



WEB COPY

CRL OP Nos. 560 and 611 of
2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP Nos. 560 and 611 of 2026

1. G.Karthick Kumar
S/o.Giddappa Naidu, Krishnagiri Main
Road, Veppanapalli, Krishnagiri
District.

Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.
560 of 2026

1. Rajendran
S/o Chinnavoovappa, Residing at
No.4/18, Addrangapalli, Shoolagiri
Taluk, Krishnagiri District.

Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.
611 of 2026

Vs

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Krishnagiri, Crime No. 19/AC/2025.

Respondent in both
Crl.O.Ps.

COMMON PRAYER

To enlarge the petitioners on bail pending investigation in Crime no. 19/Ac/2025 on the file of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption, Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District.

For Petitioner in S.Lakshmanasamy
Crl.O.P.No. 560 of
2026



WEB COPY

CRL OP Nos. 560 and 611 of
2026



For Petitioner in C.R.Malarvannan
Crl.O.P.No. 560 of
2026

For Respondent in Mr.A.Gopinath
both Crl.O.Ps. Government Advocate(Crl. Side)

COMMON ORDER

The petitioners, who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on **24.12.2025** for the alleged offence **under Section 7(a) of Prevention of Corruption Act 1988 (Amendment Act 2018)** in **Crime No. 19/Ac/2025** on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the A1/G. Karthick Kumar, was the Block Development Officer, and A2/Rajendiran was the Secretary to the Panchayat, Maruthandapalli Village. The de facto complainant approached the petitioner/A2 to convert certain portions of his land into a layout. A2 intimated the de facto complainant that he would consult with A1/BDO and demanded Rs.60,000/-. The de facto complainant was directed to call A1/BDO, who also demanded Rs.60,000/- to process his request. The de facto complainant lodged a complaint with the respondent, and after registration of the FIR, a trap was laid. A2 was caught red-handed while receiving the money, and the phenolphthalein test was positive. Hence, both persons were arrested.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that they have been in



custody since 24.12.2025, they have been suspended, and the preliminary investigation is almost concluded. He further submitted that this is a false accusation and they are ready to abide by any conditions imposed by this Court.

Hence, he prays for the grant of bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners were arrested recently and the investigation is pending. Hence, he opposed the grant of bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the fact that the FIR categorically reveals both petitioners demanded Rs.60,000/-, A2 was caught red-handed while receiving the money, and the phenolphthalein test was positive and they have been arrested only recently, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed.

09-01-2026

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



CRL OP Nos. 560 and 611 of
2026



WEB COPY

To

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Krishnagiri, Crime No. 19/AC/2025.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP Nos. 560 and 611 of
2026



K.RAJASEKAR J.
mpa

**CRL OP Nos. 560 and
611 of 2026**

09-01-2026