

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25.06.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE R.MALA

S.A.No.728 of 2008

Judgment reserved on 17.06.2015	Judgment pronounced on 25.06.2015
------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

M.Arunachala

..Appellant/Appellant/Plaintiff

Vs

1.The General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Park Town, Chennai-3.

2.The Chief Security Commissioner,
Railway Protection Force,
Southern Railway,
Moore Market Complex, 6th Floor,
Chennai - 600 003.

3.The Divisional Security Commissioner,
Southern Railway,
Tiruchirapalli.

..Respondents/Respondents/Defendants

Prayer: Second appeal filed under Section 100 of CPC against the Judgment and Decree dated 17.08.2006 in A.S.No.471 of 2005 on the file of the Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court No.II, Chennai-1 confirming the Judgment and Decree dated 18.09.2003 in O.S.No.4075 of 1997 on the file of the learned XV Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.

For Appellant : Mr.G.Justin

For Respondents : Mr.M.Vellaisamy
for Mr.V.G.Suresh Kumar

JUDGMENT

This second appeal arises out of the Judgment and Decree dated 17.08.2006 in A.S.No.471 of 2005 on the file of the Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court No.II, Chennai-1 confirming the Judgment and Decree dated 18.09.2003 in O.S.No.4075 of 1997 on the file of the learned XV Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.

2.The averments made in the plaint are as follows:-

(i)The plaintiff entered service as Constable on 11.12.1980 in the Madurai Division of Southern Railway under the Direct Control of the Divisional Security Commissioner. While the plaintiff was working under the respondent, he was issued with the charge sheet dated 09.11.1994. The plaintiff was charged with four charges.

(ii)The first charge is that the plaintiff was unauthorizedly absent from duty on 26.08.1994, 13.09.1994, 08.10.1994, 11.10.1994, 31.10.1994 and 03.11.1994. The second charge was also part of the first charge. On the said charges, the respondent conducted an enquiry. The plaintiff gave a representation to the respondent asking for documents to disprove the charges which were in the custody of the respondent and also requested to conduct the enquiry in his mother tongue, i.e. Tamil. But the enquiry proceedings were recorded in English. Before the enquiry proceedings, the plaintiff was not issued with the copy of the documents annexed to the charge sheet. In the enquiry, the plaintiff disproved all the charges.

(iii)Regarding the first part of the first charge that the plaintiff was unauthorizedly absent from duty on 26.08.1994, the plaintiff has told that he was not in a position to come on 26.08.1994 to receive the movement order and on that basis, he was permitted orally to take leave. Regarding to the second part of the first charge that the plaintiff was absent on 13.09.1994, the prosecution witness, namely, Mr.Manickavasagam has stated that the DSI has sanctioned the leave and the same was received on 12.09.1994 evening, that would prove that the plaintiff had been informed about the sanctioning of the leave. Since the the plaintiff was posted for 8-10 hour duty, his request for 16-24 hour duty was rejected. Hence, the absence on 08.10.1994 is not an unauthorized absence. Further, due to sickness, the plaintiff could not be present on 11.10.1994 and 31.10.1994 was the rest day for the plaintiff and the same was admitted by the prosecution witness. The next charge that the plaintiff was absent on 03.11.1994 is false as the plaintiff reported for duty on that day. He was sick and requested for a sick memo. But the defendants with malafide intention asked the plaintiff to appear before the Doctor. The Doctor in collusion with the Inspector refused to certify that the plaintiff was sick. The plaintiff's request to examine the Doctor in this regard was refused by the enquiry officer without any reason. There is a clear violation of principles of natural justice and the procedure laid down under Rule 153 of Railway Protection Force Rules, 1957. therefore, the Enquiry Officer has come to a perverse finding that the charges are true.

(iv)The second charge is that the plaintiff has disobeyed the order of superiors, failing to attend the Range practice held on 26.08.1994 and the same has been disproved by that fact that while the Inspector admitted that the plaintiff was orally permitted to take leave on 26.08.1994 and it is not known as to how the plaintiff's name has been entered in the movement register.

(v)The third charge that the plaintiff was found sleeping in guard's box room in open Platform No.1 and 2 at 15.00 hours during

surprise check by Mr.T.Duraiswamy, ASIPF-VM on 13.10.1994 is false and frivolous. On 14.08.1994 at about 15.45 hours the plaintiff reported for duty and SIFF refused to permit the plaintiff to attend duty. Therefore the plaintiff sent a telegram from Villupuram Office to DSE. The said incident has been accepted by the prosecution witness, namely, Mr.Manickavasagam. Similarly on 05.10.1994, the ASIPF refused to allow the plaintiff to report to duty and the plaintiff informed the same to DSE. On 04.10.1994 and 05.10.1994, sick memo issued by the Medical officer would prove that the Medical Officer had made an enquiry for medicine on duty. But later it was changed as MCP. The plaintiff's request for production of the said document was rejected by the Enquiry Officer without any reason. The plaintiff had made an entry in his point book on 13.10.1994 that he was on duty during the period from 14.16 hours at Platform Nos.5 and 6. But the Enquiry Officer has not accepted the entry and rejected on the ground that it is fictitious. The said finding is arbitrary, unreasonable and perverse. Moreover, the statement of Mr.Duraiswamy about the said allegation is not proved by any independent witness.

(vi)The fourth charge that the plaintiff was found sleeping in Coach No.SLCS 1253 during surprise night check by IP/VM at about 3.45 hours on 18.11.1994 is false. Actually, on that day, the plaintiff found some movement in the coach and got inside the compartment and found an unknown person running away after throwing some materials in the dark. The plaintiff chased the person and was not able to get him. He therefore returned back and collected the materials thrown away by that person and found that they belonged to railway signal department and he has also given the details of the materials in the written statement. The defence witness has also deposed that he saw the plaintiff coming with the materials to the officer. Further, P.W.1 in his statement has stated that the plaintiff was found sleeping in Seat Nos.41 to 45 but whereas in the said compartment there are no 5 seats together as the compartment contains only 4 seats together. Therefore, the enquiry itself is liable to be set side as it is violative of principles of natural justice. The plaintiff was put to prejudice and was denied reasonable opportunity. The plaintiff was removed from service on 02.04.1995.

(vii)Hence, the plaintiff filed a suit to declare that the order of removal passed by the third defendant in SXT/P.227/Rs.153 MA/11/94 dated 03.04.1995 and the order passed by the second defendant/appellate authority dated 04.12.1995 as arbitrary, illegal and null and void and to order the defendants to reinstate the plaintiff with back wages, continuity of service and all other attendant benefits.

3.The gist and essence of written statement filed by the third defendant is as follows:

(i)Charges were framed against the plaintiff for his misconduct and Mr.Veeramani, inspector,/RPF/Reader/Tiruchirapalli was nominated as the Enquiry officer to enquire into the charges levelled against the plaintiff. During departmental enquiry, all reasonable opportunities were given to the plaintiff to defend his case. The

Enquiry officer marked 15 documents as Prosecution Exhibits and examined two Prosecution Witness and the plaintiff submitted six defence documents and produced one Defence witness. After considering the entire evidence on record, the Enquiry Officer submitted his proceedings along with the findings and held that the plaintiff is guilty of all the charges levelled against him. A copy of the proceedings along with the findings of the Enquiry Officer was sent to the plaintiff duly advising him to submit a representation in writing, if he so desired, within a period of 15 days. The plaintiff received the copy of the proceedings on 26.02.1995, but, he did not submit any representation till 27.03.1995. The Assistant Security Commissioner/RPF/Tiruchirappalli forwarded the DAR case file to Divisional Security Commissioner/RPF/Trichy as he felt that the punishment warranted was beyond his powers. The Divisional Security Commissioner/RPF/Trichy after considering the facts agreed with the findings of the enquiry officer and imposed with the removal from service. The plaintiff preferred an appeal to the Chief Security Commissioner/RPF/Madras 06.05.1995 and the same was rejected vide his letter No.X/P.227/1149 dated 20.11.1995.

(ii) It is also submitted that the second charge was not a part of the first charge. The plaintiff disobeyed the order of the superiors as he failed to attend the Range Practice which was held on 26.08.1994. It is further submitted that as per the request of the plaintiff, the enquiry proceedings were conducted only in Tamil. The contention of the plaintiff that he was permitted to take leave on 26.08.1994 is not correct. Without permission of the authority incharge of the Villupuram Post, the plaintiff had availed leave on his own accord. No member of the Force can leave his station in holidays without prior permission from his superiors. But the plaintiff reported only on 12.10.1994 after a days absence. Weekly rest was restricted as per the instruction of Divisional Security Commissioner. Since a large number of staffs have been deputed for election duty in karnataka State, the plaintiff cannot avail rest on his own accord without prior permission. Hence the plaintiff was held guilty of first charge for absenting himself for duty on six occasions.

(iii) The plaintiff was found sleeping while he was on duty and he was awakened by Assistant Sub-Inspector Mr.Duraiswamy. The plaintiff was asked to given his point book but he has stated that he did not have point book. So, the Assistant Sub-Inspector Mr.Duraiswamy made entry about the default of the plaintiff in the point book of Naik 179 and asked the plaintiff to bring his point book to the office. He has made entry in the General Diary of Villupuram Post. Hence, the finding of the Enquiry Officer is correct in this regard.

(iv) On perusal of the point book of the plaintiff, it is seen that the entry made by the Inspector/RPF/Villupuram about the sleeping of the plaintiff was made at 03.45 hours and the entry made by the plaintiff regarding the patrolling of the area from 04.00 hours to 05.00 hours and 05.00 hours to 006.00 hours. He has also made sketch of some railway materials lying in the coach and the

sketch was drawn by him after the entry at 15.00 hours. The Constable S.Mani and defence witness who performed office entry duty has stated that the plaintiff neither given him any materials nor submitted any report. Therefore, it is clear that the plaintiff has concocted a story to cover up his fault.

(v) During the departmental enquiry held on 22.11.1994 the Enquiry Officer has clearly stated that the representation submitted by the plaintiff was considered by him and also recorded that it is not necessary to examine the Medical Superintendent, Railway Hospital and perused the documents mentioned by the plaintiff. It is further submitted that in view of all these mistakes committed by the plaintiff, he was removed from service. Further, this Court has no jurisdiction to try this suit and is also barred by limitation. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the suit.

4. The Learned Trial Judge after considering the averments both in the plaint and written statement and arguments on either side counsel has framed necessary issues and on perusing the oral and documentary evidence viz., P.W.1, D.W.1 and Exs.A1 to A13 and Exs.B1 to B18, dismissed the suit. Aggrieved against the judgment and decree of the trial court, the plaintiff preferred an appeal in A.S.No.471 of 2005 on the file of the learned Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court No.II, Chennai-600 001.

5. The learned First Appellate Court has considered the argument advanced on either side and framed necessary point for consideration and confirmed the Judgment and Decree passed by the Trial Court and dismissed the appeal. Against the Decree and Judgment of the first Appellate Court, the present second appeal has been preferred by the plaintiff.

6. At the time of admission of the above second appeal, the following substantial questions of law were framed for consideration.

"1. When there is violation of statutory rules and principles of natural justice in conducting enquiry against an employee, governed by statutory rules, whether the civil court has jurisdiction to declare a removal order passed on such employee based on such defective enquiry is bad in law or not?

2. When the appellant's removal order was passed by the disciplinary authority, violating the conditions in Rule 156 & RPF Rules 1987, whether the civil court can entertain a suit for declaration that there is such violation and therefore the removal order passed on the appellant is not valid in law?

3. The appellant having filed a suit before the civil court and such suit is not barred under Railway Protection Act and the Central Administrative Tribunal Act 1985 and whether such suit is impliedly barred under section 9 of C.P.C. or not?

7. Challenging the concurrent finding of both the Courts below, the learned counsel appearing for the appellant would submit that both the Courts below committed an error in stating that the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit. He would also submit that as per Section 9 of CPC, the Civil Court has jurisdiction to entertain the suit and even though the Trial Court has held that the plaintiff ought to have approached the Central Administrative Tribunal, as per the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, the Central Administrative Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the matter since the appellant/plaintiff is working as Constable in Railway Protection Force. He further submitted that in the disciplinary proceedings, principles of natural justice as per Section 156 of the Railway Protection Force Act, 1957 was violated and hence, the disciplinary proceedings itself is vitiated. Further, he would submit that removal from service is not the punishment for absence from duty without prior permission and both the Courts below have not considered this aspect. Hence, he prayed for setting aside the judgment and decree of both the Courts below.

8. Resisting the same, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent would submit that as against the order of the defendants, Ex.A8, instead of preferring revision under Section 219 of the Railway Protection Force Act, 1957 the plaintiff has come forward with this suit is barred and hence the suit is not maintainable. He further submitted that the civil suit can be filed if there is any violation of principles of natural justice, no proper opportunity given to the delinquent officer. He further submitted that the principles of natural justice has been followed after giving sufficient opportunity to both sides, on the side of the appellant, witnesses were examined and documents has been marked and there is no violation of principles of natural justice. He further submitted that the Enquiry Officer is entitled to put a question to the delinquent officer or witness for rectifying the ambiguity and sought for clarification and it will not vitiate the entire disciplinary proceedings. He further submitted that the Civil Court has no jurisdiction once the revision provision is there under Rule 219 of the Railway Protection Force Rules. In the Enquiry Order itself, after framing of charges, the Enquiry Officer was appointed and he has conducted the enquiry and filed a report and found that the appellant was found guilty of all the charges and then the Officer passing the final order has considered each and every oral and documentary evidence and after satisfied with the finding of the Enquiry Officer, has passed a final order and he had also called for further representation. He further submitted that both the Courts below has considered this aspect in proper perspective and came to the correct conclusion and hence, he prayed for dismissal of the appeal. To substantiate his argument, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent relied upon the decision reported in AIR 2003 SC 1724 (Mithilesh Singh vs. Union of India and others) and submits that

removal from service on the ground of absence from duty without prior permission is properly explained under Rule 147(b) of the Railway Protection Force Rules.

9.Considered the rival submissions carefully made on both sides and perused the material records and both oral and documentary evidence.

10.The admitted facts that the appellant was working as Constable and inducted in service on 11.12.1980 and his number is 382. The plaintiff/appellant was removed from service as per Ex.A6 and four charges have been levelled against him, which reads as follows:

- i. He absented for duty on 26.08.1994, 13.09.1994, 08.10.1994, 11.10.1994, 31.10.1994 and 03.11.1994 unauthorizedly and on his own accord.
- ii.Disobeying the orders of superiors in that he failed to attend the Range Practice which was held on 26.08.1994.
- iii.He was found sleeping on the boxes in Guards Box room situated on open Platform No.1 and 2 at 15.00 hours. When Shri.R.Duraisamy, Asst. Sub-Inspector/Railway Protection Force, Villupuram Post made surprise check on 13.10.1994.
- iv.He was found sleeping in Coach No.SCGS 1258 stabled in his beat area, pit line when Inspector/RPF/Villupuram made a surprise night check at about 3.45 hours on 08.11.1994.

The appellant/plaintiff has given charge memo Ex.A1 and after obtaining explanation, Enquiry Officer has been appointed and he has also given a letter dated 22.11.1994, Ex.A2 requesting for some documents and enquiry has been conducted, Ex.A3 is the preliminary statement of appellant/plaintiff and delinquent officer, Ex.A4 is the defence statement and documents, Ex.A5 is the enquiry report, Ex.A6 is the order and penalty advise and against which, the appellant/plaintiff filed an appeal/Ex.A7, which was dismissed as per Ex.A8.

11.The learned counsel appearing for the appellant would forcibly argued that the Trial Court has held that the plaintiff ought to have moved either to the Central Administrative Tribunal or the High Court. He would submit that the Central Administrative Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the case and for which, he relied upon Section 2 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, wherein it was stated as follows:

"2.Act not to apply to certain persons:- The provisions of this Act shall not apply to -

(a)any member of the naval, military or air forces or of any other armed forces of the Union;

[***]

(c) any officer or servant of the Supreme Court or of any High Court [or Courts subordinate thereto];

(d) any person appointed to the secretarial staff of either House of Parliament or to the secretarial staff of any State Legislature or a House thereof or in the case of a Union Territory having a Legislature, of that Legislature."

Since the appellant herein is working as Constable in the Railway Protection Force, this Act is not applicable. So, the finding of the Trial Court that the appellant/plaintiff ought to have approached the Central Administrative Tribunal is unsustainable.

12. Now, this Court has to consider the Railway Protection Force Rules, 1957, wherein in section 2(c) and 2(fa), it was stated as follows:

2(c) "member of the Force" means a person appointed to the Force under this Act.

(fa) "under officer" means a person appointed to the Force as a Head Constable or Naik.

So, this Act is applicable to the appellant/plaintiff. Chapter XIII of the Railway Protection Force Rules deals with Appeals and Revision and it contains Rules 211 to 220. Rule 212 deals with Appeal against orders imposing punishment.

13. Furthermore, it is appropriate to consider that the appellant/plaintiff has preferred an appeal against the order of removal from service by dismissing the appeal filed by him as per Ex.A8. But as per Rule 219 of the Railway Protection Force Rules, 1957, the appellant/plaintiff ought to have filed a revision. But admittedly, he has not preferred any revision and he moved to the Civil Court. It is appropriate to incorporate Rule 219.1 of the Railway Protection Force Rules, 1957, which reads as follows:

"219.1. An enrolled member of the Force whose appeal has been rejected by a competent authority may prefer an application for revision to the next superior authority. The powers of revision may be exercised only when,-

(a) in consequence of some material irregularity, there has been injustice or miscarriage of justice; or

(b) fresh evidence is disclosed which could not be produced or was not available at the time of passing of the impugned order."

Substantial Question of Law Nos.1 and 3

14. Now this Court has to consider whether the Civil Court has jurisdiction? It is true that the Civil Court has jurisdiction as per Section 9 of CPC, provided there was violation of principles of natural justice and fair opportunity has not been given. Section 9 of CPC deals with Court should try all Civil suit unless barred. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that there is no violation of principles of natural justice and fair opportunity has been given. In such circumstances, the civil suit is

barred. Admittedly, on perusal of Exs.A3 to A6 shows that disciplinary proceedings have been conducted in accordance with law and there is no violation of principles of natural justice. Both the Courts below have considered various judgments of this Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court and came to the correct conclusion that the suit is not maintainable before the Civil Court. The First Appellate Court has relied upon the decision reported in AIR 1988 SC 752 (Raja Ramkumar Bhargava (Dead) rep. by LRs. vs. Union of India), wherein it was held that the Court cannot taken over the function of the disciplinary authority and that Court cannot function as appellate authority to review the finding of the disciplinary authority. The First Appellate Court has also relied upon the decision reported in 1994 (1) LLN 895 (Union of India vs. Ubendra Singh), wherein it was held that the Court and the Tribunal cannot taken over the function of disciplinary authority and they have no jurisdiction to look into the truth of the charges or into the correctness of the finding recorded by the disciplinary authority or the appellate authority as the case may be. The function of the Court and the Tribunal is one of the judicial review. So, the Trial Court and the First Appellate Court has rightly dismissed the suit and the Appeal is not maintainable before the Civil Court. Against the passing of the final order, Ex.A6, the appellant/plaintiff preferred an appeal under Rule 212 of the Railway protection Force Rules, which was dismissed under Ex.A8. Against which, he ought to have preferred a revision under Rule 219 of the Railway Protection Force Rules. Without invoking Rule 219 of the Railway Protection Force Rules, the appellant/plaintiff filed a suit before the Civil Court. So, both the Courts below are correct in holding that the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit. Accordingly, Substantial Question of Law Nos.1 and 3 were answered against the appellant.

Substantial Question of Law No.2

15.As already discussed in paragraph No.14 of the judgment, there is no violation of principles of natural justice. The disciplinary authority has discussed each and every aspect of the charges along with the enquiry report and came to the correct conclusion and then only imposed punishment. During the enquiry, the appellant/plaintiff has produced the documents, Exs.A10 to A13, medical certificates for his absence on the dates mentioned in Charge No.1. But whereas the appellant/plaintiff has written a letter, Ex.B2 for his absence on 26.08.1994, wherein he has stated that since his nephew was admitted in the hospital and died, he was unable to attend the work on 26.08.1994. But whereas in Ex.A10, medical certificate it was stated that due to giddiness, the plaintiff sought for one day leave. So, on perusal of the documents, Exs.B1 to B11, leave letters given by the appellant/plaintiff for which the Inspector has given remarks shows that the appellant herein was unauthorizedly absent then and there without prior permission.

16.At this juncture, it is appropriate to consider the decision relied upon by the learned counsel appearing for the respondents

reported in AIR 2003 SC 1724 (Mithilesh Singh vs. Union of India and others), wherein it was held that mere making of request of leave will not be accepted and it is not referred to as proper intimation. It is appropriate to incorporate paragraph No.8, which reads as follows:

"8.Rule 147(vi) deals with the case of absence without proper intimation. A mere application for grant of leave cannot be construed to be a proper intimation for absence. Rule 104 indicates various modalities governing grant of leave. There is prohibition on any member of the Force to leave Station even on holidays without specific permission of the authority empowering to grant casual leave. These modalities have been enumerated in Rule 104 clearly bring out the essence of discipline, which is required to be observed. Absence from duty without proper intimation is indicated to be grave offence warranting removal from service. Therefore, mere making an application for leave cannot be construed to be of any consequence in the background of the strict requirement of giving proper intimation. Even if it is accepted that there was intimation, that by no such imagination can be construed to be a proper intimation for diluting the requirement of obtaining permission before absenting from duty. Stress is on the expression, "proper". It means appropriate, in the required manner, fit, suitable apt. The mere making of a request of leave, which has not been accepted is not a proper intimation. It cannot be said that the said word is a surplusage. The intention of legislature is primarily to be gathered from the language used, and as a consequence a construction which results in rejection of words as meaningless has to be avoided. It is not a sound principle of construction to brush aside word (s) in a statute as being inapposite surplusage: if they can have appropriate application in circumstances conceivably within the contemplation of the statute. In the interpretation of statutes the Courts always presume that the Legislature inserted every part thereof for a purpose and the legislative intention is that every part of the statute should have effect. The Legislature is deemed not to waste its words or to say anything in vain. The authorities were, therefore, justified in holding that he was guilty of the offence of absence from duty without proper intimation."

17.Considering the above citation along with the facts of the present case, admittedly, the appellant/plaintiff was absent on that day and on subsequent day only, he has given letter and that has been evidenced by Exs.B2, B4, B5, B7 and B9. So, without prior intimation the appellant/plaintiff was absent from duty and on subsequent day only he has given leave letters. In such circumstances, I am of the view that the above citation is squarely applicable to the facts of

the present case. Rule 156(b) of the Railway Protection Force Rules, 1957, deals with removal from service. It is appropriate to incorporate Rule 156(b), which reads as follows:

"156(b) Removal from service -

- (i) any of the misconduct for which he may be dismissed under clause (a) above;
- (ii) repeated minor misconducts;
- (iii) absence from duty without proper intimation or overstay beyond sanctioned leave without sufficient cause.

18. Applying the dictum laid down in Mithilesh's case, I am of the view that there is no violation of Rule 156(b) of the Railway Protection Force Rules. Accordingly, Substantial Question of Law No.2 is answered against the appellant.

19. As stated above, the appellant/plaintiff was found guilty of all the four charges levelled against him and that has been considered by the disciplinary authority and passed an order. In such circumstances, the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit since there is no violation of principles of natural justice. So, both the Courts below have considered all the aspects in proper perspective and came to the correct conclusion. Hence, I do not find any reason for interfering with the judgment and decree passed by both the Courts below and the same are hereby confirmed. The second appeal is liable to be dismissed and it is hereby dismissed.

20. In fine,

- Second appeal is dismissed.
- The decree and judgment passed by both the Courts below are hereby confirmed.
- There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Additional District Judge,
Fast Track Court No.II, Chennai-1.

2. The XV Assistant Judge,
City Civil Court, Chennai.

3.The Record Keeper,
V.R.Section, High Court, Chennai.

+1 cc to Mr.V.G.Sureshkumar, Advocate,SR.31608

+1 cc to Mr.G.Justin, Advocate,SR.31510.

Ctk(co)
krd 15/7

Pre-delivery Judgment in

S.A.No.728 of 2008



WEB COPY