

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENGALPATTU**

Present : Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Dated: Monday, the 01st day of June 2026

Crl.M.P. No.1521 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003257-2026)

Vijayalakshmi, W/o.Boopathy,
Aged about 56 years,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Vigilance & Anti Corruption, Chengalpattu,
Cr. No.02/AC/2026/CP

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 as amended by
The Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.N.Kanakaraj, the learned counsel is appearing for petitioner/accused and of M/s.T.G.Kavitha, the learned Special Public Prosecutor is appearing for the respondent/complainant, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following

ORDER

This petition is filed U/s.480 and 483 of BNSS 2023, seeking to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

2. The petitioner/accused has been charged for the alleged offences U/s.7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 as amended by The Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply received. Heard both sides. Records are perused.

4. The case as projected by the prosecution is that on 12.11.2025, the defacto complainant applied for the government assistance for the Chief Ministers Girls Child Protection Scheme through E-Seva Centre and submitted the relevant documents in hardcopy to the petitioner/accused - who was worked as Rural Welfare Officer at BDO Office at Madurantakam. Thereafter, the petitioner/accused came to the defacto complainant's village and made an enquiry regarding her application. Thereafter, the petitioner/accused contacted the defacto complainant over phone and demanded an undue advantage of Rs.1,000/- from her, for issuance of Bond under the Girls child scheme. Being not interested to give the bribe amount, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent police, accordingly, after verifying the antecedents of the accused and credibility of the complaint, a case in Cr. No.02/AC/2026/CP has been registered on the file of Vigilance & Anti Corruption, Chengalpattu.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner/accused was arrested and remanded on 08.05.2026 and she is under judicial custody for the past 25 days; according to the prosecution, the defacto complainant submitted her application on 12.11.2025, but at that time, the petitioner was working as a Anganwadi Worker at Thirukalukundram Child Development Scheme Office and only in the forenoon of 13.01.2026, she joined by promotion as Rural Welfare Officer at Madurantakam BDO office, hence, she never seen / met the defacto complainant on the alleged period of time; even on 07.05.2026 and 08.05.2026, she never met the defacto complainant nor received any money from her as alleged by the prosecution; in fact the Phenolphthalein test conducted on both of her hands found negative; moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon her and she is ready to offer substantial sureties before the court and

prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. The learned Special Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, objected to grant bail to the petitioner stating that at the time of trap, the petitioner/accused re-iterated her earlier demand of undue advantage of Rs.1,000/-, but asked the defacto complainant to put the said amount in the register which was kept in her table. Further, the investigation is at the preliminary stage, some of the witnesses are yet to be examined, documents are to be collected. At this stage, if the petitioner is released on bail, she would use her official position and tamper the evidence, that would hamper the investigation and prays for the dismissal of the petition.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner, in reply, would submit that since the witnesses are the Public Servants and evidences are documentary in nature, the petitioner being suspended from service, there is no possibility for tampering the witnesses and evidences. Moreover, nothing has been recovered from the petitioner and that best part of the investigation ought to have been completed by this time and prays to consider the bail application.

8. From the records, it is seen the occurrence has taken place on 07.05.2026 and 08.05.2026, the accused is under judicial custody from the same date. The total period of custody exceeds 25 day. It is pleaded by the learned counsel for the petitioner that while the defacto complainant applied for Government's Assistance, the petitioner/accused was working at Thirukalukundram and the Phenolphthalein test conducted during trap on both of her hands found negative. Since the witnesses are the Government Officials and the evidences are documentary in nature, there is no possibility for the petitioner/accused to tamper the witnesses or evidences.

Taking into consideration of the duration of custody undergone by the petitioner/accused, substantial portion of investigation has been completed, the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

9. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioner/accused is ordered to be released on bail on her execution of bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of this court, with further conditions that,

1. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression (LTI) in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce any of the identity proof to ensure their identity;
2. The petitioner/accused is directed to report before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of 30 days;
3. The petitioner/accused should not tamper the evidence either during investigation or trial;
4. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report before this court and appropriate action will be taken in accordance with the decision in *AIR 2006 SC 100 - P.K. Shaji Vs State of Kerala*.

Pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 01st day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To

The Inspector of Police, Vigilance & Anti Corruption, Chengalpattu.
The Superintendent, Central Prison (Women), Puzhal, Chennai.