

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 27.07.2016

PRONOUNCED ON : 05.08.2016

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.BHARATHIDASAN

Criminal Appeal Nos.295 & 347 of 2015

1. Anbalagan (A1)
2. Sakthivel @ Sadayan (A2) ... Appellants in
Crl.A.No.295/15
S.Suresh (A3) ... Appellant in
Crl.A.No.347/15

- Vs -

State rep. by The Inspector of Police,
Ayilpatti Police Station,
Ayilpatti, Namakkal District.
(Crime No.177/2005) ... Respondent in both appeals

Prayer:- Appeals filed under Section 374(2) of the Code of
Criminal Procedure against the judgment passed by the learned
Additional District and Sessions Judge (Exclusive trial of Bomb
Blast cases), Chennai @ Poonamallee in S.C.No.6 of 2009 dated
26.03.2015.

For Appellants 1 & 2 : Mr.R.Sankarasubbu
in Crl.A.No.295/15

For Appellant : Mr.K.Dhananjayan
in Crl.A.No.347/15

For Respondent : Mr.M.Maharaja
Additional Public Prosecutor

COMMON JUDGMENT

S.Nagamuthu, J.

The appellants in Crl.A.No.295 of 2015 are the accused 1 and 2 and the appellant in Crl.A.No.347 of 2015 is the third accused in S.C.No.6 of 2009 on the file of the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge (Exclusive trial of Bomb Blast cases), Chennai @ Poonamallee. The trial Court framed as many as four charges against the above stated three accused as detailed below:

Serial Number of charge	Charge(s) framed against	Charge(s) framed under Section
1	A1 to A3	120(B) of IPC
2	A1 to A3	447 of IPC
3	A1 to A3	3 of Explosive Substances Act, 1908
4	A1 to A3	302 of IPC

By judgment dated 26.03.2015, the trial Court convicted these appellants / accused 1 to 3 for various offences as detailed below:

Rank of the Accused	Penal provision(s) under which convicted	Sentence
A1 to A3	Section 120(B) of IPC	Imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year each.
	Section 447 of IPC	Rigorous Imprisonment for three months and pay a fine of Rs.500/- in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days each.

Rank of the Accused	Penal provision(s) under which convicted	Sentence
	Section 3 of Explosive Substance Act, 1908	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year each.
	Section 302 of I.P.C.	Imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year each.

Challenging the said conviction and sentence, the appellants are before this Court with these appeals.

2. The case of the prosecution in brief is as follows:

2.1. The accused 1 and 2 are brothers. The third accused is a relative of the accused 1 and 2. They were residing in Naraikinaru village, Namakkal district.

2.2 P.W.2 Mr.Palanimuthu is also a resident of the same village. He has three daughters and a son. The first accused, wanted to marry the first daughter of P.W.2, but she did not like to marry the first accused. She eloped with someone else. In this regard, there were complaints and counter complaints to the police. In the police station, the first accused expressed his desire to marry her. But, the first daughter of P.W.2 refused to marry him. Thus the enquiry was concluded giving freedom to her to chose her own way of life.

2.3. After sometime, the first accused offered to marry the second daughter of P.W.2-Ms.Revathi (P.W.20). He conveyed the said proposal to P.W.2. P.W.2 was willing to give P.W.20 in marriage to the first accused. But, P.W.20 and her mother refused. Therefore, that proposal was also dropped.

2.4. After sometime, on one occasion, it is alleged that the first accused pulled the hands of the third daughter of P.W.2, thereby extending sexual overtures towards her. She cried for help. This was witnessed by the deceased Mr.Chellakutti @ Palanisamy. The deceased Mr.Chellakutti @ Palanisamy is also a resident of Naraikinaru village. He rescued her from the clutches of the first accused and brought her home. P.W.2 and other family members thereafter decided to give P.W.20 in

marriage to the deceased Mr.Chellakutti @ Palanisamy. The deceased Mr.Chellakutti @ Palanisamy was the sister's son of P.W.2 and in such a way he was closely related.

2.5. On account of the above events, the first accused developed some sort of enmity against the deceased. He felt that because of him, he was not able to marry P.W.20. On account of the said enmity, it is alleged that he conspired with the accused 2 and 3 to do away with the deceased.

2.6. It is the further case of the prosecution that the deceased was an agriculturist by profession. He had a well in his land. There was an electricity connection given by TNEB under Connection No.534 to operate the electricity meter to lift water from the said well. The deceased, without informing the TNEB and without their authority, stealthily had removed the electricity service connection from the said approved location and fixed the board on a coconut tree situated at a distance of about 600 ft away from the said place. The board containing the fuse carrier, the meter and other equipment were tied to the coconut tree at a height of four feet and the electricity motor was fixed in a different well. Thus, connection was given from the board fixed on the coconut tree and the motor in the said well was operated. To repeat, this arrangement was done stealthily by the deceased and it was not either approved or known to the TNEB.

2.7. It is the further alleged that because of the said motive, these three accused, on 17.07.2005, had conspired to do away with the deceased. In pursuance to the said conspiracy, it is stated that on 04.08.2005 around 11.00 p.m., all these three accused had gone to the said land belonging to the deceased and fixed gelatin sticks there and arranged it in such a way that it should blast when the motor switch was put on. After fixing the gelatin sticks with the detonator, it is alleged that the accused fled away from the scene of occurrence (but there is no eyewitness to speak about the same).

2.8. After sometime, post 06.00 a.m. on 05.08.2005, the deceased had gone to the field and when he put on the electricity switch to operate the electric motor, it is alleged that the gelatin sticks blasted and as a result, he sustained extensive injuries on his body and died instantaneously. The electricity board with switch box, fuse carrier etc., also was damaged extensively. There was damage caused to the coconut tree also. The bang of the blast was felt in the nearby areas.

2.9. P.W.1 is the mother of the deceased. According to her, sometime before 06.00 a.m. on 05.08.2005, the deceased left his house for the field to put on the motor in the field. She has further stated that she was informed that in the blast which

occurred, the deceased died on the spot. She immediately rushed to the place of occurrence and found the dead body of the deceased with extensive injuries on his body. Since, she is an illiterate, with the help of a villager, she drafted a complaint and she affixed her left hand thumb impression. Then she rushed to Mayilpatti police station and presented the said complaint (vide Ex.P1).

2.10. P.W.45, the then Sub Inspector of Police, on receipt of the said complaint, registered a case in Crime No.177 of 2005 under Section 174 Cr.P.C. (Suspicious death). Ex.P24 is the F.I.R. He forwarded both the documents to Court. Investigation was taken over by P.W.49 the then Inspector of Police, Ayilpatti police station. P.W.49 immediately, rushed to the place of occurrence and made inspection, on 05.08.2005. At 12.30 p.m. in the presence of P.W.35 and another witness, he prepared an observation mahazar and a rough sketch at the place of occurrence (vide Exs.P5 and P28 respectively). From the place of occurrence, then he recovered bloodstained earth, sample earth, pieces of cloth, pieces of blue colour wire, broken fuse carrier, pieces of aluminum metal, yellow colour pieces of wire, white colour pieces of wire, pieces of white colour rope, broken switch box, broken motor switch box, starter box, yellow colour cable piece, a wooden log, two broken wooden logs, broken wooden board, two pieces of damaged portion of the coconut tree, two steel rods, a wire measuring 160 meters connecting the switch box with the motor in the well and the starter. He recovered all the material objects from the place of occurrence. Then, he conducted inquest on the body of the deceased and forwarded the same for postmortem.

2.11. P.W.38, conducted autopsy on the body of the deceased on 06.08.2005 at 12.30 p.m. He found the following injuries.

"Injuries: (1) Many superficial and deep punctured lacerations present over the chest, abdomen and head. (2) A deep laceration present over the left side of chest 9x5xbone deep, fracture of ribs 3-9 present. Laceration of left lung present 3x2x1 cm; left pleural cavity - 50 cc of fluid blood. (3) laceration on middle of chest 4x3x0.5 cm (4) laceration on left forearm present 5x3x1 cm. (5) 4 punctured wounds on right side of chest 1x0.5xcavity deep three metallic wire pieces present in one injury (6) Laceration on left side of lower jaw and mouth 8x5xbone deep. Fracture of L side of mandible present (7) Punctured wound of L arm present 1x1cmxcavity deep (8) Laceration of L Little finger and middle finger 3x2x1 cm. (9) Punctured wound on L side of abdomen 1x1xcavity deep. (10) Laceration on RV forearm 3x2x1 cm (11) Laceration of L eye

1x0.5x0.5 cm and R eye 1x0.5x0.5 cm; lacerations on forehead 5x3x0.5 cm; L cheek 3x1x0.5 cm; R side of neck 1x1x0.5 cm; R forearm 3x2x1 cm; (12) Fracture of sternum upper 1/3 present. (13) Laceration of R lung 2x1x0.5 cm (14) Laceration of heart 4x1.5x0.5 cm (Ante mortem)."

Ex.P9 is the postmortem certificate. He gave opinion that the deceased had died due to shock and hemorrhage due to the blast injuries. P.W.49 examined few more witnesses and recorded their statements. Based on the postmortem opinion, on 06.08.2005 at 08.00 p.m. he altered the case into one under Section 302 I.P.C. and submitted an alteration report to the Court.

2.12. During the course of investigation on 10.08.2005, at 06.00 a.m. at Mullukurichi, he arrested the first accused in the presence of P.W.37 and another witness. On such arrest, he made a voluntary confession in which he disclosed the place where he had hidden three gelatin sticks, a thota and a yellow bag. In pursuance of the same, he took the police and the witnesses to his garden and produced M.Os.22 to 24. On returning to the police station, he forwarded the first accused to Court and handed over the material objects also to the Court.

2.13. On 10.08.2005 at 11.00 a.m. he arrested the accused 2 and 3 in the presence of P.W.39 and another witness. On such arrest, the second accused gave a voluntary confession, in which, he disclosed the place where he had hidden three electric detonators, one ordinary detonator, insulation tape and a yellow bag. In pursuance of the same, he took the police and the witnesses to the said place and produced M.Os.27 to 29.

2.14. Similarly, the third accused gave a voluntary confession. In which, he disclosed the place where he had hidden a gimlet (Okar) and a torch light. In pursuance of the same, he took the police and the witnesses to his house and produced the said material objects. P.W.49 recovered the same.

2.15. P.W.49 made a request to the Court to send the material objects for chemical examination. The chemical examination revealed that there was no explosive substance detected from any of the material objects recovered from the place of occurrence. The material objects recovered from the first accused on his confession were found to be gelatin sticks. Similarly, the properties recovered from the second accused were found to be detonators. On completing the investigation, P.W.49 laid charge-sheet against the accused.

2.16. Based on the above materials, the trial Court framed charges as detailed in the first paragraph of this judgment. The accused denied the same. In order to prove the case, on the

side of the prosecution as many as 49 witnesses were examined, 31 documents and 33 material objects were marked.

2.17. Out of the said witnesses, P.W.1 is the mother of the deceased. She has stated that on 05.08.2005, early in the morning, the deceased left for his farm to switch on the electric motor to irrigate the land. Later, she came to know that in the blast that occurred in the field he died. She has further spoken about the complaint made by her. P.W.2 is the brother of P.W.1. He has stated about the motive between the first accused and the deceased. He has elaborately stated as to how the marriage proposal made by the first accused to marry P.W.20 was dropped and he has also spoken about the other details. He is the father of P.W.20. P.W.3 is the village assistant in Naraikinaru village. He has stated that on 05.08.2005, he found the deceased proceeding to his farm at around 05.30 a.m. and within 15 minutes thereafter, he heard the sound of a blast. He rushed to the place of occurrence and found the deceased dead with blast injuries. Then, he along with others, took the deceased to the house of P.W.1 and informed the Village Administrative Officer. P.W.4 is a resident of Naraikinaru village and he has stated that on 05.08.2005, when he was going to his field, he saw the dead body of the deceased with injuries. P.W.5 is the owner of the well, where the occurrence had taken place. This witness has turned hostile and thus he has not supported the case of the prosecution in any manner.

2.18. P.W.6 has stated that he was a resident of Naraikinaru village. According to him, on the first day of Tamil month of Aadi in the year 2005, he along with P.W.7 had gone to the house of the first accused for making collection for celebrating the temple festival. At that time, he found all the three accused sitting at the house of the first accused. At that time, all the three were discussing among themselves that they should kill the deceased. Thus, according to this witness, all the three accused conspired to kill the deceased. P.W.7 claimed to have accompanied P.W.6 has also stated about the same facts. P.W.8 has turned hostile and he has not supported the case of the prosecution in any manner.

2.19. P.W.9 has stated that on 04.08.2005, around 12 midnight, he was returning from Pudhur village to Melkatu. When he was so proceeding, he found these three accused moving by the side of the house of one Raj. When he enquired, these three accused, they told that in the village temple festival, cinema was shown to public view. When they were seeing the cinema, since they had some stomach trouble, they came there to answer the nature's call. Next day morning, according to his witness, the deceased had died in the blast. P.W.10 is yet another villager. He has stated that around 11.00 p.m. 04.08.2005, he

found these three accused near the well where the blast had later occurred. When he enquired them, they told that they had come there to do some repair in the switch box as requested by the deceased. He has stated that the next day morning he came to know that the deceased had died in the blast. P.W.11 has stated that he accompanied P.W.10 and he has spoken about the same fact.

2.20. P.W.12 has stated that on 04.08.2005 for passing urine, when he came out of the house at Naraikinaru village, he found these three accused near the field of one Papathi. When he enquired them as to why they were standing there, they told that they had come to the temple to see cinema and since they had some stomach trouble, they came to answer nature's call. P.W.13 has stated that on 04.08.2005, in the night, near the temple cinema was shown for public view. He was one among the crowd witnessing the cinema. The accused 1 to 3 were also in the crowd witnessing the cinema. He has further stated that at around 10.30 p.m., they left the crowd and after two hours, they returned. When he enquired them, they told that they gone out to answer nature's call.

2.21. P.W.14 is another neighbour. He has stated that he was also sitting in the crowd witnessing cinema. He has not stated anything against the accused. P.W.15 has stated that he was in the crowd witnessing cinema and these three accused left the crowd for some time and returned by around 01.00 a.m. and continued to see the cinema. P.W.16 has not stated anything incriminating against the accused. P.W.17 has stated that he found these three accused on 05.08.2015 in the temple premises. P.Ws.18 and 19 have spoken about the motive.

2.22. P.W.20 is Ms.Revathi, whom the first accused wanted to marry. She has elaborately stated about the proposal made by the first accused and her refusal to marry him and she has also spoken about the motive which arose out of the same. P.W.21 is a neighbour and she has also sated about the motive and the enmity between the first accused and the deceased. P.W.22 is yet another villager and he has stated about the motive and the involvement of the deceased in rescuing the sister of P.W.20 from the clutches of the first accused. P.W.23 has also spoken about the motive very elaborately.

2.23. P.W.24 is the employer of the second accused. He was operating a compressor machine and the same was then engaged in Kolimalai. The second accused was employed under him and on 05.08.2005, he did not turned up for work. The second accused was trained to blast the rocks by using gelatin sticks. P.Ws.25

and 26 have stated about the same facts. P.Ws.27 and 28 have stated that the second accused was employed and he was well trained in blasting the rocks by using gelatin sticks.

2.24. P.Ws.29 and 30 are the officials from the TNEB. They have stated that the electricity service connection given to the well of the deceased was stealthily removed by him and the Board with switch, starter, meter and fuse carrier has been fixed by him on the coconut tree about 600 ft from where he gave connection to a motor in a different well to draw water. He has further stated that on hearing about the occurrence, when they went to the place of occurrence, they found that there were extensive damages caused to these equipments. P.W.31 has spoken about the photographs taken at the place of occurrence. P.W.32 has spoken about the preparation of the observation mahazar and the rough sketch at the place of occurrence and the recovery of material objects. P.W.33 has not spoken anything incriminating against the accused.

2.25. P.W.34 has stated that he was having licence to handle explosive substances. He used to purchase explosive substances for blasting the rocks for laying road and for other purposes. He has stated that he was not maintaining any account regarding the gelatin sticks, which were in his possession. He has stated that P.W.27 who had employed the second accused, used to take the gelatin sticks from him for blasting.

2.26. P.W.35 has spoken about the preparation of the observation mahazar and the rough sketch at the place of occurrence. P.W.36 the panchayat clerk has stated about the electricity service connection stealthily given by the deceased. P.W.37 has spoken about the arrest of the first accused, the disclosure statement made by him and the consequential recoveries of M.Os.22 to 25. P.W.38 has spoken about the postmortem conducted and his final opinion regarding the cause of death. P.W.39 has spoken about the arrest of the accused 2 and 3 on 10.08.2005, the disclosure statements made by them and the consequential recoveries of the material objects.

2.27. P.W.40 an official from the District Collector's office has spoken about the sanction order given as per the provisions of the Explosive Substances Act to lay prosecution against the accused. P.W.41 the then Head Constable has stated that he carried the F.I.R. to the Court and handed over the same to the learned Magistrate. P.W.42 the Chemical Examiner to the Government has stated that he examined the material objects collected from the place of occurrence and found human blood on the same. P.W.43 the then Head Clerk of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Rasipuram has stated that he forwarded the material objects to the forensic lab for chemical examination as directed by the learned Magistrate.

2.28. P.W.44 the Head Constable has stated that he handed over the dead body to the Doctor for postmortem. P.W.45 has spoken about the registration of the case on the complaint of P.W.1. P.W.46 a Scientific Officer in the Tamil Nadu Forensic Science Lab has stated that on the clothes found on the body of the deceased, she found bloodstains.

2.29. P.W.47 is an important witness for the prosecution. She is the Deputy Director of the Forensic Sciences, Government of Tamil Nadu. She has stated that she examined thoroughly all the material objects collected from the place of occurrence, but there was no explosive substance or remains found on the same. P.W.48 is yet another official from the Tamil Nadu Forensic Lab has spoken about the examination conducted for finding bloodstains from the material objects. P.W.49 has spoken about the entire investigation done and the final report filed by him.

3. When the above incriminating materials were put to the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C., they denied the same as false. On their side, the wife of the first accused was examined as D.W.1. She has stated about the marriage between her and the first accused. The first accused had examined himself as D.W.2. He has stated that there was no motive for him against the deceased. He has pleaded innocence. Ex.D1 series are the marriage photographs of D.W.1 and D.W.2. Ex.D2 is the marriage invitation. In effect, the accused pleaded that they were innocents. Having considered all the above, the trial Court convicted them as detailed in the first paragraph of this judgment and that is how, the appellants are before this Court with these appeals.

4. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the appellants and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State and also perused the records, carefully.

5. This is a case based on circumstantial evidence. At the outset, we should say that it is well settled that in a case based on circumstantial evidence, the prosecution is bound to prove the circumstances projected by it beyond reasonable doubts and such proved circumstances should form a complete chain without any break, unerringly pointing to the guilt of the accused and there should not be any other hypothesis which is inconsistent with the guilt of the accused. With this broad principle in mind, let us go into the circumstances projected by the prosecution.

6. From the evidence of the family members of the deceased and P.W.20, the prosecution has, in our considered view, succeeded in establishing that there was no love lost between the deceased and the first accused and there was strong enmity

between them. This is stated to be the motive. But, the motive alone cannot give rise to a conclusive presumption that the deceased would have been killed by these accused.

7. The next circumstance is that as spoken by P.W.1, the deceased left his house at around 05.30 a.m. on 05.08.2005, for his field for switching on the electric motor. He was found by P.W.3 proceeding towards the field. Within, 15 minutes thereafter, there was a sound of a blast. Immediately, P.W.3 rushed to the place of occurrence and found the dead body of the deceased with blast injuries. The doctor who conducted autopsy on the deceased has stated that the death was due to the injuries found of the body of the deceased. To this extent, the prosecution has succeeded in establishing that the death of the deceased had occurred around 06.00 a.m. on 05.08.2005 due to the injuries found of the body of the deceased.

8. Now the immediate next question is whether the death was caused by any blast of any explosive substances as it is projected by the prosecution. It is the case of the prosecution that these three accused had set up a detonator connected to gelatin sticks and in turn connected to the switch box. The arrangement was that in the event the switch was put on, the detonator would get activated resulting in blast of the gelatin sticks. It is the positive case of the prosecution that when the deceased switched on the motor, as per the arrangement, the detonator got activated resulting in the blast.

9. But unfortunately for the prosecution, from the material objects collected from the place of occurrence, as per the expert, no such explosive or explosive residues were deducted. Ex.P26 issued by P.W.47 the Scientific Officer, Government Forensic Lab, would go to show that there was no such explosive or explosive remains detected in any of the material objects found. This would clearly go to show that the story of the prosecution that gelatin sticks or any other explosive substance were used to cause the blast is doubtful. The Prosecution has failed to prove this important circumstance beyond reasonable doubts.

10. Now turning to the evidence of P.W.38, Dr.Vallinayagam, who conducted autopsy, he found number of injuries on the body of the deceased. He has termed those injuries as blast injuries. This opinion was made by him out of the nature of the injuries found on the dead body. But from the body, no missile was recovered, neither any explosives nor any explosive residues were found. Though, he has denied the suggestion made by the accused that these injuries could have been caused due to blast of the switch board due to short circuit, we find it difficult to accept such negative opinion of P.W.38. It is not in dispute that the entire board containing the switch, the fuse, the

meter, the starter etc was found completely damaged. The damage was caused to the coconut tree also. These things would give an inference that there was possibility of a short circuit resulting in such a blast. This possibility has not been ruled out. As per the settled law, if there is a hypothesis which is inconsistent with the guilt of the accused is possible, the said hypothesis should be obviated by the prosecution. But, in this case, the prosecution has not removed this possibility. This also creates doubt in the case of the Prosecution.

11. Apart from these circumstance, what has been projected by the prosecution is that these three accused were found in the nearby temple in the crowd witnessing cinema. It is also in evidence that for some time they left the crowd and they were found somewhere outside the temple premises. Some of the witnesses have found them and when they enquired, they told that when they were witnessing the cinema, they had some stomach trouble and therefore they came to answer nature's call. It is also in evidence that they again returned to the same place and continue to see cinema. This conduct of the accused, in our considered view, is quite natural. From this conduct, it cannot be inferred that these accused would have planted any explosive substance at the place of occurrence, which had ultimately blasted. As we have already stated, since there is no evidence that there was a blast of any explosive substance at the place of occurrence, there cannot be any inference that these accused could have planted any such material at the place of occurrence.

12. The last piece of evidence upon which the prosecution relies on is the recovery of the gelatin sticks from the possession of the first accused and detonators from the possession of the second accused from out of their disclosure statements. The learned counsel for the appellants would submit that there is no proof in the said allegation and they were taken into custody long before. It is in evidence that these accused were employed by P.Ws.33 and 34 for the purpose of blasting rocks by using these detonators and gelatin sticks. There is also evidence that their employer had licence to possess. Assuming that these material objects were in possession of these two accused, in our considered view, from out of that, we cannot conclude that they would have killed the deceased by using the same. As employees, there was nothing wrong on their part in possessing. It does not mean that we have accepted the case of the prosecution in respect of the recovery of these material objects from the possession of these accused. There are lot of inconsistencies in respect of the arrest of these accused and the recoveries of the material objects. Therefore, this part of the case of the prosecution is also doubtful.

13. In nutshell, as we have already pointed out, except establishing the motive and except establishing that these three accused were found together in the temple festival witnessing cinema, the prosecution has not established any other incriminating circumstances against these accused. More particularly, the prosecution has miserably failed to prove that there was a blast of gelatin sticks or any other explosive substance and the deceased died out of the same. The prosecution has failed to rule out the possibility of blast due to short circuit because the board was fixed on a live coconut tree. Thus, we hold that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges beyond reasonable doubts and the appellants are therefore entitled for acquittal.

14. In the result,

(i) The appeals are allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed on the appellants / Accused 1 to 3 by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge (Exclusive trial of Bomb Blast cases), Chennai @ Poonamallee in S.C.No.6 of 2009 dated 26.03.2015 is set aside and the appellants / Accused 1 to 3 are acquitted.

(ii) The fine amount, if any paid, shall be refunded to them.

(iii) Since the appellants / accused 1 to 3 are in jail, they are directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless their detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS III)

सत्यमेव जयते

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

WEB COPY

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate,
Rasipuram

2.-Do- thro The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Salem.

3.The Additional District and Sessions Judge
(Exclusive trial of Bomb Blast cases),
Chennai @ Poonamallee.

4.-Do- thro the Principal Sessions Judge,
Chennai @ Poonamallee.

5. The Inspector of Police,
Ayilpatti Police Station,
Ayilpatti, Namakkal District.

6.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Coimbatore.

7.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Coimbatore.

8.The District Collector,
Thiruvallur.

9.The Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai-4.

10.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvallur.

11. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

+1cc Mr.K.Dhananjayan, Advocate Sr.45372

Cr1.A.Nos.295 & 347 of 2015

kji[col]
srg 18/08/2016

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY