



CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 12/02/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE N.MALA

CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

S.Asokaraj

... Petitioner/Respondent/
Accused No.1

Vs

The Union of India,
Rep by the Inspector of Police,
SPE, CBI, ACB,
Madurai.

... Respondent/Petitioner/
Complainant

PRAYER:- Criminal Revision filed under Section 438 r/w442 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records relating to the impugned order passed in CrI.M.P.No.225 of 2025 on the file of the Learned II Additional District Court (CBI Cases) Madurai dated 10.11.2025 and set aside the same as unwarranted and allow the above Criminal Revision Petition as prayed for.

For Petitioner : M.Jegadeesh Pandian

For Respondent : Mr.C.Muthu Saravanan

Special Public Prosecutor for CBI Cases



CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Petition is filed against the order dated 10.11.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.225 of 2025, cancelling the bail granted to the petitioner by the II Additional District Court (CBI Cases) Madurai.

2.The present case in RC MAI 2016 A 0012 was registered by CBI ACB Chennai on 08.04.2016, based on a complaint dated 08.04.2016 submitted by N.Muruganandam, for the offences punishable under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, against the petitioner, S.Asoka Raj, the then Superintendent of Service Tax, Madurai.

3.The Defacto complainant, Murugananadam, had lodged a complaint for illegal bribe in Crime No.144 of 2025, against the petitioner and his wife, who were working in Customs and Excise Department, in the year 2016. A criminal case was registered against the petitioner and his wife in C.C.No.270 of 2017. As on 20.02.2025, the case was pending for cross examination of the prosecution witnesses. Whil so, on 23.04.2024, when the defacto complainant went to his



CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

vacant site for conducting Boomi Pooja, one Duraimurugan and other accused approached him, threatened him with dire consequences and obstructed him from constructing the house in his property. On 09.05.2025, at about 04.30 p.m., the said Duraimurugan and others repeated the threat and therefore on 25.05.2025, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against Duraimurugan. According to the petitioner, the petitioner was not arraigned as an accused in the said case and the entire allegations were against Duraimurugan. The petitioner states that without ascertaining the facts and circumstances under which the registration of the case, was made, the petitioner's bail was cancelled by the lower Court in C.C.No.225 of 2025 on 10.11.2025. Aggrieved by the cancellation of bail, the petitioner has filed the above criminal revision petition.

4.The respondent filed a detailed counter narrating the entire facts of the case. The respondent further stated that the Trial Court had judiciously applied its mind and cancelled the bail of the petitioner. The respondent further stated that if the petitioner was enlarged on bail, then there was a possibility of tampering of evidences and influencing the



CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

witnessess by the petitioner. The respondent further stated that there were no merits in the petition and the same deserved to be dismissed.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the solitary reason for cancellation of petitioner's bail was the registration of FIR in Crime No.144 of 2025, based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant against Duraimurugan, who was allegedly instigated by the petitioner, to threaten the defacto complainant. The learned counsel further submitted that against the said FIR, a quash petition was filed in CrI.O.P(MD)No.16067 of 2025 and this Court, by order dated 08.12.2025, quashed the said FIR on the basis of a compromise entered into between the defacto complainant and Duraimurugan. The learned further submitted that in the light of the order of this Court dated 08.12.2025 quashing the FIR, the basis for cancellation of the bail no longer survives. Therefore, the learned counsel prayed that the petition be allowed.

6.Heard both sides and perused the materials on record.



CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

7.As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the foundational fact for cancellation of the bail of the petitioner was the registration of FIR in Crime No.144 of 2025, based on the complaint of the defacto complainant against Duraimurugan, alleging that the petitioner had threatened the defacto complainant through him. Since this Court has quashed the said FIR on the basis of a compromise entered into between the defacto complainant and said Duraimurugan, the foundational fact for cancellation of bail has become non-extant. The impugned order hence has no legs to stand.

8.Since the FIR in Crime No.144 of 2025, has been quashed by this Court, the impugned order passed by the learned II Additional District Judge (CBI Cases) Madurai, in Crl.M.P.No.225 of 2025, dated 10.11.2025 cannot be sustained and hence it is set aside. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Petition stands allowed.

12.02.2026

NCC:yes/no
Index:yes/no
Internet:yes/no
Sn

5/7



CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

WEB COPY

TO

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
SPE, CBI, ACB,
Madurai.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL RC(MD). No.1445 of 2025

N.MALA,J

Sn

CRL RC(MD) No.1445 of 2025

12/02/2026