



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**DATED: 18-12-2025**

WEB COPY

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR**

**CRL OP No. 33592 of 2025**

**and**

**Crl.MP.No.23459 of 2025**

R.Balasubramanian  
S/o.Ravi,  
No.13, Pandian Street,  
Venkateswara Nagar (West),  
Puducherry Union Territory.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Stat of Tamil Nadu rep by  
The Inspector of Police  
VAC Police Station,  
Puducherry District, (Cr.No.06/2025)

2.R.Karthikeyan  
The Station House Officer,  
Orleanpet police Station,  
Puducherry District and Union Territory.

Respondent(s)

**PRAYER:** The criminal original petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS to call for the entire records in Crime No.06/2025, pending on the file of the respondent police and Quash the same as illegal, incompetent, arbitrary and against the nature of justice and pass as such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.C.R.Gokulvisvas

For Respondent(s): Mr.M.V. Ramachandramurthy  
Public Prosecutor (Puducherry)  
For R1 (V and AC)



**ORDER**

The petitioner/A1 in crime No.06/2025 filed this quash petition.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner arrayed as A1, on a complaint given by one R.Karthikeyan, SHO of Orleanpet Police Station, to the Vigilance and Anti Corruption. A case for offences under Sections 7A, 12 & 8 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 registered against the petitioner along with one Devanathan and others. Further, he submitted that to safe guard one Gidla Satyanarayana previous Inspector of Orleanpet Police Station, this present case filed with false allegations.

3.A case projected against the petitioner is that the petitioner along with one Devanathan was found in Orleanpet police station on 24.09.2024 at 10.40p.m. and beyond midnight, at that time, a cash was handed over to Devanathan. Further, on 26.09.2024, Devanathan and Balasubramanian returned to Police station, had heated interaction, at about 8.30pm found recorded in CCTV. During that time, it is seen petitioner carried a yellow and purple plastic bag containing Rs.5,00,000/- and handed over to Devanathan and hence, a complaint against him.



WEB COPY

4.The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is a daily wager in PWD Department, who is acting as P.A to nominated MLA Venkatesan. On instructions, petitioner went to the police station to sort out the doubts on the complaint lodged by Balasubramanian. The petitioner falsely implicated. He further submitted that in this case, Inspector of Police found one Heera Ram standing near a bus stand with cash of Rs.21,61,000/- in a suspicious manner and he was brought to the police station, by the beat constables Stalin and Madhavan of Orleanpet Police Station. Gidla Sathiyaraya, Inspector of Police, conducted enquiry detained Heera Ram and cash. The petitioner went to the police station to enquire about the illegal detention. By that time, Devanathan came and explained that cash received from cashew nut business and produced receipts and bills. Thereafter, Devanathan and Heera Ram left the police station along with cash. Later the said Devanathan informed that there was a shortage of Rs.5,00,000/- in the returned amount. Hence, the petitioner again went to clarify the issue, which is now projected against the petitioner. The respondent police, to safeguard Gidla Sathyanaraya for his illegal act, made the petitioner a scapegoat in this case. He further submitted that on the facts of the case, the offence under Section 7A would not arise.



5. The learned Public Prosecutor (Puducherry) appearing for the first respondent strongly opposed the petitioner's contention and submitted that the petitioner is a daily wager in PWD Department, who is deputed as P.A to the nominated MLA Venkatesan. When Heera Ram was found with huge cash of Rs.21,60,000/- without proper documents, he was taken to police station and enquiry conducted, at that time, Devanathan a cashew nut trader came to the police station and informed cash belongs to him. The said Devanathan sought help of Venkatesan MLA, who deputed the petitioner to visit the police station to sort out the issue. Thereafter, the amount was handed over to Devanathan and Heera Ram. While coming out of police station, the petitioner forcibly demanded and taken Rs.5,00,000/- as bribe using the name of Inspector of Police. The said Devanathan verified with the police Inspector how petitioner using the name of police Inspector jointly received the amount, hence complained about the said bribe. The Inspector of police summoned the petitioner herein, who came to the police station and handed over the amount of Rs.5,00,000/-, on 24.09.2024 and 26.09.2024. The incident recorded in the CCTV. This news was reported widely circulated in Puducherry and Superintendent of Police Vishal Singh, IPS conducted primarily enquiry recorded the statements, collected CCTV footage, confirmed the role played by the petitioner, demanding received money from Devanathan in the police station. During the primarily enquiry, it was found that Gidla Sathyanaraya, then



Inspector of police not demanded any bribe amount, but not this reported incident to Superiors and no entry made in the police station records. Hence, the departmental action initiated against Gidla Satyanaraya and he was immediately transferred.

6.From the counter, it is seen that “***Further, the FIR is not based on conjecture but on:***

***a.The Preliminary Enquiry Report***

***b.CCTV footage evidence***

***c.Statements of witnesses examined during the PE***

***d.Approval of senior police formations***

***Hence, the assertion that no cognizable offence is disclosed is factually incorrect and legally untenable.***

7.The enquiry officer sent a report to the Inspector of Police, Orleanpet Police Station along with the materials collected during enquiry. Based on the Preliminary Enquiry Report, the present Inspector of Police, Orleanpet Police Station lodged a complaint to the Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, who registered the FIR. Investigation is at initial stage. During investigation, the contention of the petitioner and his explanation will be considered, the petitioner is free to produce materials in support of his contention if any with him and the same will be considered during investigation.



8.Considering the submissions and on perusal of the materials available on record, it is seen respondent registered FIR, Investigation commenced. Since the investigation is at the initial stage, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief.

9.In view of the above, the criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

**18-12-2025**

Index:Yes/No  
Speaking/Non-speaking order  
Internet:Yes  
Neutral Citation:Yes/No  
sms  
To

1.The Inspector Of Police  
V&AC Police Station,  
Puducherry District, (Cr.No.6/2025)

2.R.Karthikeyan  
The station House officer, Orleanpet  
police Station, Puducherry District and  
Union Territory.

3.The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 33592 of 2025



**M.NIRMAL KUMAR J.**

sms

**CRL OP No. 33592 of 2025**

**18-12-2025**