IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON: 16.04.2026

DELIVERED ON: 08.06.2026

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.R.C. No.512 of 2026 and Crl.M.P. No.3913 of 2026

V.S. Kurinji Selvan ... Petitioner

vs.

The State represented by
Deputy Superintendent of Police
Central Crime Branch, AC – III
New Delhi ... Respondents

Criminal Revision Case filed under Sections 438 and 442 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records in Cr.M.P.No.2137 of 2025 in C.C.No.16 of 2024 on the file of the Special Court No.1 for Trial of Criminal Cases related to Elected Members of Parliament and Members of Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu, Chennai-1 and set aside the order dated 30.01.2026.

For petitioner Mr. V.S. Venkatesh
For respondent Mr. K. Srinivasan
Special Public Prosecutor for CBI Cases

ORDER

The instant criminal revision case has been filed by V.S. Kurinji Selvan (A-14) (for brevity "the petitioner") seeking to set aside the order dated 30.01.2026 passed by the Special Court No.1 for Trial of Criminal Cases related to Elected Members of Parliament and Members of Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu, Chennai (for brevity "the Trial Court") in Crl.M.P.No.2137 of 2025 in C.C.No.16 of 2024 dismissing the petition filed under Section 262 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita "(for brevity "the BNSS") to discharge the petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution as culled out from the records is as follows:

2.1 A series of raids was conducted by the Income Tax Department in Chennai on 08.07.2016 and several incriminating documents were recovered during the course of such raids, of which the accounts in the form of a ledger maintained by an Accountant of a company selling gutkha under the name and style of "MDM Brand" was also found. The same revealed payments to various persons connected to the State Government. Therefore, the Principal Director of Income Tax (Investigation) addressed a letter dated 11.08.2016 to the Chief Secretary of the State of Tamil Nadu and to the Director General of Police, seeking necessary action in respect of the incriminating material.

2.2 While so, one Anbazhagan, the then MLA of Chepauk-Triplicane Legislative Assembly filed W.P. No. 19335 of 2017 before this Court seeking to constitute a Special Investigation Team to take all necessary steps to seize and eradicate the banned items, more particularly, gutkha and pan masala containing tobacco and/or nicotine.

2.3 In the said writ petition, this Court, vide order dated 26.04.2018, directed the CBI to investigate into all aspects of the offence of illegal manufacture, import, supply, distribution and sale of gutkha and other forms of chewable tobacco which are banned in the State of Tamil Nadu and the Union Territory of Puducherry, including detection of and action against those involved in the offence, whether directly or indirectly, by aiding and abetting the offence or interfering with attempts to curb the offence.

2.4 Pursuant to the directions of this Court, a case in RC 08(A)/2018/CBI/AC-III/New Delhi was registered by the CBI on 29.05.2018 under Section 120-B IPC and Sections 7, 8, 12 & 13(2) r/w 13(l)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (for brevity “the PC Act”) against unknown officials, unknown public servants and unknown private persons in compliance of the order dated 26.04.2018 passed in W.P. No.19335 of 2017.

2.5 The investigation that followed the directions of this Court revealed that one Madhava Rao (A-1) started a business in respect of chemicals in the name of Srinivasa Chemicals in 2002. One Srinivasa Rao

(A-3) initially started business of safety match box. Uma Sankar Gupta (A-2) who was well known to Madhava Rao (A-1) and Srinivasa Rao (A-3), was having good knowledge about the composition of the pan masala and gutkha formula.

2.6 In 2011, the said three persons, i.e. A-1 to A-3 started a partnership firm in the name of Jayam Industries with its factory at 3/38B, Sothupakkam Salai, Theerthakariyampatttu Village, Redhills, Chennai (for brevity "the factory premises") for production and sale of MDM Brand Gutkha. The said Madhava Rao (A-1) befriended one Rajendran and requested him to join his business and accordingly, the said Rajendran agreed to act as a partner of Jayam Industries. Madhava Rao (A-l) offered the said Rajendran the job of a Supervisor in his firm by paying Rs. 15,000/- as salary whilst, on paper, the said Rajendran remained to be a partner. Madhava Rao (A-l), Uma Sankar Gupta (A-2), Srinivasa Rao (A-3) and Rajendran obtained Registration Certificate No. ANVPR5773PEM001 on 25.08.2011 for Jayam Industries from the Central Excise Department for operating as a manufacturer of excisable goods with its factory at 3/38 B, Sothupakkam Salai, Theerthakiriyampattu Village, Behind NKC Weigh Bridge, Red Hills, Chennai, for manufacture of pan masala and gutkha containing tobacco. This unit was also registered with the Commercial Tax Department vide TIN 33951087618 dated 24.08.2011.

2.7 On 21.01.2013, the Joint Commissioner (Commercial Tax) (FAC), Enforcement-I, Chennai, issued authorization under Section 65 of the Tamil Nadu Value Added Tax Act, 2006, for conducting surprise inspection at the factory premises. The authorization was given to (i) the Commercial Tax Officer Group-V, Enforcement (Central), Chennai, (ii) the Deputy Commercial Tax Officer Group-V, Enforcement (Central), Chennai and (iii) the Deputy Commercial Tax Officer RS-V, Enforcement (Central), Chennai (for brevity "the authorized team").

2.8 Under the leadership of the petitioner, the authorised team made a surprise inspection of the factory premises of Jayam Industries on 21.01.2013 and recorded the physical stock pertaining to the commodities available in the factory premises. During the inspection, certain discrepancies were noticed and hence, the factory premises was sealed by the authorized team.

2.9 On the next day, i.e. 22.01.2013, the Commercial Tax Officer, Group-V, Enforcement (Central), Chennai, i.e., a member of the authorised team), submitted a preliminary report to the Joint Commissioner (Commercial Tax) (FAC), Enforcement-I, Chennai, regarding the said surprise inspection.

2.10 During investigation, the statement of one Kamalraj @ Kannan @ Manikkavel, Junior Personal Assistant of Ramana (A-13), Minister for Commercial Tax and Registration, Government of Tamil Nadu, revealed that after the aforesaid inspection, one Nandakumar and the said Rajendran, both of whom were employees of the said Madhava Rao (A-1) met the petitioner and requested him to de-seal the factory premises of Jayam Industries. Upon their request, the petitioner directed them to meet Ramana (A-13). They accordingly met Ramana (A-13), through his Junior P.A. Kamalraj @ Kannan @ Manikkavel and requested Ramana (A-13), for issuing a suitable direction to the officials of the Commercial Tax Department to de-seal the factory premises of Jayam Industries. Pursuant to the said request, Ramana (A-13) demanded a one-time payment of Rs.5 crores for de-sealing the factory premises and for support in running the pan masala and gutkha business smoothly.

2.11 After a few days, Nandakumar and Rajendran again visited and informed the said Kamalraj that Madhava Rao (A-1) had contacted Ramana (A-13), and settled the aforesaid issue and that they have brought Rs.7 lakhs to be given to Ramana (A-13). Thereafter, Nandakumar and Rajendran met Ramana (A-13) and informed him that they had brought Rs.7 lakhs. Hence, Ramana (A-13) instructed Kamalraj to receive the said amount. Accordingly, Kamalraj received Rs.7 lakhs and handed over the same to Ramana (A-13).

Upon receiving the said amount, Ramana (A-13) instructed the officials to de-seal the factory premises and accordingly, the factory premises was de-sealed by the petitioner and permitted for operation.

2.12 Kamalraj continued to receive Rs.7 lakhs every month from the said duo and handed over the same to Ramana (A-13). After about five months, the amount was increased to Rs.10 lakhs per month, which was regularly paid by Madhava Rao (A-1) through Nandakumar and Rajendran for six or seven months.

2.13 Further Investigation also revealed that Madhava Rao (A-1) gave Rs.50,000/- to the petitioner for de-sealing the factory premises and the said amount of Rs.50,000/- was further paid regularly to the petitioner for three or four months through Nandakumar and Rajendran till the petitioner was transferred to Madurai as Administrative Deputy Commissioner, Commercial Taxes, Madurai.

2.14 Hence, the CBI filed a supplementary final report arraying the petitioner as A-14 for favouring Madhava Rao (A-1) in de-sealing the factory premises by accepting illegal gratification and for conspiring with Ramana (A-13) and Madhava Rao (A-1) in respect of the same. Further, the said supplementary final report sought the petitioner to be tried for the offences under Section 120-B of IPC r/w Sections 7,11, 12 and 13(2) r/w Section 13(l)(d) of the PC Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner made the following submissions:

3.1 Gutkha and pan masala were banned only on 23.05.2013 and that until then, there was no ban on the manufacturing of gutkha and pan masala. Since there was no ban on sale of gutkha and pan masala, there was no necessity for sealing the factory premises on 21.01.2013. Therefore, the CBI has falsely alleged that the factory premises was sealed by the authorized team. When the factory was not sealed, there would be no purpose for the petitioner to direct Nandakumar and Rajendran to meet Ramana (A-13).

3.2 Even as per the case of the prosecution, the authorized team comprised only (i) the Commercial Tax Officer Group-V, Enforcement (Central), Chennai, (ii) the Deputy Commercial Tax Officer Group-V, Enforcement (Central), Chennai and (iii) the Deputy Commercial Tax Officer RS-V, Enforcement (Central), Chennai and the authorization granted by the Joint Commissioner (Commercial Tax) (FAC), Enforcement-I, Chennai, did not include the petitioner.

3.3 There is no material to show that the petitioner had accompanied the authorized team and hence, the petitioner has been falsely implicated.

3.4 There is no material to show that either Madhava Rao (A-1) or his employees Nandakumar and Rajendran had met the petitioner and that illegal gratification was exchanged for de-sealing the factory premises.

3.5 When the final report was filed on 02.11.2018, for reasons best known to the CBI, the investigation had revealed no offence made out against the petitioner, but, suddenly after nearly four years, when the supplementary final report was filed, the same investigation surprisingly revealed offences made out against the petitioner.

3.6 Therefore, there is no material to frame charges as against the petitioner and thus, in the light of there being no material to attract the ingredients of the offences under Section 120-B of IPC r/w Sections 7,11,12 and 13(2) r/w Section 13(l)(d) of the PC Act, the petitioner is entitled to be discharged from the prosecution.

4. The learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI Cases filed a detailed counter vehemently opposing the grounds raised by the petitioner by demonstrating overwhelming materials to prima facie disclose the offences committed by the petitioner under Section 120-B of IPC r/w Sections 7,11, 12 and 13(2) r/w Section 13(l)(d) of the PC Act and made the following submissions:

4.1 The inspection by the authorized team led by the petitioner was conducted in respect of Sales Tax and Excise reporting discrepancy and had nothing to do with the ban of gutkha and pan masala.

4.2 The file from the Joint Commissioner (Commercial Tax) (FAC), Enforcement-I, Chennai, with respect to the inspection proceedings of "Jayam Industries" (i.e. Doc No. 76 in the supplementary final report) would go to show the involvement of the petitioner in the inspection proceedings and therefore, whether the petitioner was present at the time of sealing and de-sealing would be a matter of trial and cannot be precipitated at this juncture.

4.3 The statements of Nandakumar (LW8), Rajendran (LW9) and Kamalraj (LW159) prima facie demonstrate that it was indeed the petitioner who directed Nandakumar and Rajendran to meet Ramana (A-13) and the said statements further demonstrate the exchange of illegal gratification of Rs.50,000/- for de-sealing and the regular exchange of the like sum for a certain period for the smooth running of the factory premises.

5. Based on the above submissions, it is the contention of the learned Special Public Prosecutor that the Trial Court has rightly appreciated that there is abundant material to frame charges as against the petitioner and this criminal revision case is liable to be dismissed.

6. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. The sheet anchor submission of the petitioner is that there are absolutely no materials available in the final report as against him for framing of charges. Thus, the seminal question that arises for consideration of this Court is whether there are materials available for framing charges against the petitioner, on the basis of the final report and consequently, whether the Trial Court is right in dismissing the petition filed for discharge under Section 262 of the BNSS.

8. At this juncture, it will be useful to allude to Section 262 of the BNSS, which reads as under:

> "262. When accused shall be discharged.—
>
> (1) The accused may prefer an application for discharge within a period of sixty days from the date of supply of copies of documents under Section 230.
>
> (2) If, upon considering the police report and the documents sent with it under Section 193 and making such examination, if any, of the accused, either physically or through audio-video electronic means, as the Magistrate thinks necessary and after giving the prosecution and the accused an opportunity of being heard, the Magistrate considers the charge against the accused to be groundless, he shall discharge the accused, and record his reasons for so doing."

9. Before delving into the facts, it is worth discussing the legal aspects regarding the principles relating to discharge under Section 262 of the BNSS.

10. It is trite that at the stage of deciding a discharge petition, the Trial Court cannot conduct a roving enquiry and it is not permitted to conduct a mini trial. The Trial Court has to look into whether there are sufficient materials for framing of charges against the accused. If there is a strong suspicion which leads the Court to think that there is ground for presuming that the accused has committed an offence, then, it is not open to the Court to say that there is no sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

11. In **State v. S. Selvi**[1], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered its various decisions regarding the scope of powers of discharge and has held as under:

> "6. It is well settled by this Court in a catena of judgments including Union of India v. Prafulla Kumar Samal [Union of India v. Prafulla Kumar Samal, (1979) 3 SCC 4 : 1979 SCC (Cri) 609] , Dilawar Balu Kurane v. State of Maharashtra[Dilawar Balu Kurane v. State of Maharashtra, (2002) 2 SCC 135 : 2002 SCC (Cri) 310] , Sajjan Kumar v. CBI [Sajjan Kumar v. CBI, (2010) 9 SCC 368 : (2010) 3 SCC (Cri) 1371] , State v. A. Arun Kumar [State v. A. Arun Kumar, (2015) 2 SCC 417 : (2015) 2 SCC (Cri) 96 : (2015) 1 SCC (L&S) 505] , Sonu Gupta v. Deepak Gupta[Sonu Gupta v. Deepak Gupta, (2015) 3 SCC 424 : (2015) 2 SCC (Cri) 265] , State of Orissa v. Debendra Nath Padhi [State of Orissa v. Debendra Nath Padhi, (2003) 2 SCC 711 : 2003 SCC (Cri) 688] , Niranjan

1(2018) 13 SCC 455

Singh Karam Singh Punjabi v. Jitendra Bhimraj Bijjaya [Niranjan Singh Karam Singh Punjabi v. Jitendra Bhimraj Bijjaya, (1990) 4 SCC 76 : 1991 SCC (Cri) 47] and Supt. & Remembrancer of Legal Affairsv. Anil Kumar Bhunja [Supt. & Remembrancer of Legal Affairs v. Anil Kumar Bhunja, (1979) 4 SCC 274 : 1979 SCC (Cri) 1038] that the Judge while considering the question of framing charge under Section 227 of the Code in sessions cases (which is akin to Section 239 CrPC pertaining to warrant cases) has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out; where the material placed before the court discloses grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained, the court will be fully justified in framing the charge; by and large if two views are equally possible and the Judge is satisfied that the evidence produced before him while giving rise to some suspicion but not grave suspicion against the accused, he will be fully within his rights to discharge the accused. The Judge cannot act merely as a post office or a mouthpiece of the prosecution, but has to consider the broad probabilities of the case, the total effect of the statements and the documents produced before the court, any basic infirmities appearing in the case and so on. This however does not mean that the Judge should make a roving enquiry into the pros and cons of the matter and weigh the materials as if he was conducting a trial.

7. In Sajjan Kumar v. CBI [Sajjan Kumar v. CBI, (2010) 9 SCC 368 : (2010) 3 SCC (Cri) 1371] , this Court on consideration of the various decisions about the scope of Sections 227 and 228 of the Code, laid down the following principles:

> (i) The Judge while considering the question of framing the charges under Section 227 CrPC has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out. The test to determine prima facie case would depend upon the facts of each case.
>
> (ii) Where the materials placed before the court disclose grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained, the court will be fully justified in framing a charge and proceeding with the trial.
>
> (iii) The court cannot act merely as a post office or a mouthpiece of the prosecution but has to consider the broad probabilities of the case, the total effect of the evidence and the documents produced before the court, any basic infirmities, etc. However, at this stage, there cannot be a roving enquiry into the pros and cons of the matter and weigh the evidence as if he was conducting a trial.
>
> (iv) If on the basis of the material on record, the court could form an opinion that the accused might have

> committed offence, it can frame the charge, though for conviction the conclusion is required to be proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused has committed the offence.
>
> (v) At the time of framing of the charges, the probative value of the material on record cannot be gone into but before framing a charge the court must apply its judicial mind on the material placed on record and must be satisfied that the commission of offence by the accused was possible.
>
> (vi) At the stage of Sections 227 and 228, the court is required to evaluate the material and documents on record with a view to find out if the facts emerging therefrom taken at their face value disclose the existence of all the ingredients constituting the alleged offence. For this limited purpose, sift the evidence as it cannot be expected even at that initial stage to accept all that the prosecution states as gospel truth even if it is opposed to common sense or the broad probabilities of the case.
>
> (vii) If two views are possible and one of them gives rise to suspicion only, as distinguished from grave suspicion, the trial Judge will be empowered to discharge the accused and at this stage, he is not to see whether the trial will end in conviction or acquittal.

8. This Court in State v. A. Arun Kumar [State v. A. Arun Kumar, (2015) 2 SCC 417 : (2015) 2 SCC (Cri) 96 : (2015) 1 SCC (L&S) 505] , Sonu Gupta v. Deepak Gupta [Sonu Gupta v. Deepak Gupta, (2015) 3 SCC 424 : (2015) 2 SCC (Cri) 265] , State of Orissa v. Debendra Nath Padhi [State of Orissa v. Debendra Nath Padhi, (2003) 2 SCC 711 : 2003 SCC (Cri) 688] and State of T.N. v. N. Suresh Rajan[State of T.N. v. N. Suresh Rajan, (2014) 11 SCC 709 : (2014) 3 SCC (Cri) 529 : (2014) 2 SCC (L&S) 721] has reiterated almost the aforementioned principles. However, in State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal [State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 : 1992 SCC (Cri) 426], relied upon by the counsel for Respondent 1 is not applicable to the facts of the case inasmuch as the said matter arose out of the judgement of the High Court quashing the entire criminal proceedings inclusive of the registration of first information report. The said matter was not concerned with the discharge of the accused.

10. If on the basis of the material on record, the Court would form prima facie opinion that the accused might have committed the offence, it can frame charge, though for conviction it is required to be proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused has committed the offence. At the time of framing of charges, the probative value of the material on record has to be gone into and the Court is not expected to go deep into the matter and hold that the materials would not warrant conviction. The Court is required

to evaluate the material on record at the stage of Sections 227 or 239 of the Code, as the case may be, only with a view to find out if the facts emerging therefrom taken at the face value discloses the existence of all the ingredients constituting the alleged offence. It is trite that at the stage of consideration of an application for discharge, the Court has to proceed with the presumption that materials brought on record by the prosecution are true and evaluate such material with a view to find out whether the facts emerging therefrom taken at their face value disclose existence of the ingredients of the offence." (emphasis supplied by this Court)

12. Likewise, in **State v. M.R.Hiremath**[2], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

"25. The High Court ought to have been cognizant of the fact that the Trial Court was dealing with an application for discharge under the provisions of Section 239 CrPC. The parameters which govern the exercise of this jurisdiction have found expression in several decisions of this Court. It is a settled principle of law that at the stage of considering an application for discharge the court must proceed on the assumption that the material which has been brought on the record by the prosecution is true and evaluate the material in order to determined whether the fact emerging from the material, taken on its face value, disclose the existence of the ingredient necessary to constitute the offence. In State of T.N. Vs . N.Suresh Rajan, adverting to the earlier decision on the subject, this Court held: (SCC pp.721~22,para 29)

29. ...At this stage, probative value of the materials has to be gone into and the court is not expected to go deep into the matter and hold that the materials would not warrant a conviction. In our opinion, what needs to be considered is whether there is a ground for presuming that the offence has been committed and not whether a ground for convicting the accused has been made out. To put it differently, if the court thinks that the accused might have committed the offence on the basis of the materials on record on its probative value, it can frame the charge; though for conviction, the court has to come to the conclusion that the accused has committed the offence. The law does not permit a mini trial at this stage."

(emphasis supplied by this Court)

2(2019) 7 SCC 515

13. Further, this Court finds that the very same principles have been reiterated and further crystallized in **State of Tamil Nadu v.R.Soundirarasu**[3].

14. In the case at hand, while deciding the discharge petition, the Trial Court has considered the statements of Nandakumar (LW8), Rajendran (LW9) and Kamalraj (LW 159) and file from the Joint Commissioner (Commercial Tax) (FAC), Enforcement-I, Chennai, with respect to the inspection proceedings of 'Jayam Industries' (i.e. Doc No.76 in the supplementary final report) and found that specific allegations were made by the witnesses against the petitioner and therefore, the involvement of the petitioner in the larger conspiracy wherein bribes were paid in lakhs to Ramana (A-13), were to be ascertained only at the stage of trial.

15. Therefore, this Court, by applying the law enunciated by the three rulings referred to above, has to see whether there are materials available for framing charges.

16. The prosecution has relied on the statements recorded from Nandakumar (LW8), Rajendran (LW9) and Kamalraj (LW159) under Section 161, Cr.P.C. and under Section 164, Cr.P.C. during the course of investigation to demonstrate the involvement of the petitioner in the offences

3(2023) 6 SCC 768

of bribery and criminal conspiracy which would be sufficient to frame charges against him.

16.1 Nandakumar (LW8), in his statement dated 10.09.2018 to the CBI, has stated that a Sales Tax team headed by the petitioner conducted a raid at the factory premises and sealed the same on the allegation of evasion of Sales Tax. He further stated the petitioner directed him to meet Ramana (A-13) for de-sealing the factory premises and that a bribe of Rs.7 lakhs to Ramana (A-13) and Rs.50,000/- to the petitioner was finalized and paid. Nandakumar (LW8) has reiterated the same in his statement under Section 164(5) Cr.P.C. recorded by the Metropolitan Magistrate (CCB & CBCID Cases), Egmore.

16.2 Similarly, Rajendran (LW9), in his statement dated 12.09.2018 before the CBI, stated that it was indeed the petitioner who had led the Sales Tax team which sealed the factory premises and that the same was de-sealed only after the first payment of Rs.7 lakhs to Ramana (A-13) and Rs.50,000/- to the petitioner were paid. Rajendran (LW9) has also reiterated the same in his statement recorded under Section 164(5) Cr.P.C by the 13th Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore.

16.3 Even Kamalraj (LW159) has confirmed in his statement dated 22.11.2018 to the CBI and in his statement recorded under Section 164(5) Cr.P.C. before the 8th Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town that the Sales Tax team was headed by the petitioner.

16.4 Lastly, the file from the Joint Commissioner (Commercial Tax) (FAC), Enforcement-I, Chennai, also shows many correspondences, copies of which have been marked to the petitioner and one Letter bearing VSI 3 No./28/2012.12/Gr-V/(Central) dated 28.03.2013 issued by the petitioner in respect of the surprise inspection of the factory premises.

17. While appreciating the above statements of the list witnesses in accordance with the principles laid down in the above decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court, this Court finds that the above materials are sufficient to disclose that the petitioner had led the Sales Tax team which sealed the factory premises and received bribe for de-sealing the same and had further abetted and conspired the receipt of the bribe in lakhs by Ramana (A-13).

18. As stated above, at the time of framing of charges, the probative value of the materials on record cannot be gone into and the Court is required to evaluate whether the materials and documents on record, taken at their face value, disclose the existence of all the ingredients constituting the offence. For this limited purpose, the Court cannot be expected to sift the

evidence and conduct a roving enquiry or mini trial to come to a conclusion whether the accused had committed an offence or not.

19. Having held so, based on the above materials, this Court, prima facie finds that there do exist sufficient materials against the petitioner for framing of charges. Hence, this Court finds that there is no infirmity or perversity in the impugned order warranting interference.

20. *Ex consequenti*, this criminal revision case stands dismissed. Further, it is made clear that whatever has been observed by this Court in this order is only for the limited purpose of disposal of this case and that the same shall not prejudice the rights of the parties during the course of trial and the Trial Court also shall not be influenced by the observations made in this order and shall proceed with the trial independently in accordance with law. Connected Crl.M.P. stands closed.

08.06.2026

cad

A.D. JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

cad

To

1. The Special Judge No.1 for Trial of Criminal Cases
related to Elected Members of Parliament and
Members of Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu
Chennai-1

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police
Central Crime Branch, AC – III
New Delhi 4

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

Order in
Crl.R.C.No.512 of 2026

08.06.2026