



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 33604 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

CRL OP No. 33604 of 2025

and

CrI MP.No.23479 of 2025

Surgunam @ R.Sargunan
S/o. Ramachandran, Area Inspector,
(Department of Civil Supplies and
Consumer Affairs), Puducherry

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State Represented by
The Inspector of Police
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Puducherry. Crime No.12 of 2025

2.Ayyanar
S/o Balaraman,
No.13-A, Tibetian Street,
Muthialpet, Puducherry.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: The criminal original petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records in Crime No.12 of 2025
pending on the file of the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Puducherry, Quash the same and thus render Justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Yogaraja Sekar

For Respondent(s): Mr.M.V. Ramachandra Murthy
Public Prosecutor,
Govt. of Puducherry
Assisted By Mr.M. Thamizhmani
For R1 (V and AC)



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner/A1 in Crime No.12 of 2025 filed this quash petition.

2.A case was registered in crime No.12 of 2025 against petitioner along with two others for offences under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

3.The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is an Area Inspector attached to Civil Supplies Department. He falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner never met the de facto complainant/second respondent and made any demand of bribe.

4.The de facto complainant/second respondent's admitted case is that one Rajesh (A3) received Rs.5,000/- from him and thereafter, transferred to Balakumaran (A2), which is an independent act, the petitioner not aware. Thereafter, on the date of trap i.e. 30.07.2025, Balakumaran (A2) called petitioner and went to his office. Thereafter, some bunch of amount thrust to him and without giving any time to respond, immediately the Vigilance and Anti Corruption Police surrounded the petitioner and conducted phenolphthalein test, which was positive and petitioner was arrested.



5. The Second respondent/Defacto complainant applied for Ration card on 03.04.2025. During May, 2025, petitioner conducted field inspection and gave positive report to issue ration card to Defacto complainant. A2 & A3, having some inside information, projected as though bribe amount has to be paid to the petitioner and thereafter only, field Inspection and Ration Card would be issued and what had happened between A2 and A3 and the second respondent is not within the knowledge of the petitioner. Based on the thrust and forcible handling of money, the petitioner arrayed as an accused. The major requirement of demand acceptance and recovery are not available, hence, prayed for quashing the FIR.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor (Govt. of Puducherry) for the first respondent strongly opposed the petitioner's contention and submitted that defacto complainant/R2 applied for Ration Card on 03.04.2025 and for months, it was kept without any progress. When de facto complainant approached petitioner, he was informed that he would be getting a phone call. Rajesh (A3) called him and informed that unless Rs.5,000/- is paid, the application would not be considered. Thereafter, on the request of Rajesh, from the account of Praveen his friend, Rs.5,000/- transferred by G.pay and after receipt of amount, field inspection conducted by the petitioner but not issued ration card. Thereafter, during July 2025, the defacto complainant again approached the



Civil supplies office, where, he was informed that through A2 another Rs.5,000/- to be paid, otherwise Ration Card will not be issued. The defacto complainant, thereafter lodged a complaint on 29.07.2025 to Superintendent of Police, which was forwarded to the respondent Inspector, who conducted a background check and made arrangements for trap.

7. Trap proceedings recorded and statement of official witnesses recorded. It was informed by the defacto complainant that demand of bribe was made. Thereafter, defacto complainant contacted A2, who informed him to come to new bus stand Puducherry. The de facto complainant went there handed over the bribe amount, which was received by A2. Trap team surrounded A2 and A2 confessed he demanded money for A1. Thereafter, A2 was asked to call A1. Thereafter, A2 called A1 who requested A2 to come and hand over money immediately. Though A2 informed he has to go Chennai immediately, A1 insisted A2 to hand over the money immediately. Thereafter, A2 went to the office of A1, behind the office A1 was waiting for A2 and received the bribe amount. Thereafter, trap team surrounded A1, recovered bribe amount, phenolphthalein test conducted in presence of witnesses and Mahazar prepared. Phenolphthalein test proved positive. Thereafter, A1 & A2 arrested and at that time, the role of A3 receiving Rs.5,000/- through GPay on 20.05.2025 disclosed and A3 was also arrested. Gpay bank details, telephonic conversation collected



and examined. The petitioner is the person to conduct field inspection and issue Ration Card, the petitioner dragging for 6 months to process and issue ration card to de facto complainant. Now, the investigation is at a crucial stage. Awaiting FSL report and once report is received, after getting sanction, charge sheet soon to be filed. The grounds raised by the petitioner is factual, which can be considered only during trial. Prima facie material available and further, the petitioner caught red-handed receiving bribe amount.

8.Considering the submissions and on perusal of the materials available on record, it is seen primary contention of petitioner is that the petitioner neither made any demand nor accepted bribe amount. It is an independent act of A2 & A3, for which, petitioner made a scapegoat. Now incriminating materials and statements collected. The petitioner caught red-handed while receiving bribe amount. Whether it was a thrust or voluntarily receipt of the bribe amount cannot be decided at this stage, now investigation is at crucial stage, hence this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner. Accordingly, the criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

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

06-01-2026



1.The Inspector of Police
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Puducherry. Crime No.12 of 2025

2.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 33604 of 2



M.NIRMAL KUMAR J.

sms

CRL OP No. 33604 of 2025

06-01-2026