

(2026) 08 MAD CK 1266
In the Madras High Court, Madurai Bench
Case No : Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16196 of 2026

Ganesan

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-08-2026

Acts Referred:

Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 — Section 7(B)
Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 — Section 483
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 269

Citation : (2026) 08 MAD CK 1266

Hon'ble Judges : K. Rajasekar, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : For Petitioner: Mr.S.Ravi; For Respondent: Mr.N.Balasubramanian,
Counsel for State of TN (Crl. Side)

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 09.07.2026, for the offences punishable under Sections 7(b) of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, in Crime No.6 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is the Village Assistant of Melarangiyan Village, Tiruppuvanam Taluk, Sivagangai District, being a public servant and working under the Village Administrative Office, demanded Rs.3,000/- from the defacto complainant for facilitating and securing patta transfer in favour of him. Hence, complaint was lodged by the defacto complainant and the petitioner was arrested.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submitted that there is no necessary for the petitioner to demand the bribe, since the defacto complainant's patta transfer work was already completed on

30.06.2026 itself. The defacto complainant can download his patta copy from the official website itself. The petitioner is in custody from 09.07.2026 and ready to abide any condition imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Counsel appearing for the State reiterated the prosecution case and reported that the petitioner has been arrested only recently. Investigation is still pending. The petitioner has no previous case. He opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of offence, the petitioner has now suspended from service, and also considering the period of incarceration, I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to certain conditions.

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **Principal Sessions Judge, Sivagangai**, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks, thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he/she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he/she is suspected;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[e] the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial 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 51730].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.