



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

CRL OP No. 22321 of 2026

and

Crl.M.P.No.14772 of 2026

G.Ravichandran
S/o. G.V. Gundurao,
4/39, Ramachandra Road,
Nehru Nagar, Chromepet,
Chennai-600 044.
Formerly
Deputy BDO (Panchayats) at Thellar Block

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu rep. By
the Deputy Superintendent of Police
Vigilance and Anti Corruption,
Tiruvannamalai Detachment.

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records and quash the First Information Report in Crime No. 8 of 2024 on the file of the Respondent Police as the same is an abuse of process of law.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Karthikeyan

For Respondent(s): Mr.Arun Anbumani,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

In similar circumstances, this court had quashed the proceedings against



another Deputy Block Development Officer, like the petitioner. This was in Criminal Original Petition No.2143 of 2024 dated 18.12.2024.

WEB COPY

2. Relevant portion of the order is extracted hereunder for ready reference:-

“6. Rival submissions are carefully weighed. This Court perused the FIR. While the FIR does not disclose the SOP of the Director of Planning, District Rural Development Agency, eventually the role of the petitioner can be ascertained only from the nature of the duty assigned to him. Reading the FIR alongside the SOP, prima facie it becomes evident that the petitioner neither has a role in identifying the beneficiaries of the PMAY scheme nor is he involved in any field operation. At one level, he has to verify the documents as are provided to him before the details thereof are uploaded in the computer, and at another level, he has the duty to disburse the amount based on the general recommendations of the Engineer and the Overseer. Therefore, if a wrong person is identified or if money is wrongly disbursed based on wrong recommendations, then it may not be prima facie considered that he is involved in the crime. It is apparent the investigating agency intends to err on the safer side



WEB COPY



and spread its net vast and wide. This opportunity, the investigating agency still has, even if the petitioner's name does not figure in the FIR. After all, the investigating agency can still ascertain whether the petitioner has a role to play.

7. It is in these circumstances, this Court directs that the petitioner's name be dropped from the FIR, with liberty to the investigating agency to include the name of the petitioner in the final report, once it is satisfied that it has ample materials to establish that the petitioner did have a role in the crime, notwithstanding the role he had under the SOP.”

3. Following the said order, the petitioner's name shall be dropped from the FIR. In case, the investigating agency comes across any material during the course of investigation, it is open to them include his name in the final report. The criminal original petition stands allowed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

24-08-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
ssk



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 22321 of 2



V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

To

ssk

The State of Tamil Nadu rep. By
the Deputy Superintendent of Police
Vigilance and Anti Corruption,
Tiruvannamalai Detachment.

CRL OP No. 22321 of 2026

24-08-2026