

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
COIMBATORE.**

**Present: Thiru.A.K.Babulal, B.Com., LLM,  
I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, COIMBATORE.(i/c)**

**Wednesday, this the 18<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026**

**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION Nos.921/2026 and 922/2026**

Mohan (Age 40 years)

S/o.Palanisamy.

... Petitioner in C.M.P.No.921/2026 / A-1

Eashwaran (Age 39 years)

S/o.Palanisamy.

... Petitioner in C.M.P.No.922/2026 / A-2

/vs/

State, Rep. by

through the Inspector of Police,

**Anti Corruption and Vigilance Coimbatore**

**Crime No.3/2026.**

**Offences:u/s.7(b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act r/w 12 of the Prevention  
of Corruption, 1988.**

Through the Special Public Prosecutor, Coimbatore.

... Respondent

(The Principal District and Session Court, Coimbatore.)

These two petitions filed on behalf of the petitioner in the respective petitions to release them on bail u/s.483 of BNSS.

These two petitions are coming on this day for final hearing before this Court in the presence of **Tvl. A. Parthasarathy And Associates, A. Parthasarathy, G.S.Lalitha, P. Kabilan, A. Syed Abuthahir and S. Elakkiya,** Advocates for the petitioner in C.M.P.No.921/2026 / A-1 and **Tvl. T.Muthumalaisivakumar, R. Prakash, K. Chelladurai, S. Aasathkumar, P. Ajith and M. Selvaganapathi,** Advocates for the petitioner in C.M.P.No.922/2026 / A-2 and of **Thiru. S. Sivakumar, Special public Prosecutor, Vigilance and Anti Corruption,** represented for State, upon perusing the petition submitted and upon hearing both side arguments, this Court pronounced the following:-

## COMMON ORDER

### **Heard both side.**

The petitioner in the respective petitions are the accused in Crime No.3/2026 of Anti Corruption and Vigilance, Coimbatore, for the alleged offence u/s.7(b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act r/w 12 of the Prevention of Corruption, 1988, they have filed these two petitions separately, seeking grant of bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant applied for a new water connection and the said connection was given by the Coimbatore Municipal Corporation. On 19-02-2026, A-1 being Tap Inspector / Skilled Assistant-II Went to the house of the defacto complainant and dishonestly demanded an undue advantage of Rs.6,000/- from the defacto complainant for the above work and instructed the complainant to give the demanded money in the hands of A-2. After completion of the above work, A-1 and A-2 constantly persuaded the demand in person and over cell phone. In pursuance of the demand, A-1 fixed the amount and the same has been accepted by A-2 for himself and on behalf of A-1. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner in C.M.P.No.921/2026 submitted that it is alleged that in this case, amount has been demanded by the accused for giving water connection. On 21-02-2026, tap connection has been given and the purpose of the defacto complainant has been solved. The learned counsel has further submitted that this petitioner is no way connected with the case and no phenolphthalein test was conducted in respect of the petitioner. The learned counsel has further submitted that this petitioner's examination has been scheduled from 23-03-2026 and the petitioner has to write his examinations. The learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he never indulged in any such activities as alleged and he is ready to abide any condition and he is in judicial custody for the past 14 days and prays to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner in C.M.P.No.922/2026 submitted that this petitioner is arrayed as A-2 and this petitioner is the subordinate of A-1. A-1 is the Superior officer of this petitioner. This petitioner has no knowledge about the amount which is demanded as undue advantage. On the date of occurrence, as per the instruction given by the superior officer (A-1), this petitioner went and had received the amount from the defacto complainant. Entire transaction held between A-1 and the defacto complainant and demand was made by A-1. This petitioner never demanded any amount from the defacto complainant. The learned counsel has further submitted that this petitioner is suffering from

Rheumatic problem. The petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he never indulged in any such activities as alleged and he is ready to abide any condition and he is in judicial custody for the past 14 days and prays to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

5. The learned Special Public Prosecutor submitted that on 02-03-2026, defacto complainant lodged complaint against the petitioner in the respective petitions and after conducting preliminary enquiry, and after considering the prima facie case, FIR has been registered in Crime No.22/2026, against the petitioner in the respective petitions for the offences u/s.7(b) r/w 12 of Prevention of Corruption Act. The defacto complainant applied for new water connection and for the said work, A-1 had demanded a sum of Rs.6,000/- as undue advantage and the same was collected by A-2. Both the accused are jointly and severally responsible for the offence. The learned Special Public Prosecutor has further argued that, though A-2 has prayed bail on the medical ground, no piece of medical document has been produced. In this case, on the date of giving tap connection, demand was raised by A-1 and the same was collected by A-2. Both the accused actively participated in the offence and money has been accepted by A-1 and A-2 as reward even after the completion of work. Further in this case, initially A-1 had demanded a sum of Rs.6,000/- from the defacto complainant and subsequently the said amount has been reduced as Rs.5,000/- by A-2 and accordingly both the accused are having knowledge about the undue advantage amount. The learned Special Public Prosecutor has further submitted custodial interrogation period is not yet completed and investigation is in initial stage and at this stage, if the petitioner in the respective petitions are enlarged on bail, they may tamper with the witnesses and hamper the investigation and prayed to dismiss the petitions.

6. After considering the submissions, considering the nature of offence, having regard to the nature of allegation leveled against the petitioner in the respective petitions, as the respondent police arrested the petitioner in the respective petitions recently and investigation is in nascent stage, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner in the respective petitions.

**Hence, both petitions are dismissed.**

This order is dictated to steno-typist, typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me on this 18<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, (i/c)  
COIMBATORE.

**CC to :**

1. The Principal District and Session Court, Coimbatore.
2. The Special Public Prosecutor, Vigilance and Anti Corruption, Coimbatore.
3. The Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption, Coimbatore,
4. Counsel for the Petitioner in the respective petitions / Accused.