



WEB COPY



Crl.A(MD) Nos.421 and 425 of 2016

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 29.09.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **P.DHANABAL**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL(MD)Nos. 421 and 425 of 2016
and
Crl.M.P(MD) No.2595 and 2598 of 2022**

Crl.A(MD) No.421 of 2016

Balan @ Balakrishnan

.. Appellant

Vs.

The Inspector of Police
Aravakurichi Police Station
Karur District

...Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Appeal is filed under Section 374(2) of Cr.P.C to set aside the judgment of conviction of sentence passed in S.C. No.39 of 2016 dated 22.10.2016 on the file of the Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court,Karur.

For Appellant : Mr.B.Jameel Arasu

For Respondent : M/s.M.Aasha
Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

Crl.A(MD) No. 425 of 2016

1. Balan @ Ramasamy

2. Kumar @ Mahesh Kumar

.. Appellants



Vs.

The Inspector of Police
Aravakurichi Police Station
Karur District

...Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Appeal is filed under Section 374(2) of Cr.P.C to set aside the judgment of conviction of sentence passed in S.C. No.39 of 2016 dated 22.10.2016 on the file of the Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court,Karur.

In both appeals :

For Appellants : Mr.B.Jameel Arasu

For Respondent : Ms.M.Aasha

Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

COMMON JUDGMENT

These Criminal Appeals have been filed against the judgment and conviction passed in S.C. No.39 of 2016 dated 22.10.2016 on the file of the Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court,Karur. Since both the appeals are arising out of the same judgment this Court has heard the appeals together and inclined to pass common judgment.

2. Criminal Appeal (MD) No.421 of 2016 was filed by the first accused and the Criminal Appeal (MD) No.425 of 2016 was filed by the second and fourth accused. The trial Court has convicted the first accused for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to



undergo one month simple imprisonment and sentenced to undergo one year simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 506(i) of IPC. The second accused was convicted for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one month simple imprisonment and sentenced to undergo six month simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 323 of IPC. The fourth accused was convicted for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one month simple imprisonment and the sentences shall run concurrently. Since the fifth accused died charges abated against him and the accused 1 to 4 and 6 were acquitted from charges under Section 120 (B) of IPC and the third accused was acquitted from the charge under Section 366 of IPC and the sixth accused was acquitted from the charge under Section 368 of IPC.

3. The case of the prosecution is that, the first accused entered into conspiracy for marriage with the victim and kidnapped her for the purpose of marriage and in order to execute the said conspiracy on 09.02.2015 at about 09.00 am., when the defacto complainant and her daughter were coming in a TVS XL bearing Reg. No. TN 47 6284 near Star City Garden, the accused 1 to 4 have waylaid her and abducted her in a



omnivan. When they took the victim in an omnivan, the same was restrained by the defacto complainant and at that time the first accused scolded him in filthy language and also threatened with dire consequences. At that time, the second accused assaulted the father of the victim i.e., the complainant and the sixth accused confined the victim girl in his house and compelled her for the marriage. Therefore, the accused have been charged for the above said offences. After the incident, on the same day at about 4.00 pm., the defacto complainant/P.W.1 along with his son went to police station and gave complaint. Based on the complaint/Ex.P.1, P.W.9 registered a case in Crime No.64 of 2015. The case was investigated by the P.W.9, and he examined witnesses, recorded statements and thereafter, the case was further investigated by P.W.11. Thereafter, he filed final final report.

4. After filing of final report copies were furnished to the accused under Section 207 of Cr.P.C. Thereafter the case was committed to the Principal Sessions Court, karur and then made over to Mahila Court. The Special Court has framed charges as against the accused 1 to 4 and 6. The first accused was charged for the offence under Sections 120(B), 366 and 506(i) of IPC and the second accused was charged for the offence under Sections 120(B), 366 and 323 of IPC and the third and fourth accused were charged for the offences under Section 120(B) and 366 of IPC and the sixth



accused was charged for the offence under Section 120(B) and 368 of IPC and the charges were read over and explained to the accused and the accused denied the charges and thereafter in order to prove the charges levelled against the accused persons, before the trial Court, P.W.1 to P.W. 12 were examined and Exs.P.1 to P.14 were marked along with three material objects. On the side of the defence, no witnesses were examined and one document was marked.

5. After completion of prosecution evidence, the accused was examined under Section 313(1) (b) of Cr.P.C with regard to incriminating evidences and they denied the evidence and thereafter, the trial Court passed judgment by convicting the the first accused for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one month simple imprisonment and sentenced to undergo one year simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 506(i) of IPC. The second accused was convicted for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one month simple imprisonment and sentenced to undergo six month simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 323 of IPC. The fourth accused was convicted for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years



rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one month simple imprisonment and acquitted all the accused for the offences under Sections 120(B) of IPC and third accused for the offence under Section 366 of IPC and the sixth accused for the offence under Section 368 of IPC.

6. As against the judgment and conviction passed by the Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court, Karur, the first accused preferred appeal in Crl.A(MD) No.421 and 2016 on the following grounds:

a) the prosecution failed to prove the motive for committing the alleged offence under Section 366 of IPC and no explanation for the intention to commit the offence of kidnapping.

b) the prosecution has failed to appreciate the relationship of the appellant and the prosecution witness/P.W.1 to P.W.3. The appellant is none other than the defacto complainant's wife's brother son and the prosecution has failed to explain about the delay in registering the First Information Report. The occurrence took place on 09.02.2015 at about 9.00 a.m., but the complaint was lodged on 04.00 pm.,

c) the prosecution has failed to prove the charges for the offence



under Section 366, 323 and 506(i) of IPC beyond reasonable doubt. As per prosecution, the victim was abducted for marriage but no marriage took place, thereby the prosecution theory is highly doubtful and the benefit of doubt to be given to the accused.

d) further prosecution failed to examine witnesses nearby place of occurrence. The alleged occurrence took place in the day light and busy area but none of the independent witnesses have been examined by the prosecution.

7. As against the judgment and conviction passed by the Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court, Karur, the second and fourth accused preferred appeal in Crl.A(MD) No.425 and 2016 on the following grounds:

a) the trial Court has not properly proved the entire evidence on record with proper perspective.

b) the trial Court ought not to have convicted the appellants based on the interested testimony of P.Ws.1 to 3, who are relatives.

c) the trial Court ought to have seen that there was no convincing explanation by P.W.1 while lodging the complaint for the delay in lodging the compliant.



WEB COPY

d) the trial Court failed to appreciate the evidence of P.W.2 especially, her cross examination and she has given 164 Cr.P.C statement twice, i.e., on 12.02.2015 and 19.02.2015 and there is no proper explanation from the prosecution for the two statements.

e) the trial Court has acquitted the accused for the offence under Section 120(B) of IPC and the trial Court also failed to consider the distance from the working place of P.W.2 to the place of occurrence and although P.W. 2 was illegally detained for nearly two days, she has not chosen to raise any alarm on those days.

f) the prosecution has failed to collect cell phone details of P.W.1, 3 and 12 when the call of P.W.3 regarding the alleged kidnap of P.W.2 by the first accused as deposed by P.W.2 in her chief examination. Further, in the confession statement recorded by the police there is no disclosure statement and thereby arrest and recovery was not in accordance with law.

8.1. The learned counsel appearing for the appellants would contend that the trial Court has convicted the first accused for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one



month simple imprisonment and sentenced to undergo one year simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 506(i) of IPC. The second accused was convicted for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one month simple imprisonment and sentenced to undergo six month simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 323 of IPC. The fourth accused was convicted for the offences under Sections 366 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo seven years rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1000/- in default to undergo one month simple imprisonment. The alleged occurrence took place on 09.02.2015 at about 9.00 am., but the First Information Report has been registered on the same day at about 4.00 p.m., and there is a delay of seven hours. According to the complainant, he knows the accused at the time of kidnap itself. Therefore, the delay in lodging complaint itself creates serious doubt over the prosecution case and the trial Court has failed to consider the same. It is an admitted fact that there is previous enmity between the family of P.W.1 and the accused and the accused is none other than P.W.1/complainant's brother son, while so, due to previous enmity, the present complaint was lodged as against these appellants. According to the prosecution case the occurrence took place at 9.00 a.m., near Star City Garden which is a busy area and none of the independent witnesses have been examined by the prosecution. As per the evidence of



P.W.2, she sustained injuries on her hands and legs but as per Ex.P. 7/accident register, no age of the injuries was mentioned and whether the injuries are fresh or old has not been mentioned. The victim sustained injuries on 09.02.2015 but she was examined on 11.02.2015 whileso, there could be changes in the wound but the same has not been mentioned in the accident register and the doctor also failed to state about the nature of wound and this also creates serious doubt over the prosecution case and the trial Court has not considered the same.

8.2. Further, it is stated that the co-accused made phone call to P.W.3, who is the brother of P.W.2 and stated about the kidnap of her but, no CDR report has been collected by the investigation officer. The First Information Report has been sent to Court with inordinate delay and as per the evidence of P.W.2, she was confined for two days, but, no alarm was raised by her during those days, this creates serious doubt over the prosecution case. The trial Court failed to consider the same and there are major discrepancies between the evidence of P.W.1 and statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C with regard to the manner of occurrence, thereby, the prosecution has failed to prove the charges levelled against the accused and the accused are entitled for acquittal. Therefore the judgment and conviction passed by the trial Court are liable to be set aside by allowing this appeal.



WEB COPY

9. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent would contend that in this case there are totally six accused and during investigation, A5 died. P.W.1 is the defacto complainant, P.W.2 is the victim and PW.3 is the brother of the victim. P.W.1 has categorically deposed about the lodging of complaint and abduction made by the accused persons. P.W.2 is the victim girl and she also categorically deposed the occurrence and after the occurrence, she was confined for two days and then P.W.3 has deposed about the phone call made by the accused about kidnap of P.W.2 and the evidence of P.Ws.1 to 3 are cogent and statement of the victim was also recorded under Section 164(5) of Cr.P.C . The said statement corroborates the evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 and thereby prosecution has clearly proved the abduction made by the accused. Further, P.W.2 /victim sustained injuries on the right hand and knee and the same was clearly spoken by P.W.10/ doctor, who, treated the victim and the victim was also confined by the accused for more than three days. P.W. 4 has spoken about seeing of omnivan and P.W.1 to P.W.3 and P.Ws. 10 and 11 have categorically deposed about the prosecution case and the investigation officer also deposed about the investigation conducted by him, arrest of accused and confession statement given by the co-accused and based on the disclosure statement he recovered one knife and omnivan. Therefore, the prosecution has clearly proved the case beyond reasonable



doubts and the trial Court has also analysed the evidence in a proper manner and and correctly convicted the accused, therefore, the present appeal is liable to be dismissed.

10. Upon hearing both sides and perusing the judgement of the trial Court and grounds of appeal the point for determination in CrI.A(MD) No.421 of 2016 is

a) Whether the prosecution has proved the charges levelled against the appellant/first accused for the offence under Section 506(i) and 366 of IPC beyond reasonable doubt?

11. Upon hearing both sides and perusing the judgement of the trial Court and grounds of appeal the point for determination in CrI.A(MD) No.425 of 2016 is

a) Whether the prosecution has proved the charges levelled against the appellants/second and fourth accused for the offence under Section 323 and 366 of IPC beyond reasonable doubt?

Points:

12. In this case P.W.1 is the defacto complainant, P.W. 2 is the victim, P.W.3 is the brother of the victim, P.W 4 to P.W.8 are the independent witnesses, P.W.10 is the doctor, who treated the victim,, P.W.



12 is also an independent witness,,P.W.11 is the investigation officer , PW.9 is the Sub Inspector of Police who registered the First Information Report. P.W.1 has deposed about the occurrence and lodging of complaint. According to P.W.1, on 09.02.2015 at about 09.15 a.m.,,he along with his daughter went to school near Pallapatti Starcity Garden where the accused 1,2 and 4 came there and the first accused pushed down the TVS XL and the second accused abused him in filthy language, assaulted him, slapped him on his cheek. When he hold the hand of his daughter, the second accused caught hold on him and he pushed him down. Thereafter, he closed the mouth of the victim with handkerchief and taken his daughter through one omnivan which was standing nearby without number plate. After making search in several places, he went to police station and gave complaint and the said complaint which was marked as Ex.P.1.

13. Thereafter, on 11.02.2015, the accused persons left his daughter near Pallapatti bus stand and the same was seen by one Saravana and he went to Pallapatti bus stand and when asked about the same his daughter told that she was confined in a room and the first accused threatened her to marry him or otherwise he will kill her. Thereafter, he went to Aravakurichi Police Station and gave statement before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur and the same was marked as Ex.P.2. Therefore, according to evidence of P.W.1 on the date of



occurrence the accused 1,2,4 pushed his vehicle and took his daughter by closing her mouth through kerchief but in the complaint/Ex.P.1, the same P.W.1 has stated that on the date of occurrence when he along with his daughter were proceeding in a two wheeler near Star City garden suddenly a omnivan hiding number plate and one Balakrishnan, who is his wife's brother's son alighted from that omnivan and came there, pushed the two wheeler and they fell down . Immediately, one Balan assaulted him on his cheek and body. At that time Balakrishnan used obscene words and closed the mouth of his daughter by kerchief and taken her into omnivan and the driver of the omnivan belongs to Thanthondrimalai and his name is one Kumar. Therefore, there are contradictions between the evidence of P.W.1 and the complaint with regard to the manner of occurrence.

14. According to the complainant, the accused Balakrishnan had taken his daughter by closing her mouth through handkerchief and taken to omnivan but, according to the evidence of P.W.1, A1,2,4 have taken the victim by closing her mouth through kerchief. Further, there is no reference about the particulars of kerchief, colour and other things. Further P.W1. in his cross examination had stated that there is no whisper about the colour and other particulars of the omnivan which was alleged to have used for the occurrence. In this context P.W.1 in his cross examination stated that “ஆம்னி வண்டி நிறம் மற்றும் அதன் வேறு அடையாளங்கள்



ஏதேனும் எனது புகாரிலும் போலீசார் விசாரணையிலும் சொன்னேனா என்றால் இல்லை.

வண்டியுடன் கீழே தள்ளிவிட்டு நாங்கள் கீழே விழுந்த பின் TVS 50 வண்டியின் இன்ஜின் ஒடிக்கொண்டு இருந்தது. என் மகள் காலில் அணிந்திருந்த செருப்போடு தான் தர தர என்று இழுத்துக்கொண்டு போனார்கள், எனது வண்டியை மறைத்த மூன்று நபர்களையும் எனக்கு அடையாளம் தெரியும். அந்த இடத்தில் 4 நபர்கள் இருந்தார்கள்□. Therefore, from the evidence of P.W.1 it revealed that he has not stated about the particulars of vehicle and his evidence is contra to the compliant with regard to the number of accused involved in this case and the manner of occurrence.

15. Further, P.W.1 in his evidence had stated that police obtained his cellphone number and also he has shown his cellphone to the police and the police also saw the cellphone and thereafter he returned back to home but the prosecution has failed to recover the CDR particulars. Further the alleged date of occurrence is 09.02.15 at about 9.00 am., but P.W.1 has given complaint at about 4.00 p.m., When the daughter of P.W.1 was abducted by the accused and the accused are known persons to the complainant, the ordinary prudent man would give complaint immediately after the occurrence but in this case P.W.1, who is none other than the father of the victim, who witnessed the occurrence and was also assaulted by the accused, has not given complaint immediately after the occurrence and the complaint was given in the evening 4.00 pm., this conduct of P.W.1 also creates serious doubt over the prosecution case.



16. P.W.2 is the victim who stated to have abduction by the accused and she deposed before the trial Court that on 09.02.2015 at about 9.00 am., she along with her father were proceeding in a two wheeler bearing Reg.No. TN 47 6284 near Star City Garden one omnivan hiding number plate was parked there. At that time four persons namely Balakrishnan, Balan @ Ramasamy, Kumar @ Mahesh Kumar, Karuppusamy have waylaid them at that time her father stopped the vehicle and the second accused pushed her father and the first accused caught hold her and dragged her. At that time, his father caught her hand, thereby the second accused slapped her father and also assaulted him on the body. The second accused abused her father in a filthy language and thereafter the accused 1,2,4 and 6 dragged her in the omnivan by tying her mouth with kerchief. Thereafter they pulled into the omnivan which is without number plate and the fourth accused drove the omnivan and the sixth accused was sitting near her and the fourth accused increased the volume of taperecorder inorder to unhear the noise and thereafter, on the way the first accused made phone call to her brother and stated that he kidnapped her and thereafter immediately taken her to one house and locked there. At that time, the first accused threatened her to marry him otherwise he will kill her parents but she refused. Hence on 11.02.2015 in the same van, the accused had taken her to Pallapatti and A1 and A2 had dropped her



near Pallapatti bus stand. At that time, her relative Saravanan was standing near the above said place and after seeing her, on knowing about the previous incident, he enquired her about the incident. Therefore, from the evidence of P.W.2, it clear that three persons taken the victim into omnivan.

17. According to the evidence of P.W.2, on the date of occurrence, three persons kidnapped her by tying her mouth through kerchief, but, according to the evidence of P.W.1 it revels that four persons had taken her into omnivan. According to the evidence of P.W.1, three accused closed the mouth of her daughter but according to the evidence of P.W.2 on the date of occurrence four persons were there. According to the evidence of P.W.2, she was confined in a room for nearly two days but, she did not raise any alarm during that period. During the period whether she was taken food and who provided her food and where the house was situated have to be explained by the prosecution but the same was not explained by the prosecution. Had the occurrence took place as alleged by the prosecution, P.W.2 could have raised alarm from the place of occurrence and where she was confined. But P.W. 2 has not raised alarm and even during night hours when she was confined for more than two days in the room no any alarm raised by her. This conduct of P.W.2, creates serious doubt over the evidence of P.W.2.



18. Further P.W.2 also deposed about the phone call made by the accused while P.W.2 was kidnapped through omnivan. P.W. 3 also in his evidence stated that the first accused made phone calls stating that he kidnapped her sister. From the evidence of P.W.3, it reveals that immediately after the occurrence his father made phone call to him in the meantime, accused also made phone call. Whiles, it is the duty of the prosecution to prove the same by producing call details particulars but, in this case there is no call details were obtained from the service provider. Further, the prosecution has examined P.W.12, who is said to have seen the victim girl on 11.02.2015 near Pallapatti bus stand and he also deposed that when he was standing near the Pallapatti bus stand, he saw the victim and then he made a phone call to her father but there is no evidence as to why he came to the place of occurrence on the date of alleged occurrence and this also creates serious doubt over the prosecution case. Further, it is also admitted fact that there is no talking terms with the family of the first accused and the victim whiles, there is a chance to foist a false case. Further P.W1 and 2 were examined under Section 164(5) of Cr.P.C, before the Magistrate the victim during examination stated that on the date of occurrence Balakrishnan, Kumar @ Maheshkumar along with another person used obscene words and assaulted her father and four persons taken her into omnivan and thereafter thrashed her into omnivan and closed her mouth.



19. Therefore there is a contraction between the evidence of P.W.1 and her previous statement given before the learned Magistrate with regard to the manner of occurrence. Further as per statement under Section 164(5) of Cr.P.C , two days she was confined in a room at that time the accused compelled her to tie thali but there is no whisper in the evidence of P.W. 2 with regard to tying of thali and the threats made by the accused. Further, she stated in the 164(5) Cr.P.C statement about Kumar @ Mahesh kumar, Balan and another one black short person, who is said to have kidnapped her in the omnivan closed her mouth with cloth but there is no whisper about the nature of cloth. According to the prosecution case , the accused closed her mouth with handkerchief and P.W.1 also stated in the complaint that the accused closed the mouth with kerchief. PW.2 in his evidence had given inconsistent evidence with regard to the manner of occurrence and the nature of cloth used by the accused. P.W.1 was also examined before the Magistrate under Section 164(5) Cr.P.C and the statements was recorded where he stated that Balan, Balakrishnan, Kumar @ Mahesh kumar and another one black short person were present in the scene of occurrence and then closed the mouth of the victim with kerchief and pushed her into the omnivan but P.W.2/victim in the statement recorded under Section 164(5) of Cr.P.C the accused person pushed her into the omnivan and closed her mouth with kerchief. These are the major discrepancies and the same have not been considered by the trial Court.



WEB COPY

20. Further, the investigation officer, who investigated the case in his evidence stated that he has not visited the place of occurrence, where the victim was confined and did not draw rough sketch and seen the place of occurrence. The victim was also not in a position to say where, she was confined and the victim is not an ordinary person and she is a teacher by profession and she might have know the place of occurrence where, she was confined but she has not spoken about the place of occurrence where she was confined. These are all major discrepancies and the same have not been considered by the trial Court. Therefore, the prosecution has not proved the charges levelled against the accused.

21. So far as offence under Section 366 of IPC is concerned the prosecution has failed to prove that the accused abducted the victim and compelled her for marriage and no sufficient evidence has been adduced by the prosecution. As per prosecution case the accused abducted the victim for marriage but the marriage was not solemnized between the first accused and the victim. As per prosecution case the first accused to marry the victim abducted and confined two days but no evidence that marriage was taken place. The prosecution evidences are highly doubtful and filled with doubts.



22. As far as section 506(i) of IPC is concerned there is no sufficient evidence that the accused caused criminal intimidation and mere utterance of the words is not sufficient to cause threat on the minds of the victim. As far as offence under section 323 of IPC is concerned there is no sufficient evidence that the accused assaulted P.W.1 and he got injuries and he did not state any pain due to the alleged assault made by the second accused. The prosecution has failed to prove the charges levelled against the accused for the offences under Section 366, 323 and 506(i) of IPC .

23. Therefore, the charges levelled against the accused have not been proved by the prosecution beyond any reasonable doubts and the accused are entitled for acquittal. Thereby the judgment of conviction and sentence imposed by the trial Court are unsustainable and are liable to be set aside.

24. On perusal of records it is seen that the defacto complainant filed application in both the appeals to assist the prosecution but no representation for the defacto complainant during the time of hearing the cases. Thereby those applications are liable to be closed.



WEB COPY

24. In the result,

a) the Criminal Appeal in Crl.A(MD) No.421 of 2016 is allowed and the judgment and conviction passed by the Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court, Karur in S.C. No.39 of 2016 are set aside and the first accused/ appellant is acquitted from the charges under Sections 366 and 506(i) of IPC and he be set at liberty subject to other cases if any. The bail bond, if any, executed by the appellant shall stand cancelled and fine amount, if any, paid by him is ordered to be refunded to him. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition in Crl.M.P(MD) No.2595 of 2022 is closed.

b) the Criminal Appeal in Crl.A(MD) No.425 is allowed and the judgment and conviction passed by the Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court, Karur in S.C. No.39 of 2016 are set aside and the second accused/ first appellant is acquitted from the charges under Section 366, 323 of IPC and the fourth accused/second appellant is acquitted from the charges under Section 366 of IPC and they be set at liberty subject to other cases if any. The bail bond, if any, executed by the appellant shall stand cancelled and fine amount, if any, paid by them are ordered to be refunded to them. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition in Crl.M.P(MD) No.2598 of 2022 is closed.

29.09.2023

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No
aav

22/24



CrI.A(MD) Nos.421 and 425 of 2016

To
WEB COPY

1. The Sessions Court, Fast Track Mahila Court, Karur
2. The Inspector of Police
Aravakurichi Police Station
Karur District
3. The Section Officer,
Criminal Records,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai



WEB COPY



CrI.A(MD) Nos.421 and 425 of 2016

P.DHANABAL, J.

aav

CrI.A(MD)No.421 and 425 of 2016

29.09.2023