

Crl.MP.No.6696 of 2019
in
Crl. A.No.282 of 2019

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.,

The petition has been filed to suspend the sentence of imprisonment imposed in the judgment dated 03.05.2019 made in Spl.C.C. No.13 of 2010 on the file of the learned Special Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chengalpattu pending disposal of the appeal.

2. The petitioner/appellant herein is the accused in Spl.C.C.No.13 of 2010 on the file of the learned Special Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chengalpattu. He was found guilty of the offences u/s. 7, 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act and he has been convicted and sentenced as under:

S.No.	Conviction	Sentence
1.	Section 7 of P.C Act 1988.	3 years S.I and fine of Rs.5,000/- in default to undergo S.I for 2 months.
2.	13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of P.C Act.	3 years S.I and fine of Rs.5,000/- in default to undergo S.I for 2 months.

Aggrieved against the same, the petitioner has preferred this appeal and also filed the petition for suspension of sentence.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the accused Radhakrishnan was working as Special Officer in the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Limited - Employees Co-operative Thrift and Credit Society at Nandhampakkam, Chennai. On 21.09.2008, the petitioner demanded Rs.50,000/- as bribe from the complainant for settling his balance retirement benefits amounting to Rs.4,73,225/-. The demand has been made towards illegal gratification other than legal remuneration from him as a motive or reward, thereby a trap was laid pursuant to which the petitioner/appellant was arrested redhanded while accepting the bribe of Rs.50,000/- on 08.11.2008. The petitioner after filing of final report was tried and convicted as stated above.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner/appellant would submit that the petitioner the appellant has got arguable points available in the appeal and he would also submit that it is a clear case where the prosecution has suppressed about an earlier complaint and also suppressed the fact about the earlier trap proceedings and that the petitioner has got a fair chance of succeeding the appeal and would pray that the substantive sentence imposed against the petitioner may be suspended. She would further submit that the trial Court has

suspended the sentence for a period of one month and the petitioner has paid the fine amount.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) would submit that the trial court considering the evidence of the prosecution witnesses has rightly convicted the accused and would oppose the suspension of sentence.

6. Taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned counsels on either side, this Court is of the opinion that the substantive sentence of imprisonment be suspended.

7. In view of the above, the substantive sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner by the trial Court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioner/appellant is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.50,000/- [Rupees Fifty thousand only] with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Special Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chengalpattu and on further condition that the petitioner/appellant shall report before the trial Court on the first working day of every English Calendar month at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

16.05.2019

rkp/mrp

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA,J.
rkp/mrp



Crl.MP.No.6696 of 2019
in
Crl. A.No.282 of 2019

WEB COPY

16.05.2019