

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No. 18084/2023**

**in**

**S.C No. 243/2022**

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

**in**

**K-3 Aminjikai P.S. Crime No. 88/2021**

A. Balamurali

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
K-3 Aminjikai Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. J. Anand, B. Balamurugan, S. Raghul, 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 23.6.2023 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 452, 307, 506(ii) and 120(B) IPC in S.C.No. 243/2022 in Crime No. 88/2021 on the file respondent police , seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to his non-appearance before the trial court, NBW was issued against him on 8.6.2023. His absence is neither wilful nor wanton. This petitioner was absent for only one hearing. He undertakes that hereafter, he will be regular in attending the court. He is in custody from 23.6.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 8.6.2023 and it was executed on 23.6.2023. Now, the case is pending at evidence stage. If the petitioner 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 material available on records, it would go to show that NBW was issued against the petitioner on 8.6.2023 and it was executed on 23.6.2023. The petitioner was absent for one hearing. Now, the case is pending at evidence stage. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Considering the above facts, stage of the case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail with 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 XIX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai and on further condition that

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

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the said Court on all working days at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

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

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond during trial.

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

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

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

**Principal Sessions Judge**

Copy to :

1. The XIX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 18084/2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,**  
**Principal Sessions Judge**  
**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18092/2023**

in

C.C.No.5196/2023

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

in

**K-2 Ayanavaram P.S. Crime No. 209/2023**

Akash @ Akashraj

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, D. Jaisankar, 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 arrested on 15.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 380, 511 of IPC in CC No. 5196/2023 in Crime No. 209/2023 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. He is in custody from 15.6.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner trespassed into the defacto complainant's house when he went out and attempted to commit theft. This petitioner is having 6 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. No offence committed. Attempt only made. The petitioner is in custody for the past 43 days. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 6 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 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 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 V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 18092 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18093/2023**

in

**G-3 Kilpauk P.S. Crime No. 153/2023**

Vijayakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Subash Chandrabose, G. Pandian, G. Penosh, S. Ammaiyappan, 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 5.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 457 IPC r/w sec. 4 of TNPHW Act 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 and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. He has been falsely implicated in this case with an ulterior motive. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. He is in custody from 5.7.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that on 3.7.2023, at midnight 1.00 O'Clock, when the defacto complainant sleeping in her house alone, this petitioner sitting in the corner of the room. After seeing him, the defacto complainant screamed. But, the petitioner strangulated her neck and closed her eyes and sitting on her. The defacto complainant struggled and pulled his banian and spatika mala. She came out from the

room and called her neighbours for help. Thereafter, this petitioner ran away from the house. Investigation is going on. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was present at defacto complainant's house while she was sleeping alone that too at midnight 1.00 p.m. with an evil intention. Due to the activity of the petitioner, the defacto complainant screamed. The attitude of the petitioner cannot be condoned. Considering the grave nature of offence, conduct and attitude of the petitioner, and that investigation is not yet completed, this court 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**  
**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18096/2023**  
in  
**D-5 Marina P.S. Crime No. 132/2023**

S. Arunagiri

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C.K.M. Appaji, S. Shanmugam, M. Subha, S. Samson, 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 offences punishable under Section 294(b), 341, 397, 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 the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody from 2.7.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with two other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.500/- from him at knife point. This petitioner is having 6 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for more than three weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 6 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 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 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 II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 18096 / 2023**



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,  
Principal Sessions Judge  
Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18102/2023**

in

**CCB, Bank fraud Wing Crime No. 58/2023**

M.S. Senthil

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCB, Bank Fraud Wing,  
Vepery,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C. Vidhusan, Shanmitha.S 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 offences punishable under Section 120-B r/w 420 IPC in Crime No. 58/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner is a panel valuer of the defacto complainant's bank. The allegation against the petitioner is that he quoted higher valuation for the property without inspecting the disputed property and gave valuation report and based on his valuation report, the bank had sanctioned the loan to A1 and sustained loss. This petitioner had given the valuation report based on the guideline value and market value prevailed at that time and it cannot be disputed in the year 2023. The bank had granted loan to A1 based on the salary slip and IT returns of the borrower. The bank has right to reject the loan application of the borrower. This petitioner is no way involved in the said criminal conspiracy and there is no money transaction between the petitioner and the other accused. The petitioner is working as panel valuer for more than 20 years . The allegation in the FIR are totally false. This petitioner is innocent of the

offence. He is in custody from 13.7.2023. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant bank has sanctioned housing loan to one Prashanth /A1 vide loan application dated 3.10.2018 to the tune of Rs.40,00,000/- and the account has become NPA in the year 2019. After due verification of all the documents submitted by A1, the bank has conducted another valuation of the property and vide the valuation report it was stated that the value of the property is Rs.23,30,000/- in the year 2022. This petitioner being a panel valuer of the defacto complainant's bank, colluded with other accused, hatched a criminal conspiracy and he had given higher valuation for the property as the property measuring 1180 sq.feet instead of its original extent of 847 sq.feet to the tune of Rs.65,38,000/- without inspecting the disputed property and based on his valuation report, the bank had sanctioned the loan to A1. This petitioner facilitated A1 to get additional loan by submitting forged documents and thus cheated the bank and caused wrongful loss to the bank. Investigation is at preliminary stage. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. If he is released on bail, he may tamper the evidence and will cause hindrance to investigation. Hence, he stoutly objects the grant of bail.

5. This petitioner was arrested on 13.7.2023 for the alleged offence u/s.120-B r/w 420 IPC. The allegation against the petitioner is that he being the panel valuer of the defacto complainant bank, without inspecting the property, gave higher valuation for the disputed property colluded with other accused as if the property admeasuring to an extent of 1180 sq.feet though its original extent is 847 sq.feet. Based on his valuation report, the defacto complainant bank has sanctioned Rs.40 lakhs to A1 in the year 2018. Thereafter, A1 has not paid EMI and therefore the account became NPA in the year 2019. After that the bank has verified the documents and found that the documents produced by A1 are all forged one and also the valuation certificate issued by this petitioner is also for an exaggerated value. During investigation, it came to light the original value of the property is Rs.23,30,000/- in the year 2022. But, this petitioner had given a higher valuation for the property to the tune of Rs.65,38,000/-. Due to the criminal act of this petitioner, the defacto complainant bank sustained wrongful loss. Based on the valuation report issued

by this petitioner, the bank had sanctioned housing loan of Rs.40,00,000/- to A1 and therefore, prima facie, the offence made out against the petitioner. Investigation is at preliminary stage. Considering the role played by this petitioner, cheated amount is not yet recovered, short duration of custody and stage of the investigation, 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**  
**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18103/2023**

in

S.C.No.420/2023

in

**P-6 Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No. 108/2023**

Manikandan @ Vellai Mani

.. 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. G. Penosh, K. Subash Chandra Bose, G. Pandian, S. Ammaiyappan, 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 9.3.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 302, 506(ii) r/w 120-B, 149 IPC in S.C.No. 420/2023 in Crime No. 108/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the victim is a notorious rowdy element. He earned several enemies. Someone might have murdered him. This petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Investigation is completed. Charge sheet has been filed and the case has been committed to the Court of Sessions. The petitioner is in custody from 9.3.2023. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him and prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused murdered the defacto complainant's husband Ragupathy. Hence, the complaint.

5. According to CPP, this petitioner was detained under Act 14/1982. HCP is pending before Hon'ble High Court. His detention order is not yet set aside. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

6. Considering the objection made by the CPP, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

7. 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  
Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18104/2023**

in

**H-5 New Washermenpet P.S. Crime No. 252/2023**

Antony

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
H-5 New Washermenpet Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Anbuselvan, V. Karthick, 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 15.6.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 323, 397, 506(ii) IPC 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 offences. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused was released on bail by this court on 7.7.2023 in CrI.M.P.No.15896/2023. The petitioner is in custody from 15.6.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner along with other accused waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.630/- from him at knife point. This petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 8 previous cases. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. The petitioner is in custody for 43 days. Co-accused was already granted bail by this court on 7.7.2023. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 8 previous cases.

However, considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner with 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, Sub-Jail, Saidapet, Chennai.

vv

**Crl.M.P.No. 18104 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18105/2023**

in

**D-3 Ice House P.S. Crime No. 186/2023**

1. Premkumar

2. Subhan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

D-3 Ice House Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Mohan Raj, G. Vinoth Kumar, M. Vinothini, 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 12.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 392, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 186/2023 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 of the offences. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are in custody from 12.7.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners demanded money from the defacto complainant to consume alcohol. On his refusal, the accused forcibly robbed Rs.300/- from him at knife point. The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is having one murder case, 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner is having two previous cases including one murder case.



5. The petitioner is in custody for the past two weeks. Period for taking custodial interrogation is over. Considering the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners with 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 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. 18105 / 2023**

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

**Principal Sessions Judge**

**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18106/2023**

in

S.C.No. 388/2023

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

in

**P-1 Pulianthope P.S. Crime No. 8/2023**

Ajith @ Sasikumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. Ilayaraja Kandasamy, S. Hariprasad, A. Mageshwari, 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 7.1.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 324, 302, 506(ii), 149 IPC in S.C.No.388/2023 in Crime No. 8/2023 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 offences. He was detained under Act 14/1982. Now his detention order has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court in HCP No. 372/2023 dated 24.7.2023. The petitioner is in custody from 7.1.2023. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, this petitioner along with other accused brutally attacked the defacto complainant's husband using deadly weapons. Due to which, he sustained grievous injuries and died on the way to hospital. Hence, the complaint.

5. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that the detention revocation order is not produced by the counsel for the petitioner, 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**

**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No. 18114/2023**

**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 21.7.2023. 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**

**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**Crl.M.P.No. 18115/2023**

**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 21.7.2023. 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**

**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18128/2023**

in

**J-6 Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No. 266/2023**

1. Kannan

2. Siva

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J-6 Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M.G. Mathivanan, Kathiravan, C. Ravi, K. Vijayalakshmi, 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 7.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 6(b), 7 r/w 20(1) of COTP Act and sec. 328 IPC in Crime No.266/2023 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 of the offence and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. False case has been foisted on them only for statistical purpose. The petitioners are in custody from 7.7.2023 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners were illegally found in possession of 205 Kg of banned tobacco products for sale and apart from that cash Rs.58,000/- towards the sale proceeds of tobacco products and the properties were recovered from the petitioners. However, according to CPP, huge quantity of tobacco products were seized. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.



5. Considering the fact that huge quantity of banned tobacco products and cash Rs.58,000/- towards sale proceeds were seized from the petitioners, no valid reason stated for possession of such a huge quantity of banned tobacco products and non completion of investigation, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners 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**  
**Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023**

**CrI.M.P.No. 18108/2023**  
in  
**CCB-I Team-9 Crime No. 151/2023**

Sasikumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCB-I, Team-9,  
Vepperi, Egmore,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Selvabharathi, S.M. Raghuram, M. Satham Hussain, 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 406, 420 r/w sec. 34 IPC in Crime No. 151/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this petitioner was originally arrested on 1.9.2022 in Crime No.224/2022. Thereafter he was detained under Act 14/1982 on 12.12.2022. This petitioner is innocent of the offence. This petitioner is friend of defacto complainant. They known very well from the year 2012 onwards. The defacto complainant is an Assistant Professor in Government Colleges since 2009. He acted as a right hand of the former Higher Education Minister K.P. Anbalagan and he was being the treasurer of Tamilnadu SC/ST University College Teacher's Association. Both are living at one apartment. At one point of time, this petitioner had difference of opinion with the defacto complainant. Due to which, he lodged the present false case against the petitioner . The allegations narrated in the FIR against this petitioner is totally false. In this case, this

petitioner was arrested on 7.7.2023. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. Hence, prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that it is a case of job racketing. This petitioner posed himself as Public Grievance Director of Central Government, fabricated fake identity card with Central Government seal and utilising the same totally received Rs. 3 Crores from 36 innocent persons including the defacto complainant under the guise of securing Member post at TNPSC, Assistant Professor post and TNPSC Group 2A post. This petitioner received Rs.1,85,00,000/- as 1<sup>st</sup> instalment on 30.10.2017 and received Rs.1,15,00,000/- as second instalment on 15.11.2017. Thereafter failed to secure the job nor returned the amount. This petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 16 previous cases of similar nature at his credit. Cheated amount is not yet recovered. Investigation is at preliminary stage. If the petitioner is released on bail, there is every possibilities for his abscondence. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of job racketing. This petitioner was arrested on 7.7.2023 in this case for the alleged offence u/s. 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC. The allegation made against the petitioner is that he along with other accused totally collected Rs.3 Crores from the defacto complainant and 36 victims under the guise of securing Member Post at TNPSC Assistant Professor post and also TNPSC Group 2A post. The cheated amount is very huge and the same is not yet recovered. Arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Investigation is at preliminary stage. According to CPP, this petitioner is a habitual offender and he is having 16 previous cases of similar nature. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. Considering the role played by this petitioner, involvement of huge amount, cheated amount is not yet recovered, investigation is at preliminary stage 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**

