IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.07.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.19834 of 2026

S.Kanagaraj … Petitioner

vs.

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D1, Triplicane Police Station,
Crime No. 205 of 2026,
Chennai District. ... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of BNSS, to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner in the event of his arrest in connection with the case in Crime No.205 of 2026 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Manokaran

For Respondent : Mr.Arun Anbumani
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 8 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Sections 61(2)(a) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 in Crime No.205 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant had received a call from the phone number 90477 77775 from a person introducing himself as Thirunavukkarasu and had stated that he is running an opinion poll company called IPDS in Chennai. He had informed the defacto complainant that he had called for an important purpose and that he had contacted him upon the directions of persons from an important political party and he had asked if the defacto complainant could meet him in his house, for which the defacto complainant had replied by stating that he is busy and that the matter can be conveyed over phone itself. Further, the defacto complainant had disconnected the call as the caller had repeatedly insisted on meeting him personally. The caller kept repeatedly calling him through WhatsApp but the defacto complainant did not answer the same. Once again at about 10.20 p.m., when the said caller had called the defacto complainant through WhatsApp, the defacto complainant had answered the call and at that time, the said person had told him that he had come to that position in his career with great difficulty and that he has no idea as to how long the DMK Government will last and that if the defacto complainant does as he says, both will be benefitted. But the defacto complainant had informed that he has no interest in the said deal. Immediately, the caller had informed the defacto complainant that he would be provided with Rs.35

Crores and that he need not resign and the caller had further informed him that though it is his duty to vote as per the Whip's directions he should not do so and that it is enough if he acts as per their directions during the motion against the Speaker and for which he will be given Rs.35 Crores. It was further informed that if the defacto complainant agrees to the said deal, then on behalf of the party, one Naresh, Krishnan and one Ashok Kumar who are aware of all the dealings will meet him and take care of everything. The defacto complainant had informed the caller that he is not interested in the said deal and asked him not to speak to him any further. But, the said caller kept repeating the same thing and the defacto complainant asked him not to talk to him again. Immediately, the caller had told the defacto complainant that it is good for him and his family only if he acts as per his directions and had threatened the defacto complainant that he will face dire consequences otherwise and the said person also had threatened the defacto complainant that he should not reveal to anyone about the conversation and if he does so, then him and his family members will not be alive. The above stated allegations amounts to destabilisation of the elected Government and amounts to offences against a public servant. Hence the defacto complainant lodged a complaint.

3. On receipt of the said complaint, the respondent-police registered the FIR in Crime No.205 of 2026 for the offence under Sections 8 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Sections 61(2)(a) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

4. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is arrayed as A15 and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that he is not a named accused in the FIR. He is resident of Karur District and he is doing finance business. Even according to the case of the prosecution and during the course of search in the house of other accused persons viz., A7 and A8, who were native of Karur were arrested in this case, the petitioner's name was not whispered by any of the accused. There is no allegation as against the petitioner that neither he has met the accused nor contacted through phone. He further submits that the petitioner has been implicated only for the reason that one Mr.Naresh, who is the resident of Trichy was arrested by the respondent with some money. On the confession statement of the said person that his wife had given certain amount of cash in the finance of one Mr.Karunanithi and Saravanan for the purpose of giving it to her husband at Madurai. Thereafter, the respondent has seized the phone of said Naresh,

who had disclosed about the name of Karunanithi, whereupon, the respondent police had arrested the said Karunanithi and Saravanan on 17.07.2026. After their arrest, the petitioner has been implicated falsely in this case on the guise of their statement. Offences under Sections 8 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act require at least a *prima facie* material showing conscious offer, promise, abetment, facilitation or participation in gratification. Conspiracy under Section 61(2)(a) of BNS requires material showing meeting of minds. Criminal intimidation under Section 351(3) of BNS cannot be fastened on a person who is not alleged to have uttered, conveyed or caused any threat. Even according to the prosecution, person who had called the defacto complainant was the one who threatened him with dire consequences. He further submits that there is no call detail record, WhatsApp communication, voice record, message, tower location, CCTV footage, bank transaction, money trail, recovery, document, electronic record or independent witness connecting the petitioner with the alleged offer of Rs.35 Crores or with the alleged threat. It was further submitted that the petitioner is in noway connected with the alleged occurrence and he is very much available at his residence and is ready to co-operate with the investigation.

5. On a perusal of the counter affidavit filed by the respondent and also on the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), it is revealed that, on receipt of the complaint from the defacto complainant, the respondent registered FIR. During the course of investigation, the respondent collected electronic evidence, digital records, CCTV footage and other relevant materials. As on date, fourteen accused persons were arrested and remanded to judicial custody.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent submits that the hawala operator and he is head of the hawala operator with huge money. The petitioner is not a stranger to the occurrence nor has he been falsely implicated. During investigation, it was found that the petitioner is a resident of Karur and he is operating and controlling an organized financial network through multiple finance establishments functioning under different names across the State, including Deepam Finance, Pentagon Finance and Blue Mountain Finance, for the mobilization, concealment, routing and distribution of funds through organized domestic hawala channels. The petitioner is acting under the directions of Member of Legislative Assembly namely V.Senthil Balajiand his brother R.V.Ashok Kumar along with A7 and A8. They coordinated with

the petitioner for utilizing the finance establishments functioning under his control as an integral part of the organized hawala network for routing the conspiracy funds intended for payment of illegal gratification to the targeted Members of the Legislative Assembly belonging to the present ruling party. Therefore, the petitioner is knowingly agreed to facilitate the operation of the said organized financial network, thereby concealing the source, movement and intended destination of the conspiracy funds. Hence, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required in this case and there is a possibility that the petitioner could tamper the witnesses and evidences if he is granted anticipatory bail and he vehemently objected the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent and also perused the materials available on record.

8. Even according to the case of the prosecution, the petitioner is not a named accused in Crime No.205 of 2026. On perusal of the records, it is revealed that during the investigation, the respondent found some cash

transaction between the accused persons from their respective finance namely Deepam Finance, Pentagon Finance and Blue Mountain Finance. The crux of the allegation as per the FIR is that the 1st accused contacted the Member of Legislative Assembly and offered a sum of Rs.35 Crores to vote as per the Whip's directions in the proposed 'No Confidence Motion' against the Speaker of the Tamil Nadu Assembly. However, the said Member of Legislative Assembly refused to agree for the offer made by the 1st accused. Therefore, the 1st accused threatened with dire consequences. Further, alleged that if the offer made by the 1st accused accepted by the said Member of Legislative Assembly, the other accused persons will contact him and negotiate further. So far, the respondent-police have arrested 14 accused persons and interrogate investigation is going on.

9. This Court already granted anticipatory bail to two accused persons in Crl.O.P.Nos.17765 and 17241 of 2026, dated 08.07.2026. That apart, the money which is allegedly involved in the Hawala transaction has been seized by the respondent from the respective finance.

10. In view of the above, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in this case. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

11. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Principal Sessions Judge, (Special Court for Vigilance and Anti-corruption cases), Chennai, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only), with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that:

(a) the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. in the Morning and at 5.30 p.m. in the Evening and shall co-operate to the investigation until further orders;

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner was released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]***; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

30.07.2026

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

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
D1, Triplicane Police Station,
Crime No. 205 of 2026,
Chennai District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras,
Chennai.

Copy to

The Principal Sessions Judge,
(Special Court for Vigilance and Anti-corruption cases),
Chennai.

G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

dm

Crl.O.P.No.19834 of 2026

30.07.2026