accused /A3 was already released on bail by this court. The incident took place on 13.5.2023 and the complaint was given only on 15.5.2023 around 10 p.m. The petitioner is in custody from 16.5.2023 and 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, A1/Grade I Police waylaid him and accompanied him and under threat forced him to go to the ground of Armed Forces 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 this petitioner/A1, being a police personnel along with his friend A2 committed theft of Rs.30 lakhs, out of which, this petitioner received cash Rs.10 lakhs and A2 had taken Rs.20 lakhs towards his share. Out of the stolen property, cash Rs.21,12,500/- was recovered and jewels weighing 53 grams were also recovered which was redeemed by this petitioner out of the stolen amount. Investigation is not yet completed. This petitioner is the main accused 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. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed on 3.7.2023 and that there is no change in circumstance. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Co-accused/A3, who was granted bail by this court is only a Car driver. He is not a beneficiary. Whereas, this petitioner is the prime accused, being a police official he hatched a criminal conspiracy along with A2 and looted Rs.30 lakhs from the defacto complainant and received Rs.10 lakhs towards his share out of stolen amount. Hence, this petitioner cannot claim parity with A3 and also the innocence pleaded by this petitioner cannot be accepted. This petitioner and A2 are the brain behind the crime. Investigation is not yet completed. Remaining portion of amount is not yet recovered. No change in circumstance was reported before this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to this petitioner.

6. Hence, this 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**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No. 17468 /2023**

in

**F-2 Egmore P.S. Crime No. 252/2023**

Manimaran

.. Petitioner/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 in the presence of M/s. M. Rajavelu, R. Raghavel, S. Sarala, 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 6.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 323, 392, 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC and sec. 25(1)(A) of Arms Act in Crime No. 252/2023 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 of the offence and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. He is in custody from 6.6.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and demanded money from him. On his refusal, the accused robbed Rs.600/- from him by showing patta kathi and escaped from the spot. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 9 previous cases. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of crime. Earlier bail application of this petitioner was dismissed on 5.7.2023 and that there is no change in circumstance. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of allegations made against the petitioner, his bad antecedents and no change in circumstance was reported before this court after the dismissal of earlier bail application, 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  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17469/2023**

in

**C-4 Rajiv Gandhi General Hospital P.S. Crime No. 63/2023**

Karthikeyan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
C-4 Rajiv Gandhi General Hospital Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Rajavelu, S. Sarala, 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 2.7.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 379 IPC in Crime No. 63/2023 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. The property involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner has no bad antecedents. He is in custody from 2.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner committed theft of 30 Kg of copper wires and he was caught red-handed at the Out Gate entrance by the security and handed over him to the respondent police. However, he submits that the property involved in this case has been recovered and this petitioner has no bad antecedents.

5. The property involved in this case has been recovered. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the past 20 days. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. 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 VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the 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 VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 17469 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17470/2023**

in

**G-5 Secretariat Colony P.S. Crime No. 120/2023**

P. Manickam

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-5 Secretariat Colony Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Suganya, V. Muthupandi, 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 27.5.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 392, 397, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 120/2023 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 of the offence and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 27.5.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.2500/- from him at knife point. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 24 previous cases. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of crime. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Earlier bail application of this petitioner was dismissed on 14.7.2023. No change in circumstances was reported. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioner 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**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17471/2023**

in

**C-5 Kothawal Chavadi P.S. Crime No. 31/2023**

Srinath

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
C-5 Kothawal Chavadi Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M.K. Yukanth, Habisha Shiji, Corneille Inbaraj, 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 29.6.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 392, 511 of IPC in Crime No. 31/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. This petitioner, co-accused and defacto complainant are known to each other. While consuming liquor, there was quarrel arose between them. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged the present complaint. The alleged occurrence was said to have taken place at 10 p.m. on 28.6.2023 and the complaint was lodged on 29.6.2023 at 10.30 a.m. The petitioner is in custody from 29.6.2023. Hence, he may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.300/- and a cell phone from him at knife point. This petitioner is having two previous cases. This petitioner's earlier bail

application was dismissed only on 17.7.2023 and that there is no change in circumstances. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. This petitioner's earlier bail application was dismissed only on 17.7.2023. Again on 29.7.2023, this petition has been filed. No change in circumstances was reported. This petitioner is having two previous cases. If the petitioner is released on bail, again, he may indulge in similar nature of crime. Considering the nature of offence, antecedents of the petitioner and the objection raised by the CPP, 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

Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No. 17474/2023

in

S.C No. 125/2021

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

in

H-6 R.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No. 590/2013

Basheer @ Basheer Khan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Velmurugan, 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 3.7.2023 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 395 r/w 397 IPC in S.C.No.125/2021 in Crime No. 590/2013 on the file of respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to the ill-health of the petitioner, he could not appear before the trial court on hearing date and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 15.3.2023. 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 3.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 1.6.2023 and it was executed on 3.7.2023. Now the case is pending for trial. The petitioner is having 9

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. On perusal of the records, it appears that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 1.6.2023 and it was executed on 3.7.2023. No document filed for the illness of the petitioner and there is no valid reason stated by the petitioner for his absence on the date of issuance of NBW. The petitioner has not chosen to recall the warrant till his arrest. The reason stated by the petitioner is not convincing. Now, the case is pending for trial. The petitioner is having 9 previous cases at his credit. Earlier bail application of this petitioner was dismissed on 13.7.2023. No change in circumstance is reported after the dismissal of earlier bail application. 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**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No. 17477/2023**

**in**

**S.C No. 107/2021**

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

**in**

**H-6 R.K.Nagar P.S. Crime No. 589/2013**

Basheer @ Basheer Khan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Velmurugan, 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 3.7.2023 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 364, 395, 396 and 506(ii), 201 r/w 34 IPC in S.C.No.107/2021 in Crime No.589/2013 on the file of respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to the ill-health of the petitioner, he could not appear before the trial court on hearing date and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 6.6.2023. 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 3.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 6.6.2023 and it was executed on 3.7.2023. Now the case is pending for trial. The petitioner is having 9

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. On perusal of the records, it appears that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 6.6.2023 and it was executed on 3.7.2023. No document filed for the illness of the petitioner and there is no valid reason stated by the petitioner for his absence on the date of issuance of NBW. The petitioner has not chosen to recall the warrant till his arrest. The reason stated by the petitioner is not convincing. Now, the case is pending for trial. The petitioner is having 9 previous cases at his credit. Earlier bail application of this petitioner was dismissed on 13.7.2023. No change in circumstance is reported after the dismissal of earlier bail application. 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**

**Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Cr.L.M.P.No. 17476/2023**

in

**G-1 Vepery P.S. Crime No. 187/2023**

Poovendhan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

G-1 Vepery Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Muthamizh Selvakumar, M. Jithendran, A. Esaki Pandey, S. Ramesh Kumar, 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 15.7.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 187/2023 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. The petitioner has no previous case. Victim sustained simple injury and he has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner is in custody from 15.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner and the defacto complainant are husband and wife. This petitioner always came to house in drunken state and picked up quarrel with the defacto complainant. On the date of occurrence, this petitioner after consuming alcohol, picked up quarrel with his wife and slashed on her forehead using blade and caused cut injury to her. However, he submits that the victim sustained simple injury and she has been treated as out-patient. The petitioner has no bad antecedents.

5. Wordy quarrel arose between husband and wife. In the melee, this petitioner attacked the complainant using blade and caused cut injury on her forehead. According to CPP, the victim sustained simple injury and she has been treated as out-patient. No previous case is reported against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the past one week. Considering the relationship between the petitioner and the complainant, nature of injury sustained by the victim 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 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 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 17476 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17479/2023**

in

**H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 315/2023**

Rajesh @ Poochi Rajesh

.. Petitioner/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. Karthik 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 offence punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 315/2023 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 12.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner went to the defacto complainant's shop and demanded rowdy mamul from him. On his refusal, the accused forcibly robbed Rs.330/- from him and also assaulted him . This petitioner is having 4 previous cases.

5. The petitioner is in custody for the past 10 days. 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 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. 17479 / 2023**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17480/2023**

in

**H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 313/2023**

1. Sanjay  
2. Arun

.. 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. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, M. Mohamadhu Ajar, G. Sundaresan, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner, who was arrested on 12.7.2023 and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner was arrested on 11.7.2023 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 313/2023 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. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. They are in custody for more than one week. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.430/- from him at knife point. The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having 4 previous cases and the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having 5 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioners are in custody for more than one week. Considering the nature of offence 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 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. 17480 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17482/2023**

in

**H-1 Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 153/2023**

Anthony

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-1 Washermenpet 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 11.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 399 & 402 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 the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 11.7.2023. 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. During regular patrol, the police found them and on enquiry, they came to know about the preparation to commit dacoity by the accused. The petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 14 previous cases.

If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in criminal activities. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the bad antecedents of the petitioner and short duration of custody, 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  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17481/2023**

in

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

Haribabu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-1 Washermenpet 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 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. He has been falsely implicated in this case. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 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. During regular patrol, the police found them and on enquiry, they came to know about the preparation to commit dacoity by the accused. The petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 12 previous cases.

If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in criminal activities. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the bad antecedents of the petitioner and short duration of custody, 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  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 17483/2023**

in

**PEW-Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 198/2023**

Satham @ Navaz Basha

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
PEW-Washermenpet 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 7.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(a), 4(1-A) of TNP Act in Crime No. 198/2023 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. The petitioner is in custody from 7.7.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner was found in possession of 75 bottles of Tasmac brandy in opened state for sale without valid licence and indulged in selling the same for higher price. This petitioner is having 5 previous cases. If he is released on bail, again, he will indulge in similar nature of crime.

5. According to CPP, the property involved in this case has been recovered. No one is reported as hospitalized after consuming the alleged contraband. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 5 previous cases. However, considering the above facts, 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 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 XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 17483 / 2023**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No.17485/2023**

**in**

**S.C.No.297/2023**

**in**

**N.4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Crime No.954/2021**

Thiresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
N.4, Fishing Harbour Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, K.M. Selvakumar, H. Meeran Mohideen, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, who was surrendered before this court on 18.7.2023 and remanded to judicial custody on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 324(4 counts), 307, 307 r/w, 34 IPC in S.C.No.297/2023 in Crime No.954/2021 on the file respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to the absence of the petitioner on the date of hearing on 27.6.2023, this court has issued NBW against him. On 18.7.2023, the petitioner had voluntarily surrendered before this court and filed petition to recall the warrant. However, dismissing the same, the petitioner was remanded to judicial custody. The petitioner was absent only one day. 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 18.7.2023 and hence prays for granting bail.

4. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 27.6.2023. He surrendered before this on 18.7.2023 and filed a petition to recall the warrant. The recall petition and the petitioner was remanded to judicial custody. The case is pending for appearance and the next hearing date is 26.7.2023. Considering the fact that the petitioner was absent for only one hearing and he had surrendered himself voluntarily on 18.7.2023 and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on condition.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a own bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) before the Superintendent of the concerned prison, in which the petitioner has been confined,

(a) the petitioner shall appear before this court on all working days at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

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

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

(e) 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 :  
The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

**Crl.M.P.No.17485/2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No.17486/2023**

in

S.C.No.140/2021

(on the file of learned III Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

**in**

**K.4, Anna Nagar P.S. Crime No.420/2019**

Jeelan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Muthamizh Selvakumar, A. Esaki Pandey, S. Ramesh Kumar, K. Sarath Kumar, 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 28.3.2023 on execution of NBW for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 341, 394 r/w. 397, 506(ii) r/w. 34 IPC in S.C.No.140/2021 in Crime No.420/2019 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to illness, the petitioner was unable to appear before the trial court and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 2.3.2022. Subsequently, he was arrested in another case and in this case he was produced under P.T. warrant and remanded to judicial custody. The petitioner undertakes that hereinafter he will be regular in attending the court. The petitioner has been in custody from 28.3.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that NBW was issued on 2.3.2022 and he was absconding for more than a year. After much effort he was secured by the respondent police. The occurrence is of the year 2019. The case is posted for trial. He seriously objects granting bail stating that if he is released on bail, there is every possibility of his abscondence and the case proceedings would be stalled.

5. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 2.3.2022. On perusal of the records, it is found that from 31.1.2023 he was produced under P.T. warrant and remanded to judicial custody on execution of NBW. According to the counsel for the petitioner, the reason for his non appearance before the trial court is that he was suffering from illness and he was under treatment. But no medical record has been produced to prove his contention. Further, he has not chosen to surrender himself and to file necessary petition to get the warrant recalled. Now the case is posted for trial. If the petitioner is released on bail, the chances of his absconding is more and the case proceedings would be stalled. Under such circumstances, considering the stage of the case and the conduct of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me in open court today.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No.16213/2023**

in

**F.4, Thousand Light P.S. Crime No.not known of 2023**

1. Dhivya  
2. Bharath

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
F.4, Thousandlights Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. P. Thinesh, G.D. Pon Prabhakaran, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s.294(b), 323, 506(i) IPC and Sec.4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No. not known of 2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is the wife of the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner. The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner joined the office of the defacto complainant by depositing Rs.3,800/- as cash security. Since she finds difficult in the job, she decided to leave the job and demanded return of cash security. There arose wordy quarrel. The petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. An exaggerated complaint has been given. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is working as HR Manager in the company, Xtancia Techno Soft OPC Pvt. Ltd., The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner joined the office and paid cash deposit of Rs.3800/-. While so, on 20.6.2023, she along with her husband came to the office and started quarrel demanding return of deposit amount and

also attacked the defacto complainant. Based on the complaint, enquiry is pending in CSR 163/2023. However, he submits that injured has been treated as out-patient and the petitioners have no previous case.

5. It is alleged that the petitioners have threatened the defacto complainant and assaulted him with hands. Only petition enquiry is pending. According to learned CPP, injured has been treated as out-patient and the petitioners have no previous case. No serious objection was raised by learned CPP. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to condition.

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

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open court

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. The XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, F.4, Thousand Light Police Station, Chennai.

**nmk**

**Crl.M.P.No.16213/2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No.17265/2023**

in

**B.2, Esplanade P.S. Crime No.1335/2020**

Sulaiman @ Yasin

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police(L & O),  
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. A.G. Abdul Kareem, M. Karthick, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s.341, 294(b), 363, 307, 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.1335/2020 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The alleged occurrence is said to have been taken place in the year. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused were already enlarged on bail. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A2 along with other accused compelled the defacto complainant to buy drugs. When he informed that he break the habit of consuming drugs, the accused have kidnapped the defacto complainant and assaulted him with knife in a lonely place near IOC Nethaji Nagar and dropped him at



Mannady. Though the occurrence took place during 2020, this petitioner was absconding till date. The petitioner is a named accused. Arrested accused were enlarged on bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Investigation is pending. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The allegation is that this petitioner along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant, as he refused to buy drugs. The occurrence took place during 2020. However, the petitioner, who is a named accused, absconding all these years. He cannot claim parity with that of the co-accused who were enlarged on bail. Considering the serious nature of offence and the conduct of the petitioner, the fact that investigation is pending, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open court

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No.17268/2023**

**in**

**E.4, Abiramapuram P.S. Cr.No.448/2022**

Manikandan @ Nalu Mani

...Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.457, 380 of IPC in Cr.No.448/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. A1 was enlarged on bail. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with another accused break opened the defacto complainant's shop and committed theft of Rs.1,500/-. Investigation is pending. Amount not yet recovered. A1 was enlarged on bail after sufficient period of incarceration. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other accused break opened the defacto complainant's shop and committed theft of cash Rs.1,500/-. Amount not yet recovered and investigation is pending. This petitioner cannot claim parity with

that of the co-accused, who was granted bail after sufficient period of incarceration. Granting anticipatory bail in such cases would send a wrong signal to the society at large. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

nmk

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No.17270/2023**

in

**H.3, Tondiarpet P.S. Crime No.158/2023**

Manikandan Rathinam

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s.294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No.158/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused was already enlarged on bail. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, this petitioner had attacked the defacto complainant with hands and stones. However, he submits that injured has been discharged from the hospital after taking treatment for 3 days and the petitioner has no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection.

5. Quarrel between the parties. It is alleged that the petitioner had attacked the defacto complainant with hands and stones and caused injuries. However, injured has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner has no previous case. No serious objection

was raised by learned CPP. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable in nature. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the XV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners 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 report 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 Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today in the open court

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

nmk

**CrI.M.P.No.17270/2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No.17272/2023**

**in**

**N.4, Fishing Harbour P.S. Cr.No.111/2023**

Suresh Kumar

...Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
N.4, Fishing Harbour Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s.392 of IPC in Cr.No.111/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed a sum of Rs.500/- at knife point and assaulted him. Investigation is pending. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. It is a case of robbery. The allegation is that this petitioner along with other accused robbed cash at knife point. Granting anticipatory bail in such cases would send a wrong signal to the society at large. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**nmk**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No.17267/2023**

in

**H.1, Washermenpet P.S. Crime No.277/2023**

Vikram @ Vikram Kothari

.. 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. Karthick, S. Divakar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s.447, 294(b), 323, 307 IPC in Crime No.277/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. The petitioner is running a plastic bottles wholesale business. The petitioner and the defacto complainant loved each other and after consent by both the families, their marriage was fixed to be held on 29.6.2023 and he has also paid advance amount for catering services for the marriage. While so, in the earlier occasion, the defacto complainant's mother lodged a complaint against him as if he had sent the photographs and vide clippings to her mother damaging her character. However after conducting enquiry, the said complaint was closed. Subsequently, the marriage was stopped by the defacto complainant and her family members. When the petitioner questioned them, this false complaint has been lodged alleging that the petitioner poured kerosine on the defcto complainant and tried to ablaze her. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. In fact, the petitioner had spent Rs.25 lakhs to the family of the defacto complainant. Only to evade



marriage, this false complain has been given. The alleged occurrence is on 14.7.2023. But the complaint has been given only on 16.7.2023. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner had love affair with the defacto complainant. On 14.7.2023, he went to the defacto complainant's house and when refused to talk, he poured kerosine on her and tried to ablaze her. The defacto complainant raised alarm and the neighbours came and saved her. Learned CPP submits that investigation is pending. He seriously objects granting anticipatory bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he went to the defacto complainant's house and poured kerosine on her and tried to ablaze her. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that their families accepted their love and their marriage was fixed to be held on 29.6.2023. The defacto complainant did not turn up and the marriage was stopped. When the petitioner questioned her, this false complaint has been lodged and no such occurrence took place. On perusal of the averments in the FIR, it appears that the petitioner and the defacto complainant loved each other. Already a complaint dated 20.6.2023 was given against the petitioner as he sent their intimate photographs to the mother of the defacto complainant and the same was closed based on the assurance given by the petitioner. There is chances for exaggeration. The arguments put forth by the counsel for petitioner has some force. No one sustained injury. No bad antecedent was reported against the petitioner. The petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the XV 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 report 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 Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today in the open court

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

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

**nmk**

**Crl.M.P.No.17267/2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No.17266/2023**

in

**CCB, Crime No.122/2023**

V. Senthil Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Central Crime Branch-I, Team 16  
Anti Land Grabbing Cell, Veperiy,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. B. Shyam, K. Saranya Dharshini, BT. Dhanesh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following

**ORDER**

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offences u/s. 406, 420 IPC in Crime No.122/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. Petitioner is a land broker by profession. A2/Elango approached A1 to purchase a property, for which, this petitioner along with A1 showed the property of the deceased Prema. Mrs. Prema owner of the property was willing to sell the property and accordingly an unregistered Joint Development Agreement dated 13.1.2017 was entered into between Prema and A2/Elango. Subsequently, Sale Deed was executed in favour of A2 by Prema for a sale consideration of Rs.3,22,95,000/- and the same was registered on 2.2.2017. In the said sale Deed, this petitioner stood as witness. Except the same, this petitioner has no connection in the said transaction. No notice u/s.41A Cr.P.C., was issued. A1 and A2 were granted bail by the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai. A2 was granted bail in CrI.M.P.No.27293/2023 dtaed 12.7.2023 on condition to deposit Rs.2 Crores and A2 had

already deposited the said amount into the Court. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner has been arrayed as A3. A1/Rajendran was taking care of one Prema, relative of the defacto complainant. A1 along with other accused including this petitioner, taking advantage of her mental instability, tried to grab her property and made her to enter into a joint venture agreement with A2/Elango, owner of Lakshmi Builders for development of the property and subsequently obtained a Sale Deed infavour of A2 for a sale consideration of Rs.3,22,95,000/-. Out of which a sum of Rs.40 lakhs was paid into the account of Prema. However, the balance amount of Rs. 2,70,00,000/- was not paid and the accused have shared the crime proceeds among them. After the demise of said Prema, the defcto complainant came to know the execution of Sale Deed and hence lodged this complaint. However, learned CPP submits that this petitioner stood as witness to the Sale Deed. A1 and A2 were granted bail by the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court and the conditional order was complied by A2 by depositing the cash into the Court. He has not raised any serious objection.

5. The allegation is that this petitioner along with other accused tried to grab the property of one Prema(now deceased), relative of the defacto complainant and obtained a Sale Deed without paying sale consideration. The petitioner stood as witness to the said Sale Deed. On perusal of records, already A1 and A2 were granted bail by the Court below. A2 was granted bail with condition to deposit Rs.2,70,00,000/. and he had deposited the said amount vide receipt dated:12.7.2023. Under such circumstances, the custodial interrogation appears to be unnecessary. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the Chief 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 report 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 Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

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

Delivered by me today in the open court

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copies to:

1. The Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, CCB-I, Team 16,  
Anti Land Grabbing Cell, Vepery, Chennai.

**nmk**

**CrI.M.P.No.17266/2023**