

**b 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 20th day of July 2026

Crl.M.P. No.2453 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-004891-2026)

Purushothaman, aged 45 years, S/o.Krishnan,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Directorate of Vigilance and Anti Corruption (DVAC),
Chengalpattu Detachment, Chengalpattu.

Cr. No.07/AC/2026/CP

.. Respondent/Complainant

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

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.M.Satheeshbabu, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused and of 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, praying 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 in 2018).

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

4. The case, as projected by the prosecution is, the petitioner was working as Village Administrative Officer at Valayaputhur Village,

Madurantakam Taluk, Chengalpattu District. The defacto complainant who is practicing Auditor by profession, purchased 81.61 acres of land at Valayaputhur Village and he applied for name transfer of Patta. Pursuant to that, on 24.06.2026, the defacto complainant approached the petitioner/accused in his office, since his application is pending. At that time, the petitioner demanded and insisted him to brought Table and Chair for his office. Since the defacto complainant expressed his inability, the petitioner demanded a sum of Rs.15,000/- to Rs.20,000/- being the cost of the chair and table. But, the defacto complainant accepted to pay Rs.5,000/- only. Again on 25.06.2026, the petitioner contacted the defacto complainant over phone and re-iterated his earlier demand of Rs.5,000/-. Being not willing to give the bribe amount, the defacto complainant lodged the complaint before the respondent police, accordingly, a case in Cr. No.07/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 01.07.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 20 days; the petitioner has never, at any point of time, demanded any illegal gratification from the defacto complainant for processing or recommending the patta transfer application; the entire trap proceedings have already been completed and the examination of witnesses and seizure of documentary evidences have also been completed on the same day itself; the alleged tainted currency notes, phenolphthalein test materials, mahazars and other connected records are in the custody of the respondent police, therefore, nothing further remains to be recovered from the petitioner and hence, his further custodial detention is wholly unnecessary; the investigation has been completed; moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon him and he 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 CDR details are to be collected, the staff in the office of the petitioner/accused are to be examined and documents are to be collected and the investigation is not yet completed. At this stage, if the petitioner is released on bail, he would use his 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 and hence he prays to consider the bail application.

8. From the records and submissions, it appears that the petitioner is under judicial custody for the past 20 days. It is pleaded by the learned counsel for the petitioner that except collecting the CDR details of the accused, investigation has been completed. Under such circumstances, this court is of the considered view that custody of the petitioner for the purpose of investigation is not necessary. The petitioner - being a Government servant, there is no possibility of flee from justice. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, period of custody undergone by the petitioner/accused, substantial portion of investigation has been completed and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioner/accused is ordered to be released on bail on his 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 stay within the limit of Kayar Police Station and report before the Station House Officer, Kayar Police Station, Chengalpattu District daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of 30 days;**
3. The petitioner/accused shall not tamper the evidence either during investigation or trial;
4. The petitioner/accused shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;
5. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report to the learned Magistrate and the learned Magistrate shall take appropriate action as if the conditions have been imposed by the Magistrate himself/herself 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 20th day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To

The Inspector of Police, Directorate of Vigilance and Anti Corruption (DVAC),
Chengalpattu Detachment, Chengalpattu.

The Station House Officer, Kayar Police Station.

The Superintendent, District Jail, Chengalpattu.