

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON: 29.11.2016

DELIVERED ON: 09.12.2016

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.N. PRAKASH

CrI.O.P. No.18424 of 2016

Anand Kumar Jhavar

Petitioner

vs.

1 State represented by:

The Deputy Commissioner of Police
R-1, Mambalam Police Station
Chennai 600 017

2 The Inspector of Police
R-1, Mambalam Police Station
Chennai 600 017

3 K.M. Suresh

4 V.S. Jayarajan

5 Sri Meenakshi Enterprises (P) Ltd.
V.V.K. Charities represented by Shanthi
No.491, Thirumalaipillai Road
T. Nagar
Chennai 600 017

Respondents

(RR 3 to 5 impleaded as per order dated 06.09.2016 in
CrI.M.P. No.9372 of 2016)

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482, Cr.P.C.
seeking a direction to the respondents to register the case
based on the complaint dated 13.08.2016 pending on the file of
the respondents police.

For petitioner Mr. A. Natarajan, Sr. Counsel
for Mr. Rajamanickam

For RR 1 & 2 Mr. C. Emalias
Addl. Public Prosecutors

For RR 3 & 4 Mr. R. Kannabiran

For R5 Mr. K. Rajasekaran

ORDER

This is a text book case to demonstrate as to how an ingenious litigant can use the legal system for executing an illegal act.

2 For the sake of convenience, the parties will be referred to by their name.

3 The factual matrix of this case is as follows:

3.1 Sri Meenakshi Enterprises (P) Ltd. (for brevity "SMEPL") are the owners of the commercial complex at No.73, VVK Traders, Ranganathan Street, T.Nagar, Chennai - 17, which is a commercial hub of Chennai, where, every inch of land is worth a goldmine. SMEPL entered into a rental agreement on 15.12.1996 with Sakthi Fast Foods, a partnership firm with K.M. Suresh, Abdul Latheef and V.S. Jayarajan as its partners and had rented out 2,500 sq. ft. of basement area to them. Some time in October 1998, the tenancy was changed from Sakthi Fast Foods into the name of Sakthi Sarees and Dresses, pursuant to a deed of partnership dated 01.10.1998 that is said to have been submitted by the tenant to the landlord. Again, on 15.04.2005, the rental agreement was renewed with Sakthi Garments. At the inception of the tenancy in the year 1996, K.M.Suresh, Abdul Latheef and V.S. Jayarajan were partners in Sakthi Fast Foods and in the year 1998, Sakthi Fast Foods became Sakthi Garments in which K.M.Suresh, Abdul Latheef and V.S. Jayarajan continued to be its partners. It is stated that Abdul Latheef and K.M. Suresh quit the partnership on 01.03.2003 and V.S. Jayarajan continued in the firm after inducting his wife A.G. Sheena as partner from 31.03.2003. On 02.05.2008, A.G.Sheena resigned from the partnership and in her place, Anand Kumar Jhawar (the petitioner herein) was inducted as a partner in Sakthi Sarees and Dresses. Sakthi Sarees and Dresses later on became Sakthi Garments with V.S. Jayarajan and Anand Kumar Jhawar as partners. Some time in the year 2015, disputes arose between V.S. Jayarajan and Anand Kumar Jhawar.

3.2 It is alleged by Anand Kumar Jhawar that V.S. Jayarajan was only a dormant partner and that he is an ordinary resident of Kerala where he has business interest. It is further alleged by Anand Kumar Jhawar that on 28.09.2015, V.S. Jayarajan attempted to trespass into his shop to take complete control of the same with the help of some henchmen and on the complaint of Anand Kumar Jhawar, the Inspector of Police, R1, Mambalam Police Station conducted enquiry in C.S.R. No.533 of 2015 dated 28.09.2015 and after warning V.S.Jayarajan to refrain from such illegal acts, had let him off. When V.S. Jayarajan once again tried to dispossess Anand Kumar Jhawar, the latter, sensing that something illegal is brewing to dispossess him, filed O.S.

No.3398 of 2016 before the I Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, against SMEPL and V.S. Jayarajan, seeking an order of interim injunction restraining them from illegally dispossessing him from the shop premises, except under due process of law. In I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No,3398 of 2016, on 29.06.2016, the I Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, granted an ex parte order of interim injunction against illegal dispossession in favour of Anand Kumar Jhawar and the said suit is still pending.

3.3 Armed with the order of interim injunction, Anand Kumar Jhawar was under the impression that he is safe, whereas, a grandeur scheme to vacate him had already been hatched and executed behind his back, which, he came to know on 09.08.2016, when, suddenly, a posse of policemen from R1, Mambalam Police Station descended with a Bailiff by name Kanthan, from the Rent Control Court and threw out on the street, the garments and articles for sale, displayed in the shop and forcibly vacated Anand Kumar Jhawar from the shop and handed over the possession of the shop to K.M. Suresh. The protestation by Anand Kumar Jhawar's party that there is in an order of interim injunction against illegal dispossession granted by a competent civil court fell on deaf ears. Neither the Bailiff nor the police relented. Some advocates were also present during the course of illegal dispossession.

4 After operation dispossession, Anand Kumar Jhawar made enquiries and learnt the following facts which are indeed very startling.

4.1 It is seen that on 03.02.2016, K.M. Suresh, the erstwhile partner in Sakthi Garments had filed a rent control proceedings in RCOP No.163 of 2016 before the XVI Small Causes Court, Chennai on 03.02.2016, claiming himself to be the owner of the property, arraying V.S.Jayarajan as the tenant and praying for eviction of V.S. Jayarajan on the ground of wilful default of rent from July 2015.

4.2 It is further alleged in the R.C.O.P. that the premises has been kept locked for six months. The R.C.O.P. was filed by K.M. Suresh through his advocate A. Ilayaraja, having office at Madras High Court Advocates' Association, High Court, Chennai. Later, A. Ilayaraja, Advocate, withdrew his vakalat and K.M. Suresh engaged Mr. S. Gurumurthy, Advocate (Enrolment No. 910/94) on 16.03.2016.

4.3 V.S. Jayarajan entered appearance in R.C.O.P. No.163 of 2016 through advocate M. Subramanyam and filed counter statement on 23.03.2016, wherein, it is stated as follows:

"3. The respondent states that para 5 is concerned, due to the personal situations, the

respondent could not pay the rents and the respondent could not occupy the portion also. For such reasons, the portion is locked from July 2015 to February 2016.

4. The respondent states that he is ready to quit and deliver the vacant possession to the petitioner, since the respondent is not in a position to continue the tenancy due to his personal situations. He is ready to hand over the possession of the tenanted premises on or before 31.3.2016 to the petitioner by vacating the premises and by handing over the possession."

4.4 Thereafter, on the representation made on behalf of K.M.Suresh and V.S. Jayarajan, the matter was referred to the Lok Adalat. In the proceedings before the Lok Adalat on 25.04.2016, V.S. Jayarajan handed over some keys to K.M. Suresh, as proof of handing over the premises and a consent award was passed by the Lok Adalat in favour of K.M. Suresh. On 29.04.2016, Suresh filed an affidavit before the XVI Small Causes Court, Chennai in R.C.O.P. No.163 of 2016 stating that when he tried to open the door with the keys given by V.S. Jayarajan, the lock could not be opened and that V.S. Jayarajan had handed over wrong keys. Hence, K.M. Suresh filed E.P. No.217 of 2016 on 21.06.2016 against V.S. Jayarajan.

4.5 On the execution ordered by the Rent Controller, John Eliyas, Junior Bailiff, is said to have inspected the shop premises on 19.07.2016 and has sent a report to the Court stating that he needs police protection to execute the warrant as there is lot of crowd in the area.

4.6 It may be pertinent to state here that it is not the report of the Bailiff that the premises was locked, but, it is the report of John Eliyas, Junior Bailiff that there is a full fledged shop functioning in the premises.

4.7 On 29.07.2016, the XVI Judge, Small Causes Court, Chennai, ordered police aid for executing the warrant. On 02.08.2016, the Bailiff has given a letter to the Inspector of Police, R-1, Mambalam Police Station to provide police aid. On 09.08.2016, Kanthan, Bailiff, along with some policemen from R-1, Mambalam Police Station and advocates, forcibly evicted Anand Kumar Jhavar from the property. The entire eviction has been photographed and videographed and photos and videos were furnished to this Court. On watching the videos and photos, it is obvious that a full- fledged textile shop was vacated by the Bailiff with police aid, actively assisted by advocates. Perhaps, they did not know that they were being videographed or that CCTV cameras were installed in the shop. Anand Kumar Jhavar submitted a complaint to the Deputy Commissioner of

Police, Mambalam Range on 13.08.2016, but, to no avail. He filed E.A. Nos. 100 to 102 of 2016 in E.P.No.217 of 2016 to set aside the illegal orders, but, as usual, the petitions are pending adjudication before the Rent Controller.

5 Under such circumstances, Anand Kumar Jhavar is before this Court with the present Criminal Original Petition for a direction to the respondent police to take action on his complaint.

6 Under ordinary circumstances, this Court would have dismissed this petition based on the ruling of this Court in Sugesan Transport Pvt. Ltd. vs. The Assistant Commissioner of Police, J-2 Adyar Police Station, Adyar, Chennai - 20 [2016 (2) LW (Crl.) 499]. However, the facts obtaining in this case did shock the conscience of this Court, because, the process of Court has been used to achieve an oblique end. Therefore, this Court ordered notice to the Inspector of Police, R1, Mambalam Police Station, K.M. Suresh and V.S. Jayarajan.

7 On behalf of the police, Mr. C. Emalias, learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the police had only carried out the orders of the Rent Controller by providing police aid when it was sought by the Bailiff and that the police cannot go into the legality or otherwise of the order of Rent Controller.

8 Mr. Kannabiran, advocate, entered appearance for both K.M.Suresh and V.S. Jayarajan and Mr. K. Rajasekaran, advocate, entered appearance for SMEPL. All of them were served with copies of petition and typed set of papers and were asked to file their individual affidavits.

9 What is the stand of SMEPL, the landlord?

10 At this juncture itself, it may be relevant to state the stand taken by Shanthi Meenakshi, Managing Director of SMEPL, in her counter affidavit dated 08.09.2016 that was filed in I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016 before the I Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, wherein, at paragraph no.6, it has been stated as under:

"I submit that the fact being that, I rented out the suit premises shop to M/s. Sakthi Fast Foods, a Partnership Firm represented by its Partners, Mr. K.M. Suresh, Mr. Abdul Lathief and the 2nd respondent/2nd defendant by entering into a rental agreement dated 15.12.1996 with them. They further entered into a new venture by name Sakthi Garments. During March, 2003, the said Abdul Lateef retired from the partnership firm. Thereafter, two rental lease renewal agreement dated 15.04.2005 has been entered into between me and Sakthi Garments and Priya Dresses, represented by its partners Mr. Suresh and Jayaraj, the 2nd respondent/2nd

defendant herein. Subsequently, due to misunderstanding between the partners, the said Jayaraj also retired from the partnership. As I needed the premises for my personal use, I requested them to vacate the premises and hand over the eastern portion of the suit property where Sakthi Garments was functioning. Due to different of opinion, the said Jayaraj, the 2nd respondent/2nd defendant refused to vacate the premises measuring 1,200 sq. ft. on the eastern side of the suit shop property where Sakthi Garments was functioning, a RCOP No.163/2016 has been filed by Mr. Suresh against the said Jayaraj, the 2nd respondent/2nd defendant herein in XVI Small Causes Court, for vacating and handing over the premises and the RCOP was ordered accordingly. Thereafter by way of E.P. No.217 of 2016, the eastern side of the suit properties was handed over to Mr. Suresh by the Bailiff on 09.08.2016 and he in turn handed over it to me. All the process of vacating and handing over the possession of the suit property was done only under due process of law by the Hon'ble Rent Control Court. As on date, the plaintiff is not possession as he was evicted by the Hon'ble Rent Control Court."

11 Shanthi Meenakshi has filed an affidavit dated 01.10.2016 before this Court, wherein, she has stated that the premises was given on rent to Sakthi Fast Foods, which, later became Sakthi Sarees and Dresses and from 15.04.2005, it became Sakthi Garments. She has stated that she knows only K.M. Suresh, Abdul Latheef and V.S. Jayarajan and does not know about Anand Kumar Jhavar nor about the re-constitution of the partnership firm. In fine, the tenant is a partnership firm by name Sakthi Garments as on the date of eviction.

12 To recapitulate, in the counter affidavit dated 08.09.2016 filed before the City Civil Court, Chennai, Shanthi Meenakshi has stated that she had asked V.S. Jayarajan to vacate and hand over the eastern portion of the property, where, Sakthi Garments was functioning, but, he had refused to vacate the premises; that R.C.O.P. No.163 of 2016 was filed by K.M. Suresh against V.S. Jayarajan; that in E.P. No.217 of 2016, the property was handed over to K.M. Suresh by the Bailiff on 09.08.2016 and that in turn, K.M. Suresh handed over the property to her. Whereas, in the counter affidavit dated 01.10.2016 filed before this Court, Shanthi Meenakshi has stated that she is totally unaware of any of the proceedings and that on 28.08.2016, K.M. Suresh and V.S. Jayarajan handed over vacant possession of the property to her.

13 This Court is unable to reconcile this conflicting stand that has been taken by Shanthi Meenakshi. Admittedly, the

property belongs to SMEPL. Neither K.M. Suresh nor V.S. Jayarajan is the owner of the property. How did Shanthi Meenakshi condone the act of K.M. Suresh filing a R.C.O.P. against V.S. Jayarajan, as if he is the landlord of the premises, is a question for which, there is no answer. On 19.08.2016, when the entire eviction process was being carried out, where was Shanthi Meenakshi? Was she a Nero playing fiddle when Rome was burning? Ergo, this Court is unable to accept her version in the counter affidavit dated 01.10.2016 filed before this Court that she was totally oblivious of what was happening with regard to her property.

14 Coming to the stand of K.M. Suresh and V.S. Jayarajan, it is indeed strange that both of them have engaged the same advocate, Mr.Kannabiran, to defend them. After standard denial of all the allegations, in paragraph no.6 of the counter affidavit dated 15.10.2016 filed by K.M.Suresh, it is stated as follows:

"6. I state that the 5th respondent herein stated very clearly in para 6 of the counter filed in the above I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S.No.3398 of 2016 which filed in the typed set of papers filed by the petitioner in the above amended petition in page no.163, 164 the 5th respondent herein landlord of the suit property vacated the Jayarajan as requested by her to the Suresh Partners of the Sakthi Garments and Priya Dresses, as I needed the premises and hand over the eastern portion of the suit property where Sakthi Garments was functioning due to difference of opinion the said Jayaraj the 2nd respondent/2nd defendant refused to vacate the premises measuring 1200 sq. ft. on the eastern side of the suit shop property where Sakthi Garments was functioning a RCOP No.163/2016 has been filed by Mr. Suresh against the said Jayaraj the second defendant herein XVI Small Causes Court, Chennai for vacating and handing over the premises and RCOP was ordered accordingly a receipt executed between the 5th respondent and 3rd respondent herein in the above amended petition to hand over the possession by the K.M. Suresh to Mrs. S. Meenakshi and get back the advance amount of Rs.5,00,000/- and the receipt dated 18.08.2016 and further the 5th respondent herein leased out the vacated portion to one Manickarajan continuously and further para 7 of the counter very clearly that the petitioner herein has no right to question the eviction because he had sub let from the 2nd defendant herein himself has vacated and handed over the shop."

15 The above averments are so unintelligible and abstruse and what one can make out from the above averments is that K.M. Suresh has been set up by Shanthi Meenakshi to evict the tenant in the premises and that he had done his job and handed over the premises to Shanthi Meenakshi. Of course, Shanthi Meenakshi is now crying foul before this Court that she had not set up K.M. Suresh. Unfortunately, her counter affidavit dated 08.09.2016 filed in I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016 betrays her innocence.

16 Last, but, not the least, the counter affidavit of V.S. Jayarajan also contains standard denials. Paragraph no.6 of the counter affidavit which is relevant is extracted hereunder:

"6. The 4th respondent stated that the 5th respondent stated clearly in her counter filed in the I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016 which filed in typed set of papers filed by the petitioner with the above amended petition in page no.163, 164, the 5th respondent herein landlord of the suit property vacated by me and handed over to the 3rd respondent herein, at request of the 5th respondent herein with the 3rd respondent herein. Partners of the Sakthi Garments and Priya Dresses. There was difference of opinion between me and the 3rd respondent herein that some money due to me from the 3rd respondent herein I refused to give vacant premises eastern side at about 1200 sq. ft. to the 5th respondent, than the 3rd respondent settled my money due I also cooperated with Court Bailiff and police people at the time of delivery of petition premises and handed over vacant possession to Mr. Suresh, 3rd respondent herein and I filed my counter in the I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016 before the I Assistant City Civil Court in the case of petitioner herein which are all denied the allegation made out by the petitioner herein."

The above averments are so confusing that they also do not throw any light as to how K.M. Suresh, an erstwhile partner, suddenly, became a landlord!!

17 On a perusal of the photographs that had been taken at the time of eviction, the presence of Mr. Kannabiran, advocate, in the shop is limpid. What is the need for an advocate to accompany the Bailiff and the police for eviction? Assuming for a moment that an advocate would have a role in helping his client for execution of legal process, when Mr.Kannabiran saw a full fledged shop running in the premises, is it not his duty as an officer of the Court to withdraw from the eviction proceedings and report to the Rent Controller that there is an obstructor in the premises who requires to be legally dealt with?

18 This Court, in exercise of its powers under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, called for the entire records in RCOP No.163 of 2016 from the file of the XVI Small Causes Court, Chennai (Rent Controller) and found that the order of eviction has been obtained by playing fraud on the Rent Controller and the Lok Adalat. It is pertinent to quote at this juncture the Latin phrase *Fraus omnia vitiat* (Fraud vitiates everything).

19 To recapitulate the concatenation of events:

- The prime property in question belongs to SMEPL;
- Sakthi Garments, a partnership firm, was a tenant;
- K.M. Suresh, claiming himself to be a landlord of the property, filed R.C.O.P. No.163 of 2016 before the XVI Small Causes Court, Chennai seeking eviction of V.S. Jayarajan, contending that the premises is locked for 6 months;
- V.S. Jayarajan filed a counter affidavit in the R.C.O.P. agreeing to vacate on or before 30.03.2016;
- Both K.M. Suresh and V.S. Jayarajan appeared before the Lok Adalat on 25.04.2016 where the latter handed over some keys to the former based on which an award was passed;
- K.M. Suresh filed an affidavit dated 29.04.2016 before the Rent Controller contending that V.S. Jayarajan has handed over wrong keys;
- K.M. Suresh filed E.P No.217 of 2016 against V.S. Jayarajan and obtained an eviction order;
- On 29.06.2016, interim injunction was granted in I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016 by the I Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, against SMEPL and V.S. Jayarajan from illegal dispossession;
- John Eliyas, Junior Bailiff, gave a report to the Rent Controller seeking police aid;
- Kanthan, Bailiff, obtained police aid for eviction;
- On 09.08.2016, Anand Kumar Jhavar was vacated from the property.
- On 08.09.2016, Shanthi Meenakshi filed a counter affidavit in I.A.No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016 contending that she got vacant possession of the property from K.M. Suresh and V.S. Jayarajan on 09.08.2016.

20 During oral arguments, each side reiterated the averments in their respective counter affidavits. The facts require no further elucidation. A partnership firm, which was running a business, was overnight evicted by a process, which apparently appears legal, but, on lifting the veil, a sinister hydra is found hiding underneath. The conspirators have taken the Rent Controller, Lok Adalat and the I Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai, for a royal ride. Kanthan, Bailiff, has happily joined the bandwagon as a cohort. An award passed by the Lok Adalat is not appealable and it is an executable decree. The prayer of Anand Kumar Jhavar in I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016 against SMEPL and V.S. Jayarajan is for an order of interim injunction restraining them and their men and agents from dispossessing Anand Kumar Jhavar and his men from the peaceful possession of the shop portion situated at No.73, Ranganathan Street, T.Nagar, Chennai 600 017, more fully described in the schedule, except under due process of law, till the disposal of the suit. The I Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai, has granted interim injunction on 29.06.2016 by a detailed order, after giving a finding that the balance of convenience is in favour of Anand Kumar Jhavar. This means that Anand Kumar Jhavar cannot be evicted by an illegal process. In violation of this order of interim injunction, Anand Kumar Jhavar has been evicted by an illegal process, though it may seemingly be legal.

21 The High Court, being a Constitutional authority, under whose superintendence, fall the Rent Controller and Lok Adalat, cannot be a mute spectator and turn a Nelson's eye to the said happenings, lest, it should embolden such manipulators of the legal system to continue with impunity, their nefarious activities. The acts of K.M. Suresh, V.S. Jayarajan and Shanthi Meenakshi, prima facie, amount to criminal contempt as defined under Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts, Act, 1971 for manipulating the Rent Control Court, Lok Adalat and for violating the order of the I Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai in I.A. No.8311 of 2016 in O.S. No.3398 of 2016. Such illegal dispossession has attained an institutional status in Chennai that, in the "Report of the Committee to inquire into the parallel justice delivery system at Egmore Court (November 2016)" that was submitted by the Committee, headed by Justice K. Chandru (Retd.) to the First Bench of this Court, it has been observed as under:

"Apart from the double bail system in which certain group of lawyers indulge in extortion of demanding money from the lawyers/clients who are engaged by the accused, there has also been several activities of goondaism, thuggery and private execution force adopted by certain elements at the Egmore Court complex. Some of the news items covering these events will be worth reproducing:

(iii) 15 advocates in Eviction Drama:

On Thursday, a group of 15 advocates broke into the office of Kamal Pasha, beat him up and forced him out of the premises as they claimed that Mr. Palanisamy now owned the land and that he had decided to evict Kamal Pasha. The police rushed to the spot and pacified the advocates to stop the eviction.

(Deccan Chronicle dt. 12.09.2008)

22 If "X" illegally dispossesses "Y" with goondas, the remedy for "Y" is to file a suit under Section 6 of the Specific Relief Act. Here, the illegal dispossession has been effected under the cover of Court orders. In other words, the Court system has been used to commit a gross illegality. Therefore, the High Court, being a sentinel of every individual's human right, with all the Constitutional powers under its command, should set right the injustice. Otherwise, people will lose faith in the judicial system, resulting in anarchy.

23 Since the act of criminal contempt relates to the subordinate judiciary, this Court can take action either on reference made to it by the subordinate Court or on a motion made by the Advocate General (See Vilas V. Sanghai vs. Sumermal Mishrimal Bafna and another [2016 (9) Scale 489]).

24 Bearing in mind, the above, what are the reliefs that this Court can grant?

25 Extraordinary cases require extraordinary solutions [See Prithipal Singh vs. State of Punjab (2012) 1 SCC 10].

26 In view of the above:

- The entire proceedings in R.C.O.P. No.163 of 2016 and Lok Adalat proceedings in R.C.O.P. No.163 of 2016 dated 25.04.2016 are hereby quashed in exercise of powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
- This Court directs the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mambalam Range to put Anand Kumar Jhavar back in possession of the property;
- This Court directs Anand Kumar Jhavar to give a complaint to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Central Crime Branch, Chennai and on such complaint being given, a regular FIR be registered against K.M. Suresh, V.S.Jarayajan and Shanthi Meenakshi and those who were part of the illegal eviction.

- The Registrar-Vigilance, High Court of Madras is directed to conduct an enquiry on the role played by Kanthan, Bailiff, attached to the Small Causes Court, Chennai.
- The Registry is directed to place a copy of this order and the relevant records before the Advocate General of the State of Tamil Nadu for him to decide as to whether a motion for criminal contempt should be made before the High Court.

In fine, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed with the above directions.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS VII)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To

- 1 The Deputy Commissioner of Police
R-1, Mambalam Police Station
Chennai 600 017
- 2 The Inspector of Police
R-1, Mambalam Police Station
Chennai 600 017
- 3 The Public Prosecutor
Madras High Court
Chennai 600 104
- 4 The Deputy Commissioner of Police
Central Crime Branch
Chennai
- 5 The Deputy Commissioner of Police
Mambalam Range
Chennai
- 6 The Advocate General
High Court of Madras
Chennai 600 104
- 7 The Registrar
Small Causes Court
Chennai

Copy to:

1.The Registrar,
Vigilance, High Court, Madras.

2.The Section Officer,
Criminal Section,
High Court, Madras.

3.TheRegistrar Judicial,
High Court, Madras.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Chennai.

+1 cc 's to Mr.Raja Manickkam,advocate,sr.72595

+1 cc to Mr.Rajasekaran,advocate,sr.72599.

+1 cc to Mr.R.kannabiran,advocate,sr.72792 (14/12)

mg(co)
krd 9/12

CrI.O.P. No.18424 of 2016



WEB COPY