

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.17789/2023

in

CCB Crime No.34/2023

O.A.Kaja Moideen

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.M.Balaji, K.Easwar, P.Kumar and M.Kannan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406, 420 and 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.34/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the defacto complainant wanted to purchased the property situated at Velachery through one broker Raja and paid Rs.71,00,000/- as advance to all the four accused and the accused now refused to register the sale deed as agreed by demanding extra amount of Rs.40,00,000/- It is also alleged the patta for the said property stands in the name of one Chandra Bhai. He further submits that the defacto complainant approached the petitioner for buying the property measuring 435 sq.ft. undivided share out of 2400 sq.ft. for a sale consideration of Rs.28,86,525/- and paid Rs.5,00,000/- as advance amount. The said property belongs to the daughter of the petitioner Saleemah and she appointed the petitioner as her Power Agent. The petitioner entered sale agreement dated 14.4.2022 with Narendrababu and Aruna. There is no devision in the land. The time was fixed for 90 days to execute the sale deed. The defacto complainant did not approach the petitioner for registering the sale deed. Instead of filing specific performance suit in civil forum, the defacto complainant took a short-cut method and filed the criminal complaint. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. He is aged 79 years. Hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant wanted to purchase the property from the petitioner and other accused for a sum of Rs.2,10,00,000/- On 14.4.2022, he entered into a sale agreement with the present petitioner and paid Rs.5 lakhs to him. He also entered agreements with other accused and paid Rs.10 lakhs to accused Moideen Abdul Khader and Rs.56 lakhs to accused Shahul Hameed. On receiving the patta from the accused, the defacto complainant found that the patta was given only for 1506 sq.ft. Though the defacto complainant requested the accused to change the patta, they did not change the patta and asked for the entire sale consideration. In November, 2022 when there was compromise talk, the accused demanded extra amount of Rs.40 lakhs and threatened to lodge false complaint.

4. Dispute between the parties regarding sale of immovable property. Already sale agreement was entered between the parties. As far as the petitioner is concerned, he has received Rs.5 lakhs as advance sale consideration. According to the petitioner, the sale deed was not executed within the time. The petitioner is ready to co-operate for the investigation. Considering the nature of dispute, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

SS

CrI.M.P.No.17789/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.17790/2023

in

CCB Crime No.34/2023

Mohideen Abdul Khadhar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.M.Balaji, K.Easwar, P.Kumar and M.Kannan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406, 420 and 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.34/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the defacto complainant wanted to purchased the property situated at Velachery through one broker Raja and paid Rs.71,00,000/- as advance to all the four accused and the accused now refused to register the sale deed as agreed by demanding extra amount of Rs.40,00,000/- It is also alleged the patta for the said property stands in the name of one Chandra Bhai. He further submits that the defacto complainant approached the petitioner for buying the property measuring 330 sq.ft. and 525 sq.ft. undivided share out of 2400 sq.ft. for a sale consideration of Rs.20,89,350/- and Rs.34,99,875/- and paid Rs.5,00,000/- each as advance amount. The petitioner entered sale agreements dated 18.4.2022 with Narendrababu and Aruna. There is no devision in the land. The time was fixed for 90 days to execute the sale deed. The defacto complainant did not approach the petitioner for registering the sale deed. Instead of filing specific performance suit in civil forum, the defacto complainant took a short-cut method and filed the criminal complaint. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. He is aged 69 years. Hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant wanted to purchase the property from the petitioner and other accused for a sum of Rs.2,10,00,000/- On 18.4.2022, he entered into a sale agreements with the present petitioner and paid Rs.10 lakhs to him. He also entered agreements with other accused and paid Rs.5 lakhs to accused Kaja Moideen and Rs.56 lakhs to accused Shahul Hameed. On receiving the patta from the accused, the defacto complainant found that the patta was given only for 1506 sq.ft. Though the defacto complainant requested the accused to change the patta, they did not change the patta and asked for the entire sale consideration. In November, 2022 when there was compromise talk, the accused demanded extra amount of Rs.40 lakhs and threatened to lodge false complaint.

4. Dispute between the parties regarding sale of immovable property. Already sale agreement was entered between the parties. As far as the petitioner is concerned, he has received Rs.10 lakhs as advance sale consideration. According to the petitioner, the sale deed was not executed within the time. The petitioner is ready to co-operate for the investigation. Considering the nature of dispute, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

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

SS

CrI.M.P.No.17790/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.17919/2023

in

C-3, Seven Wells P.S. Crime No.91/2023

1. Bhavik Rathore
2. Moheet L.Rathore

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C-3, Seven Wells Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.P.Subba Reddy, J.D.Srikanth Varma, N.C.Thirumalai Balaji and G.Nagarajan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 448, 385 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.91/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been dragged into the crime only by the defacto complainant for evading the payment of outstanding amount to the petitioners. The petitioners are practising advocates. The defacto complainant has wantonly suppressed the entire facts of the ongoing project at Walltax Road and also in regard to the loan amount he has obtained from Tumkur Co-operative Bank, Karnataka. The defacto complainant is a Contractor. The father of the petitioner late Lalit Kumar C.Jain was the whole and sole reason behind whose goodwill the project has come at this stage today and he is the founder of the project. The defacto complainant approached the father of the petitioner during 2018 to get a loan sanctioned from Tumkur Co-operative Society Bank as the father of the petitioners was in good relation with them. The defacto complainant took additional loan of Rs.2 crores from the said bank on the good faith and guarantee of the father of the petitioners. The property belongs to the father of the petitioners was kept with the bank as good faith and the same shall be released at the instance of the payment of Rs.2 crores. The another property situated at Kodaikanal is lying with the bank because of the loan obtained by the defacto complainant. The father of the

petitioners died on 18.5.2022. When the petitioners approached the defacto complainant, he refused to pay the due of Rs.2 crores to the bank. The petitioners released the property by making payment. The defacto complainant refused to repay the amount that was settled to the bank on his behalf and lodged the present false complaint. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, they may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to dispute regarding property, the petitioners went to the house of the defacto complainant and threatened him to pay Rs.2.5 crores. According to the defacto complainant, he has already paid the entire amount and investigation is pending.

4. Money dispute between the parties. According to the petitioners the defacto complainant has not paid the loan amount to the petitioners, which was repaid by them. According to the defacto complainant, the entire amount has been paid. The petitioners are ready to co-operate for the investigation. Considering the nature of dispute between the parties, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, C-3, Seven Wells Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.17919/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.17930/2023

in

C-2, Elephant Gate P.S. Crime No.111/2023

Kumaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C-2, Elephant Gate Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.111/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the petitioner along with another abused the defacto complainant with filthy language and assaulted him. He further submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner and another waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted with hands and threatened with wooden log. Injured has been treated as outpatient and the petitioner has no previous case.

4. Injured has been treated as outpatient. No bad antecedents reported. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences areailable. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum

to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, C-2, Elephant Gate Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.17930/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18112/2023

in

G-1, Vepery P.S. Crime No.189/2023

1. Selvi

2. Sumathi

.. Petitioners/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.S.Anbarasan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 341, 294(b), 323 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.189/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1st petitioner is the elder sister of the defacto complainant's husband. There was property dispute between the accused and defacto complainant for the past one years. It is alleged that the petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and others and assaulted her. He further submits that it is a counter FIR. The petitioners have not committed any offence. They apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, the petitioners may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to dispute over immovable property, the petitioners waylaid the defacto complainant and others and assaulted with hands and threatened with wooden log. Injured has been treated as outpatient. The petitioners have no previous case. Counter case in Cr.No.188/2023 was also registered.

4. Property dispute between the parties. Case and counter case was registered. Injured has been treated as outpatient. No bad antecedents reported. Except 506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, G-1, Vepery Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.18112/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18137/2023

in

H-1, Washermenpet P.S. Crime No.Not known/2023

Jagadeesan.G.

.. 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.M.Udhayakumar, A.Hariharan, S.Yogapriay and S.Raj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.
2. The learned CPP submits that no complaint and no FIR is pending as against the petitioner before the respondent police.
3. Considering the representation of the learned CPP, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18138/2023

in

D-4, Zam Bazaar P.S. Crime No.Not known/2023

Mohammad Abdul Kaathar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-4, Zam Bazaar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.A.Panneer Chelvam, M.Kruthika and Sarath Kennedy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 420 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the defacto complainant started a business and the accused borrowed money and failed to repay the same. He further submits that the defacto complainant is the father-in-law and lodged the complainant due to family dispute. In 2014, the petitioner was having a business and subsequently, he went to abroad and came down to India in 2018. There is no money transaction between the petitioner and his father-in-law. During the said period, he was in abroad. The petitioner apprehends arrest and hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner is the one of the Managing Partner in the business run by the defacto complainant. He was authorised to sign in the cheques and other documents before the Government authorities along with the defacto complainant. Taking advantage of the same, the petitioner made a fraud and took the cash after debiting the firm's account which was maintained in the City Union Bank of India, Triplicane Branch. Rs.34 lakhs was misappropriated. Legal notices were sent to the bank for honouring the cheques without joint signatures. Enquiry is pending.

4. It is alleged that the petitioner, who is the son-in-law of the defacto complainant and one of the Managing Partner in the business run by the defacto complainant has taken

Rs.34 lakhs from the company. The amount has not been repaid. The defacto complainant lodged the complaint and petition enquiry is pending. Considering the nature of case and amount involved, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18139/2023

in

C-3, Seven Wells P.S. Crime No.89/2023

Bhuvaneshwaran

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C-3, Seven Wells Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.R.Ganesh Kumar, C.Vadivel, G.Moses, A.Vinoth Kumar, P.Ramu and M.Aadhithyan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 392 of IPC in Crime No.89/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that 4 identifiable persons came in a two-wheeler, waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted him in hands and also robbed Rs.6000/- from him. He further submits that as per the prosecution two arrested accused have robbed the amount. The petitioner is arrayed as A4. He has no specific overtact. The petitioner is innocent. He apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with three others waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.6000/- from him at knife point. Based on the confession of the arrested accused, the petitioner has been implicated in this case. Arrest of the accused is necessary for custodial interrogation. Hence, strongly opposed the petition.

4. It is alleged that the petitioner and other three accused came in two-wheeler and robbed Rs.6000/- from the defacto complainant. According to the prosecution, arrest of the petitioner is necessary for custodial interrogation. Considering the nature of case and strong objection raised by the prosecution, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18140/2023

in

P-6, Kodungaiyur P.S. Crime No.316/2023

Suresh

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 420 of IPC in Crime No.316/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that there was car loan transaction between the petitioner and defacto complainant and the petitioner is in default in paying the loan and misused the car. He further submits that the petitioner obtained car loan of Rs.14 lakhs and Rs.7,00,000/-was paid to the petitioner. The petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. He apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, the petitioner may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner obtained car loan from the defacto complainant Bank and failed to repay the loan amount. When the employees of the Bank visited the place of the petitioner, the vehicle was not there. On verification with RTO, it came to know that on 18.11.2022 the petitioner forged the seal of the defacto complainant Bank and with forged signature he sold the car to another person. The loan amount has not been recovered. Arrest of the petitioner is necessary for custodial interrogation. Hence, strongly opposed the petition.

4. The petitioner purchased car by availing loan from the defacto complainant bank and failed to repay the loan amount. Further, the petitioner by forging the signature and seal of the bank, sold the car to another person. According to the prosecution, amount has not

been recovered, arrest of the petitioner is necessary for custodial interrogation. Considering the nature of case and strong objection raised by the prosecution, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18142/2023

in

P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.279/2023

Anandan @ Anandbabu

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.C.Johnson Samuel, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC r/w 120-B of IPC in Crime No.279/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the petitioner and others assaulted the defacto complainant with knife and caused serious injuries to him. He further submits that the petitioner is no way connected with the said offence. He has been implicated based on the confession of A1 and A4. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police and hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, the petitioner and others assaulted the defacto complainant with knife on his head and caused grievous injuries to him. The petitioner is having 9 previous cases. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. Hence, strongly opposed the petition.

4. It is alleged that due to previous enmity, the petitioner and others assaulted the defacto complainant with knife on his head and caused grievous injuries to him. According to the prosecution, the petitioner is having 9 previous cases and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary. Considering the nature of offence, bad antecedents of the

petitioner and strong objection raised by the prosecution, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18152/2023

in

J-7, Velachery P.S. Crime No.272/2023

1. Davinder Singh
2. Suresh Kumar Mandal
3. Gulab Mandal
4. Balram
5. Ashirvad Kumar Sah
6. Amit Kumar
7. Manish Kumar
8. Vikesh Kumar Sah
9. Vishal Kumar Shah

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
J-7, Velachery Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.K.Manickavasagam, U.Yuvaraj, A.Vinoth Kumar, M.Dhilipan and T.Kanimozhi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 341, 427, 448 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.272/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is alleged that the petitioners trespassed into the shop of the defacto complainant, abused the Manager and assaulted him. It is also alleged that the accused damaged the shop, cctv camera and car mirror. He further submits that counter case in Cr.No272/2023 was registered. Due to business rivalry, the false complaint has been lodged. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, they may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity, the petitioners and others went to the shop of the defacto complainant and damaged the shop, cctv camera and car mirror and investigation is pending.

4. The allegation is that the petitioners entered the shop of the defacto complainant, damaged the shop, cctv camera and car mirror. No one sustained injury. Business dispute between the parties. Case and counter-case has been registered. The petitioners are ready to co-operate for the investigation. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, J-7, Velachery Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.18152/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18154/2023

in

J-6, Thiruvanmiyur P.S. Crime No.145/2023

Sowndharya

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J-6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.N.Senthilkumar, R.Girija, C.Chandrasekaran, J.Manikandan and J.Mercy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 147, 448, 342, 294(b), 323, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.145/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the accused along with others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and assaulted her son with knife. He further submits that the petitioner is innocent and she has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the accused along with others trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and assaulted her son with knife. Injured was admitted in the hospital for one week and thereafter discharged. The petitioner has no previous case.

4. Injured has been discharged. No bad antecedents reported. The petitioner is ready to co-operate for the investigation. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, J-6, Thiruvanmiyur Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.18154/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18156/2023

in

F-3, Nungambakkam P.S. Crime No.Not known/2023

Martin Luther

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 294(b), 323, 341 and 506(i) of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant with sharp weapon. He further submits that the defacto complainant and his friend Ganapathi assaulted the petitioner with brick. The petitioner was admitted in the hospital and discharged on 25.7.2023. However, the false complaint has been given against the petitioner. The petitioner apprehends arrest and hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the injured has been treated as outpatient and the petitioner has no previous case.

4. Injured has been treated as outpatient. The petitioner has no previous case. Only CSR pending and no case has been registered. Considering the nature of case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum

to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, F-3, Nungambakkam Police Station, Chennai.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.18156/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18143/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.13151/2023

in

Crime No.70/2023

1. J.Latha
2. M.Palani
3. M.Senthilnathan
4. J.Kavitha

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

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

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.J.Suresh, Rajaram, R.Vijayaraj Naren, R.Rajesh and M.Manodeeban, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13151/2023, dt: 14.6.2023.
2. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13151/2023, dated 14.6.2023 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.
3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition for 35 days.
4. The petitioners have complied the condition for 35 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.
5. (i) Petition is allowed.
(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18144/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.13449/2023

in

Crime No.53/2023

S.Vijai

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

J-13, Tharamani Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13449/2023, dt: 15.6.2023.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13449/2023, dated 15.6.2023 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for 35 days.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition for 35 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18145/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.14022/2023

in

Crime No.207/2023

Karthick

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

D-6, TIW Anna Square Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.14022/2023, dt: 23.6.2023.

2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.14022/2023, dated 23.6.2023 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for 31 days.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition for 31 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18147/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.13292/2023

in

Crime No.109/2023

1. Tamilarasan @ Tamilayya

2. Rajesh.D.

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P-3, Vyasarpadi Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.M.Srinivasan and A.Krishnamurthy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13292/2023, dt: 14.6.2023.

2. The petitioners were granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.13292/2023, dated 14.6.2023 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioners have complied the condition for 39 days.

4. The petitioners have complied the condition for 39 days. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18263/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.15142/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.12060/2023

in

Crime No.151/2023

1. N.Vishal

2. N.Akash

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

N-1, Royapuram Police Station, Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.Kingston Jerold, R.Vijay and Sabarish, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.15142/2023, dt: 3.7.2023.

2. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.12060/2023, dated 5.6.2023 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders. The condition was modified and the petitioners were directed to appear before the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has complied the condition for 25 days after modification.

4. The petitioner has complied the condition for 25 days after modification. Considering the nature of case and the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No.18148/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.17083/2023

in

Crime No.143/2023

Naveen

.. 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.Anandan and G.Suresh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks modification of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.17083/2023, dt: 18.7.2023.
2. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.17083/2023, dated 18.7.2023 with condition that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has some life threat by enemies and he received such information through his friends. Hence, the petitioner has decided to move to his relative house at Chengalpet. Hence, the condition to appear before the respondent police may be modified and the petitioner is ready appear before any other police station or Magistrate Court.
4. Learned CPP submits that the petitioner has not even complied the condition for single day and filed the modification petition, hence, strongly opposed the petition.

5. The bail was granted on 18.7.2023. So far the petitioner has not complied the condition for single day. Further, the reason stated by the petitioner for modification of the condition is not sufficient and acceptable. Hence, this court is not inclined to modify the condition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.**

Crl.M.P.No.18151/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.11655/2023

in

C.A.No.279/2023

in

C.C.No.460/2014

(on the file of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate. FTC-III, Saidapet, Chennai)

Sindhu Senthivel

.... Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

Vs.

M/s.Bhavani Security & Night Patrol,
Rep. by its Proprietor Mr.S.V.Sethuraj,
No.53/103, 2nd Street, Parameshwari Nagar,
Adyar, Chennai-600020.

.... Respondent/Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.N.Ravishankar Vallatharasu and Sangarganesh, Counsel for the petitioner, upon hearing the counsel for the petitioner, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks extension of time granted in Crl.M.P.No.11655/2023, dated 24.5.2023.

2. As per the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.11655/2023, dated 24.5.2023 this court suspended the sentence imposed on the petitioner with condition to deposit 20% of the compensation amount before the trial court within 60 days from the date of the order. Now, the present petition has been filed to extend the time.

3. According to the counsel for the petitioner, the father of the petitioner was admitted in the hospital for kidney failure and the petitioner was forced to spend huge amount for treatment. Now, the petitioner is trying to arrange funds. Hence, the time may be extended.

4. Considering the reasons stated by the petitioner, this court is inclined to grant further time for two weeks to deposit the amount.

5. Petition is allowed and two weeks time till 11.8.2023 is granted to deposit the 20% of the compensation amount.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18247/2023

in

P-1, Pulianthope P.S. Crime No.279/2023

1. Santhosh

2. Sibi @ Elavarasan

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P-1, Pulianthope Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.A.Salmaan Faris, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 9.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.279/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is alleged that the 1st accused along with 4 others waylaid the defacto complainant and assaulted him with deadly weapon. He further submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are in custody from 9.7.2023. Co-accused has been released on bail in Crl.M.P.No.17084/2023. The petitioners have no previous case. Hence, the petitioners may be granted bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that due to previous enmity the petitioners and others assaulted the defacto complainant with knife and investigation is pending.

4. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused has been granted bail by this court. The petitioners are in custody from 9.7.2023. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

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

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

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

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.18247/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.18248/2023

in

H-3, Tondiarpet P.S. Crime No.174/2023

Rakki

.. 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.Prabhu Doss and M.Velmurugan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.7.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 294(b), 392, 397 of IPC in Crime No.174/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the petitioner used filthy language and robbed Rs.130/- and one MI Cellphone from the defacto complainant. She further submits that the petitioner is innocent and he is in custody from 17.7.2023. The petitioner is ready to abide by any condition and hence, he may be granted bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed his cellphone and cash Rs.130/- He is involved in two previous cases.

4. The petitioner is in custody from 17.7.2023. Investigation is almost completed. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

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

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

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

ss

Crl.M.P.No.18248/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.17649/2023

in

D-4, Zam Bazaar P.S. Crime No.144/2022

Samuel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-4, Zam Bazaar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.S.Shankar, D.Jagan, S.G.Saravana Kumar and B.Rajesh, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 406 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.144/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is alleged that the petitioner assured to secure 1st Standard school seat at Kendriya Vidhyalaiya, Avadi for the daughter of the defacto complainant's friend, stating that the petitioner was very close to Union Finance Minister and Governor of Telungana and believing the words, Rs.1,00,000/- was transferred into the account of the petitioner in four instalments and subsequently, the petitioner failed to secure the school admission and also refused to return the money. Further, it is alleged that the petitioner threatened the defacto complainant. He further submits that the case has been registered on the direction of the learned Magistrate. The petitioner never promised to secure school admission. Already there was enmity between the defacto complainant and the petitioner. He apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, the petitioner may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner demanded Rs.3 lakhs and received Rs.1 lakhs on the assurance of getting school admission to the daughter of the defacto complainant friend. Thereafter, he neither secured the school admission nor repaid the amount and threatened the defacto complainant.

4. On perusal of the copy of the bank transaction and Gpay account transaction, it is seen that a sum of Rs.10,000/-, Rs.10,000/- and Rs.20,000/- were transferred to the account of the petitioner. However, from whom account the amount has been transferred has not been mentioned in the copy. Further, the amount of Rs.49,000/- and Rs.1,000/- were transferred to some other person's account. Further, the petitioner is ready to co-operated for the investigation. Considering the above circumstances, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, D-4, Zam Bazaar Police Station, Chennai.

ss

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Principal Sessions Judge.

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023

Crl.M.P.No.18149/2023

in

Crl.M.P.No.16083/2023

in

Crime No.207/2023

Jayakumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

TIW, D-6, Anna Square Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

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

ORDER

1. The petitioner seeks modification of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16083/2023, dt: 12.7.2023.

2. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.16083/2023, dated 12.7.2023 with condition that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has sustained grievous injuries on his leg and plate was fixed on his leg. Hence, he is unable to comply the condition. Therefore, the condition may be modified. He also submitted the photocopy of the petitioner and x-ray copy.

4. Considering the reasons stated by the petitioner, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.17929/2023

and

Crl.M.P.No.18297/2023

(Intervene Petition)

in

V-4, Rajamangalam P.S. Crime No.Not known/2023

1. N.Senthil Kumar

2. T.Selvaraj

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.R.Thanjan, V.Umameswari and S.Sathiskala, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and of M/s.C.S.Loganathan and S.Lakshmipathy, Counsel for the intervenor and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 107, 440 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.Not known/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is alleged that on the instigation of the 2nd petitioner, the 1st petitioner trespassed in the house of the defacto complainant and also threatened in respect of a property dealing of his friends' circle. He further submits that the petitioners have not involved in any offence. The defacto complainant invited the 1st petitioner to have coffee. However, lodged the complaint. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, the petitioners may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP and the learned counsel for the intervenor submit that the property at Karur District belonging to the father-in-law of the defacto complainant and his family members. One Ponnusamy, who is brother of T.K.Subramaniam died on 5.8.2022 due to cancer. Knowing the fact, one Dharmaraj Power Agent of Ponnusamy created fabricated documents and life certificate of deceased Ponnusamy. On

the same day, i.e., 5.8.2022, proposed accused Dharmaraj and Elango executed registered sale deed in favour of Elango vide Document No.1910of 2022, SRO, Chinnadharapuram, Karur District. The wife of the petitioner and mother-in-law filed application for cancellation of the sale deed. The accused along with henchmen demanding to withdraw the said complaint and the accused Senthilkumar came to the house of the defacto complainant and threatened him and his family members.

4. There was property dispute and the defacto complainant has already given complaint before the Inspector General of Registration, Chennai for cancellation of the document. As far as the present complaint is concerned, it is alleged the petitioner Senthikumar went to the house of the defacto complainant and threatened him. No case has been registered so far. Considering the nature of allegation, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

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

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

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 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 open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. The XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.17929/2023

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

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

Friday, the 28th day of July, 2023.

Crl.M.P.No.17785/2023

in

W-2, A.W. P.S. Crime No.5/2023

R.Shravan Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
W-2, All Women Police Station,
Triplicane,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.K.P.Sathish Kumar, I.Bobby Portia and A.Abdul Hadi, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s 417 of IPC and Sec.4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.5/2023 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the sister of the petitioner Priyanka, who was A4 in the above case, was married to the defacto complainant's brother Saravanan. A4 Priyanka left the matrimonial home due to suspicious nature of her husband Saravanan. She lodged a complaint in Hyderabad and a case was registered. The said Saravanan, through his sister Deepika, lodged the present false complaint against his wife Priyanka and her family members. Deepika has one-side love with the petitioner / A1. Previously, the brother of the defacto complainant and his wife A4 and A1 has proposed to do a fencing business in Hyderabad and the said Saravanan sponsored Rs.7 lakhs. The petitioner returned the entire amount by account transfer. Saravanan created several problems with A4 his wife and with A1, the petitioner / brother-in-law. As per the complaint, the defacto complainant only has love affairs. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the brother of the defacto complainant Saravanan married one Priyanka on 29.4.2018. The petitioner is the brother of

the said Priyanka. She informed about her brother and gave the phone number of the defacto complainant to him. She also offered to marry him with the defacto complainant and asked to love him. Believing her words, the defacto complainant loved him and met frequently. Thereafter, he accused asked for Rs.7 lakhs for doing business and the brother of the defacto complainant gave the same. Thereafter, he demanded Rs.2,50,000/- for the marriage and the same also given. He demanded 30 sovereign jewels for the marriage. He came to Chennai and had physical relationship with the defacto complainant on compulsion at her house. Thereafter, Priyanka informed that the petitioner called and refuse to marry the defacto complainant. His parents also abused the defacto complainant. Arrest of the petitioner is necessary for interrogation. Hence, strongly opposed the petition.

4. It is alleged that the petitioner, on the false promise of getting married the defacto complainant, has physical relationship with her by compulsion. Thereafter, he refused to marry her. It is also alleged that the petitioner received amounts from the defacto complainant's family and also demanded more dowry for the marriage. According to the prosecution, Arrest of the petitioner is necessary for interrogation. Hence, strongly opposed the petition. Considering the serious nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in open court.

ss

Principal Sessions Judge