



Crl.O.P.No.4870 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.03.2026

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.4870 of 2026

and

Crl.M.P.No.3514 of 2026

S.T.Edward Wilson @ Wilson

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance & Anti-Corruption,
Thiruvallur.

(Crime No.8/AC/2025/TVL)

2. J.Austin Joseph

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita/482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records relating to Crime No.8/AC/2025/TVL pending on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Pachaiyappan

For R1 : Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

For R2 : No Appearance



Crl.O.P.No.4870 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking quashment of Crime No.8/AC/2025/TVL, pending on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The brief facts of the case are as follows:-

2.1. Based on the complaint given by the second respondent that the petitioner/A1, who was working as a Special Tahsildar (Land Acquisition), had demanded illegal gratification of Rs.1 lakh, for releasing the compensation amount, a case in Crime No.08/AC/2025/TVL was registered for the offence under Section 7(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018).

2.2. After registration of the case, a trap was laid by the first respondent. Pursuant to the same, when the *de facto* complainant contacted the petitioner/A1, he instructed him to contact one Gomathinayagam. Thereafter, on the instructions of the said Gomathinayagam, one Vellaidurai had received the bribe money from the *de facto* complainant and was caught red-handed by the first respondent police. The accused were arrested and their statements were recorded.



3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the alleged tainted money was received by Vellaidurai, a land broker, who has no nexus or connection with the petitioner and that the petitioner has been implicated in this case only on the basis of the alleged statement recorded from the co-accused. He further submitted that the fact remains that the land in question, for which compensation was sought, was mortgaged with a bank. When the *de facto* complainant, who claims to be the Manager of a company, viz., M/s.Value Spaces Logistic & Industrial Part Private Limited, approached the petitioner seeking compensation, he had informed the *de facto* complainant that the compensation would be released only upon production of the original documents or an NOC from the bank. He also submitted that the petitioner had also sent a communication dated 20.06.2025 in this regard to the *de facto* complainant. However, suppressing the same, a false complaint has been lodged. Therefore, the registration of the FIR and continuation of the investigation against the petitioner amounts to an abuse of process of law. Hence, he prayed that the First Information Report registered against the petitioner may be quashed.

4. The submissions of the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) are as follows:-



WEB COPY

4.1. The land belonging to the *de facto* complainant's company was acquired by the Government of Tamil Nadu for the Chennai Peripheral Ring Road Project (CPRR). Accordingly, the company had applied for compensation.

4.2. The petitioner, who was a Special Tahsildar (Land Acquisition), demanded 5% of the compensation amount as illegal gratification from the *de facto* complainant for releasing the compensation amount.

4.3. Subsequently, on 26.06.2025, the petitioner reduced the bribe amount to Rs.1 lakh and instructed the *de facto* complainant to pay Rs.75,000/- initially on 30.06.2025 and the balance later.

4.4. Thereafter, on the instructions of the owner of the company, the *de facto* complainant, who was not willing to pay the illegal gratification, lodged a complaint with the first respondent police on 30.06.2025. Based on the said complaint, the case was registered and a trap was laid on the same day.

4.5. On 30.06.2025, at about 12.35 p.m., the *de facto* complainant contacted the petitioner (Mobile No.99405 55888) through his mobile phone (No.93423 20600) and during the conversation, the petitioner reiterated his demand and instructed him to hand over the money to



Gomathinayagam who will come and collect the money at the *de facto* complainant's company. During the conversation, the *de facto* complainant had switched on the speaker in his mobile phone and the conversation was heard by the witnesses. Later, the said Gomathinayagam had directed Vellaidurai to receive the bribe amount from the *de facto* complainant.

4.6. The investigation indicates that the said Vellaidurai received the money on the instructions of Gomathinayagam, who was acting as per the directions of the petitioner. There are Call Detail Records (CDRs) to substantiate that there was nexus among the trio.

4.7. Further, the investigation is at its nascent stage and all aspects will be looked into. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of *State Vs. M.Maridoss and Another* reported in (2023) 4 SCC 338, has held that, as per the settled position of law, it is the right conferred upon the investigating agency to conduct the investigation and reasonable time should be given to the investigating agency to conduct the investigation unless it is found that the allegations in the FIR do not disclose any cognizable offence at all or the complaint is barred by any law. Therefore, the first respondent police have to be given a reasonable time to get along with the investigation

4.8. Hence, the First Information Report against the petitioner does not deserve to be quashed.



WEB COPY

5. Having heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and upon perusal of the materials available on record and taking note of the fact that the conversation between the petitioner and the *de facto* complainant is stated to have been heard over speaker phone mode by other witnesses and also considering the availability of CDRs between the *de facto* complainant and the accused, this Court is of the view that a *prima facie* case is made out for proceeding with the investigation. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interdict the investigation, which is at its nascent stage.

6. Further, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M.Maridoss (supra)*, the right conferred upon the investigating agency should not be stifled and a reasonable time must be given to the investigating agency to conduct the investigation.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. However, the first respondent police is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.8/AC/2025/TVL and file the final report, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of **four months** from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



Crl.O.P.No.4870 of 2026

WEB COPY

8. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

17.03.2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
ham

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance & Anti-Corruption,
Thiruvallur.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.4870 of 2026

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

ham

***Crl.O.P.No.4870 of 2026
and
Crl.M.P.No.3514 of 2026***

17.03.2026