



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.31855 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.31855 of 2025

V.Vasudevan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State rep by ,
Rep by the Station House Officer,
Vigilance & Anti Corruption Unit,
Puducherry.
(Cr.No.3 of 2023)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of
their arrest in Cr.No.3 of 2023 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Dinesh Kumar

For Respondent : Mr.M.V.Ramachandra Murthy
Public Prosecutor (Puducherry)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under



Crl.OP.No.31855 of 2025

Sections 409 and 420 of IPC and Section 13(1)(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 in Cr.No.3 of 2023, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner while working as Junior Accounts Officer, Health Department, was responsible for administrative and financial supervision of the RMNCH+A Procurements. Despite knowing that the required tendering procedures were not followed and that quotations were fabricated by interrelated firms, the petitioner approved the tender process and issued payments without verification or quality test report and facilitated fraudulent procurement of medical consumables under the RMNCH+A Programme implemented by the Puducherry State Health Mission (PSHM). Based on the said allegations, FIR has been registered. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner



herein has ranked as A12, who is a Junior Assistant working under the

Doctors who are arrayed as A9 to A11 and who are in in-charge for awarding tenders for supplying of medicines and he has been falsely implicated in this case and nothing to do with the alleged allegations. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner is not having any direct overt act and he is only sub-ordinate to committee awarding contracts and he has not benefited any thing. He further submitted that the co-accused were enlarged on bail and interim bail by this respectively vide order dated 13.11.2025 and 14.11.2025 in Crl.OP.Nos.30992 and 30405 of 2025. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. It is reported by the learned Public Prosecutor (Puducherry) appearing for the respondent police that the total amount involved in this case is Rs.44,03,252/- and the same was misappropriated by the accused persons in respect of procuring medicines. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.



6. Considering the nature of the offence and the co-accused were enlarged on bail and interim bail respectively, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made, before the learned **Principal Sessions Judge, Puducherry** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.31855 of 2025

Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019]'. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]***;

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

21.11.2025

Vv

To

5/6



1. The **Principal Sessions Judge, Puducherry**

2. The Station House Officer,
Vigilance & Anti Corruption Unit,
Puducherry.

3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.31855 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.31855 of 2025



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.No.31855 of 2025



21.11.2025