

RAJENDRAN Vs State Represented by

RAJENDRAN Vs State Represented by

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1417228

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Jan-30-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice K.Rajasekar

Appeal No. : CRL OP/2174/2026

Appellant : Rajendran

Respondent : State Represented by

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR CRL OP Nos.2174 and 2202 of 2026

1. G.Karthick Kumar S/o.Giddappa Naidu, Krishnagiri Main Road, Veppanapalli, Krishnagiri District. Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No. 2202 of 2026

1. Rajendran S/o Chinnavoovappa, Residing at No.4/18, Addrangapalli, Shoolagiri Taluk, Krishnagiri District. Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No. 2174 of

2026 Vs

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police

Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, Krishnagiri, Crime No. 19/AC/2025. Respondent in both Crl.O.Ps. COMMON PRAYER To enlarge the petitioners on bail pending investigation in Crime no. 19/Ac/2025 on the file of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption, Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District. For Petitioner in S.Lakshmanasamy Crl.O.P.No. 2202 of For Petitioner in Mr.V. RajMohan Crl.O.P.No. 2174 of For Respondent in Mr.A.Gopinath both Crl.O.Ps. Government Advocate(Crl. Side)

COMMON ORDER

The petitioners, who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 24.12.2025 for the alleged offence under Section 7(a) of Prevention of Corruption Act 1988 (Amendment Act 2018) in Crime No. 19/Ac/2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the A1/G. Karthick Kumar,

was the Block Development Officer, and A2/Rajendiran was the Secretary to the Panchayat, Maruthandapalli Village. The de facto complainant approached the petitioner/A2 to convert certain portions of his land into a layout. A2 intimated the de facto complainant that he would consult with A1/BDO and demanded Rs.60,000/-. The de facto complainant was directed to call A1/BDO, who also demanded Rs.60,000/- to process his request. The de facto complainant lodged a complaint with the respondent, and after registration of the FIR, a trap was laid. A2 was caught red-handed while receiving the money, and the phenolphthalein test was positive. Hence, both persons were arrested.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that they have been in

custody since 24.12.2025, they have been suspended, and the preliminary investigation is almost concluded. He further submitted that this is a false accusation and they are ready to abide by any conditions imposed by this Court. Hence, he prays for the grant of bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent

police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners were arrested recently and major part of the investigation is completed . Hence, he opposed the grant of bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the submissions made on both sides, facts and

circumstances of the case and the petitioners were suspended from the services and major part of the investigation is completed and taking note of the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner herein, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on they

executing a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) each with two sureties each, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri and on further conditions 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 report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation. [c] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial; [d] the petitioners shall not tamper with the evidence or witness 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 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 accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section

269 B.N.S. 30.01.2026 smn To 1.The Principal Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, Krishnagiri

3. The District Jail, Dharmapuri 3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.
K.RAJASEKAR J. smn CRL OP Nos.2174 and 2202 of 2026 30-01-2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com