

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 21.09.2017

Pronounced on : 09.10.2017

Coram

The Honourable Dr.Justice G.Jayachandran

Criminal Appeal No.460 of 2011

G.Pillarchetty .. Appellant/1st Accused

/versus/

State:Deputy Supdt of Police,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Dharmapuri,
Cr.No.03/AC/2002 .. Respondent/Complainant

Criminal Appeal is filed under Section 374 of the Criminal Procedure Code praying (a)to call for the records of the case from the trial Court in Spl.C.C.No.4 of 2008 on the file of the Special Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dharmapuri, (b)to examine the legality, propriety and correctness of the proceedings and the impugned judgment and (c)to set aside the order of conviction and direct the acquittal of the appellant (d)grant such other eqvitable relief deemed to rafir

For Appellant :Mr.A.Thiyagarajan

For Respondent :Mr.R.Ravichandran,GA(Crl.Side)

J U D G M E N T

सत्यमेव जयते

This appeal is preferred by A1[Mr.N.Santhirasegaran] in C.C.No.4 of 2008 on the file of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate No.1, Dharmapuri challenging the judgment of conviction and sentence passed against him for the offence under Section 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2. Facts in brief leading to the appeal:

Mr.Arumugham [PW.3], a Carpenter by profession in order to expand his profession, has approached the Electricity Board, Pennagaram for providing electricity service connection to run 18HP motor at his new premises located in the Bye pass Road, Pennagaram. When he met A1[Mr.G.Pillar Chetty] Additional

Divisional Engineer(O&M) and A2 [Mr.M.Kanthan], Junior Engineer (O&M) on 22.01.2002 with his application, they have refused to receive it and have demanded Rs.500/- and Rs.250/- respectively. Also, he was directed to give the application along with agreement from the land owner duly signed by Munsif. Again, on 05.02.2002, PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] met A1[Mr.G.Pillar Chetty] and A2 [Mr.M.Kanthan] and gave his application along with the documents required. Since he did not give bribe to A1[Mr.G.Pillar Chetty] and A2[Mr.M.Kanthan], they refused to receive it, but they demanded Rs.500/- and Rs.250/- respectively as bribe. Also, they informed PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] that unless he give money before 06.02.2002, his application will not be taken for processing.

3. Since PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] was not inclined to give bribe, he gave a complaint [Ex.P3] to the respondent police. On receipt of the complaint, PW-7 [Mr.Balan], District Superintendent of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, has registered First Information Report[Ex.P14]. After preparing entrustment mahazar in the presence of the witnesses, he had followed the defacto complainant [PW-3-Mr.Arumugham] and the accompanying witness Mr.C.Lakshmanan [PW-4] to the office of the accused. On 05.02.2002 at about 5.00 p.m., when PW-3 [Mr.Arumugham] and PW-4 [Mr.C.Lakshmanan] went to the Electricity Board Office, Pennagaram, A3 [Mr.N.Padmanaban] enquired PW-3 [Mr.Arumugham], whether he has brought all the documents along with the money demanded. When PW-3 answered in affirmative, A3 [Mr.N.Padmanaban] went inside A1 [Mr.G.Pillar Chetty]'s room and after some time, A3 came out from the A1's room and took PW-3 [Mr.Arumugham] and PW-4[Mr.Lakshmanan] inside A1's room. A3 collected the application and gave it to A1. A3 demanded money from PW-3 [Mr.Arumugham] and received the tainted money Rs.750/- from PW-3 [Mr.Arumugham] took Rs.500/- and place it in the table drawer of A1 and retained Rs.250/- with him. A1 saw A3 placing the tainted money in his drawer.

4. Thereafter, A1 perused the application and instructed PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] to get chitta and adangal copy for the land. PW-3 and PW-4 along with A3 came out from A1's room. PW-3 gave the pre-arranged signal to the trap laying officer. Thereafter, the search of A1's room was conducted. The hand wash of A1 in the solution containing sodium carbonate did not show any colour reaction. When he enquired about whether he received any money from PW-3, A1 took Rs.500/- from his table drawer and handed it over to PW-7 [Mr.Balan, DSP]. The currency numbers tallied with the currency number found in the entrustment mahazar [Ex.P-4] prepared earlier. The hand wash of A3 with sodium carbonate solution turned pink in colour. On enquiry, A3 took out the tainted money of Rs.250/- from his right side pant pocket. The currency numbers tallied with the currency numbers recorded in Ex.P4 [entrustment mahazar]. The recover of tainted currency

from A1 and A3 were recorded under mahazar [Exs.P4 and P5]. A1 to A3 were arrested and their house search did not lead to any recovery of incriminating materials. The hand wash solution of A1 and A3, the cloth wash solution of A3 pant were sent to Lab for chemical analysis and a report of the Lab marked as Ex.P-13 reveals the presence of phenolphthalein in the hand wash of A3 and his pant wash. During trial, A3 died and the case against him got abated. The trial Court acquitted A2, since there is no incriminating evidence available against him and convicted A1 accepting the prosecution case.

5. Grounds of appeal:

The learned counsel appearing for the appellant submitted that the trial Court has failed to consider the evidence of PW-5 [Assistant Executive Engineer] that as per the procedure of the Electricity Boards Rules, the duty of receiving applications for effecting service connection rests only with the Junior Assistant A2 and it is unbelievable that the applicant A1 demanded and accepted bribe money. The evidence of PW-3 bristles with inconsistency and did not support the case of the prosecution. The prior demand of bribe alleged in Ex.P3 on 28.01.2002 and 05.02.2002 had not been proved by the prosecution. The defence witness and exhibits, which prove that A1 was on other duty on 05.02.2002 and returned to office only after 04.45 p.m., disproved the case of the prosecution that he demanded money on 05.02.2002. The fact that the defacto complainant has purchased 10 HP motor only on 31.01.2002, is evidence from Ex.P-16[receipts], while so, in the complaint [Ex.P-3], PW-3 has stated that he met A1 and A2 on 28.01.2002 along with the application attested by the Revenue Inspector and Village Administrative Officer and purchase bill of motor cannot be true. Undue reliance of accompanying witness Mr.Lakshmanan [PW-4] and the trap laying officer [PW-7] had led to miscarriage of justice. When the earlier demand is not proved, the recovery of tainted money from A1's drawer cannot be sufficient to hold A1 guilty of demand and acceptance of reward or motive. Further, the learned counsel appearing for the appellant also contended that the charges framed against A1 is ambiguous. The incriminating evidence spoken against A1 is not put to A1 while questioning under Section 313 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

6. The absence of phenolphthalein as established from Lab report and the evidence of PW-4[Mr.Lakshmanan] and PW-7 [Mr.Balan] go to show that A1 never handled the tainted money. While so, the evidence of PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] that kept the tainted money on the table of A1 and left the room, give room to suspect. The tainted money was planted in the accused drawer, without his consent and knowledge. The prosecution has failed to prove demand either prior to complaint [Ex.P3] or at the time of occurrence. Hence, it is improper to presume that the tainted money alleged to have been recovered from A1's drawer, is an

illegal gratification received by A1 by abusing his official position.

7. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that PW-3[Mr.D.Arumugham] has been treated hostile by prosecution, since he retracted from his statement given under Section 161 of Criminal Procedure Code to the Investigating Officer. But, the trial Court has considered and appreciated the evidence of accompanied official witness PW-4 [Mr.Lakshmanan], who has impartially narrated the events happened. When he accompanied the defacto complainant [PW-3] to meet A1 on the relevant date of trap. PW-4 [Mr.Lakshmanan] had deposed that on the date of trap he and PW3 [Mr.Arumugham] met A3 at his office about 17.00 hrs., who took them to the room of A1. In the presence of A1, A3 demanded bribe amount from PW3[Mr.Arumugham]. PW3 gave the tainted money to A3, who accepted Rs.750/- on behalf of A1 and A2 from PW3 [Mr.Arumugham]. Subsequently, A3 put the bribe amount of Rs.500/- received from PW3 in the left side drawer of A1's table with A1's knowledge and consent.

8. He also submitted that the evidence of PW4[Mr.Lakshmanan] accompanying official witness very clearly reveals that A1 has not received the bribe amount with his hands. But, on the other hand, he instructed A3 to receive the bribe amount on behalf of him. The tainted money was received by A3. With A1 knowledge and consent, A3 received the bribe amount of Rs.500/- on behalf of A1 being his share and put the bribe amount in A1's table drawer with A1's knowledge. It is submitted that, the witness PW-4 [Mr.Lakshmanan] is the impartial official witness. Admittedly there is no motive or enmity between PW3 [Mr.Arumugham] and A1 to A3. The evidence of accompanying official witness [PW-4 Mr.Lakshmanan] who is present at the time of demand and acceptance of bribe by A1 to A3 from PW3 defacto complainant, is corroborated by the evidence of PW7[Mr.Balan, the Trap Laying Officer] with the perfection in all aspects as to the demand and acceptance of bribe amount of Rs.750/- without any material contradiction. The minor discrepancies of PW-4 [Mr.Lakshmanan] regarding the house search of A1 and A2 cannot be a grave error or omission to suspect the credential of PW-4 [Mr.Lakshmanan]. The house search, which was conducted on the date of trap i.e 05.02.2002 evening, is only a subsequent event to the trap proceedings. Any contradiction regarding the presence of family members during the search should be attributed to lapse of memory of insignificant detail due to efflux of time.

9. The prosecution through witnesses and documents has proved that based on the complaint of PW-3[Mr.Arumugham], a trap was laid. Tainted currencies were entrusted to PW-3 [Mr.Arumugham]. The pre-trap proceedings recorded as mahazar are

marked as Exs.P4 and P5. The currencies mentioned in Exs.P4 and P5 had been recovered from A1's drawer and the possession of A3. It is not the case of the prosecution that, A1 received the money from PW-3[Mr.Arumugham]. If it is so then the absence of phenolphthalein in the hand wash of A1 would be a reason to suspect the prosecution case. Whereas the consistent case of the prosecution as seen from the deposition of PW-3[Mr.Arumugham], PW-4[Mr.Lakshmanan] and PW-7[Mr.Balan,the Trap Laying Officer] and as recorded in the recovery mahazar Exs.P4 and P5 is that PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] and PW-4[Mr.Lakshmanan] entered into the office on 05.02.2004 and they first met with A3, who enquired, whether PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] has brought the money as demanded. Thereafter, A3 alone went into A1's room for apprising about PW3 [Mr.Arumugham] arrival and with the permission of A1, A3 took PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] into A1's room. PW-4[Mr.Lakshmanan] has accompanied PW3[Mr.Arumugham] and had seen, what happenings in the A1's room. In front of A1, the money has been again demanded by A3. After receiving Rs.750/-, A3 has kept Rs.500/- in the table drawer of A1 under his full vision and knowledge and A3 has retained Rs.250/- promising PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] that he will give that money to A2. Before that could happen, the trap laying officer has entered into the office and started enquiry, since the tainted money was received on behalf of A2, though he did not pass it on A2, the trial Court has rightly acquitted A2.

10. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant contended that First Information Report was registered on 05.02.2002 at about 10.00 a.m. The possibility of demand by A1 on that day, is not possible, since A1 was on duty on that day and come to office only after 04.45 p.m.. To strengthen his submission, Ex.D1- a communication to all Additional Divisional Engineers of Electricity Board instructing to arrange for meter reading of 11 KV feeders and the evidence of DW-2[Mr.Shadasivam retired driver TNEB] is relied on.

11. A perusal of Ex.D1-communication reveals that the Executive Engineer (O&M)/Palacode has instructed all the Assistant Executive Engineers (O&M) to arrange for taking meter readings in 11KV feeders on the day mentioned against each feeder, as per this communication, on 05.02.2002, the initial reading of Arabampatty, Papparampatty and Jakkampatty 11 KV feeders to be taken on 05.02.2002. DW-2[Mr.Shadasivam], retired Driver of the Electricity Board has deposed that, on 05.02.2002 from morning 7.00 a.m., to evening 04.45 p.m., A1 was with him on duty and had referred the trip sheet of the vehicle. The trip sheet being prepared after the trap, what recorded in it is not reliable. If the accused had produced the initial meter reading of any of these 11 KV feeders to show that as per the communication[Ex.D1], he went to those places on the date specified and recorded reading, the alibi is believable, since

it will be a document prepared contemporaneous during inspection.

12. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant relying upon the following judgments to focus his proposition that the evidence of PW-4[Mr.Lakshmanan] should be viewed with suspicion and conviction should not be solely based on his evidence.

13. The judgment of the Hon'ble Surpeme Court reported in Sat paul v. Delhi Administration [1976 SCC (Cri)160] wherein it is held in para 23, which reads as follows:

"23. It is true that there is no absolute rule that the evidence of an interested witness cannot be accepted without corroboration. But where the witnesses have poor moral fibre and have to their discredit a heavy load of bad antecedents, such as those of PWs 1,2 7 and 8, having a possible motive to harm the accused who was an obstacle in the way of their immoral activities, it would be hazardous to accept their testimony, in the absence of corroboration on crucial points from independent sources. If any authority is needed reference may be made to R.P.Arora v. State of Punjab (Supra), wherein this Court ruled that in a proper case, the Court should look for independent corroboration before convicting the accused person on the evidence of trap witnesses.

14. The judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in G.V.Nanjundiah v. State (Delhi Administration) [1988 SCC (Cri) 77], wherein it is held in paras 26 and 27, which read as follows:

"26.....The question as to the handing over of any bribe and recovery of the same from the accused should be considered along with other material circumstances one of which is the question whether any demand was at all made by the appellant for the bribe. When it is found that no such demand was made by the accused and the prosecution has given a false story in that regard, the Court will view the allegation of payment of the bribe to and recovery of the same from the accused with suspicion.

27.In the instant case, the foundation of the prosecution case of the demand made by the appellant for bribe has, as observed already, been shaken to a great extent. In any event, it casts a grave doubt on the subsequent event

that was alleged to have taken place in the matter of giving of bribe to the appellant and recovery of the bribe money from him coupled with the unusual behaviour of the contractor in purchasing sweets and fruits for the appellant on the plea that it would justify the presence of Verma at the time of giving of bribe to the appellant."

15. The following judgments were relied on to emphasis the demand and acceptance are sine qua non for conviction. Mere recovery of tainted money divorced from circumstance under which, it is paid, would to be sufficient to convict.

(i) The judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Banarsi Dass v. State of Haryana reported in [(2010) 3 MLJ (Cr1) 1332(SC)], wherein in paras 10 and 11, the relevant portion read as follows:

"10. It is a settled canon of criminal jurisprudence that the conviction of an accused cannot be founded on the basis of inference. The offence should be proved against the accused beyond reasonable doubt either by direct evidence or even by circumstantial evidence if each link of the chain of events is established pointing towards the guilt of the accused. The prosecution has to lead cogent evidence in that regard. So far as it satisfies the essential of a complete chain duly supported by appropriate evidence.

11. To constitute an offence under Section 161 of the IPC, it is necessary for the prosecution to prove that there was demand of money and the same was voluntarily accepted by the accused. Similarly, in terms of Section 5(1) (d) of the Act, the demand and acceptance of the money for doing a favour in discharge of its official duties is sine qua non to the conviction of the accused. In the case of M.K. Harshan v. State of Kerala AIR 1995 SC 2178: (1997) SCC (Cr.) 283, this Court in somewhat similar circumstances, where the tainted money was kept in the drawer of the accused who denied the same and said that it was put in the drawer without his knowledge, held as under:

"....It is in this context the Courts have cautioned that as a rule of prudence, some corroboration is necessary. In all such type of cases of bribery, two aspects are important. Firstly, there must be a

demand and secondly there must be acceptance in the sense that the accused has obtained the illegal gratification. Mere demand by itself is not sufficient to establish the offence. Therefore, the other aspect, namely, acceptance is very important and when the accused has come forward with a plea that the currency notes were put in the drawer without his knowledge, then there must be clinching evidence to show that it was with the tacit approval of the accused that the money had been put in the drawer as an illegal gratification. Unfortunately, on this aspect in the present case, we have no other evidence except that of PW-1. Since PW-1's evidence suffers from infirmities, we sought to find some corroboration but in vain. There is no other witness or any other circumstance which supports the evidence of PW-1 that this tainted money as a bribe was put in the drawer, as directed by the accused. Unless we are satisfied on this aspect, it is difficult to hold that the accused tacitly accepted the illegal gratification or obtained the same within the meaning of Section 5(1)(d) of the Act, particularly, when the version of the accused appears to be probable".

(ii) The judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in C. Sukumaran v. State of Kerala reported in [(2015) 11 SCC 314], wherein it is held in para 10, which reads as under:

"16. Further, none of the prosecution witnesses have actually deposed in the case that the appellant was the person who had demanded and accepted the bribe from the complainant and since PW-2 has materially turned hostile, therefore, neither the demand aspect nor can the acceptance of the bribe money be verified from any other witnesses of the prosecution. Further, PW1 in his deposition before the Special Judge has also not supported the case of the prosecution, as he had refused to acknowledge the ownership of the tea shop, on the premises of which the bribe money was allegedly accepted by the appellant from the complainant. Hence, it is safe to say that the prosecution has failed to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that the appellant had accepted the illegal

gratification from the complainant under Section 13(1)(d) of the Act. In support of the same, the learned counsel on behalf of the appellant has rightly placed reliance upon the decision of this Court in B.Jayaaj v. State of A.P., which reads thus:(SCC p. 58, para 8)

8. there is no other evidence to prove that the accused had made any demand, the evidence of PW1 and the contents of Ex.P-11 cannot be relied upon to come to the conclusion that the above material furnishes proof of the demand allegedly made by the accused. We are, therefore, inclined to hold that the learned trial Court as well as the High Court was not correct in holding the demand alleged to be made by the accused as proved. The only other material available is the recovery of the tainted currency notes from the possession of the accused. In fact, such possession is admitted by the accused himself. Mere possession and recovery of the currency notes from the accused without proof of demand will not bring home the offence under Section 7. The above also will be conclusive insofar as the offence under Section 13(1)(d)(i) and (ii) is concerned as in the absence of any proof of demand for illegal gratification, the use of corrupt or illegal means or abuse of position as a public servant to obtain any valuable thing or pecuniary advantage cannot be held to be established."(emphasis supplied).

16. On going through the judgments cited above, the point, which is very clear in the mind of this Court is, in case of trap, the evidence of interested witness requires corroboration to base conviction. The demand and acceptance of illegal gratification is not a matter of inference. It ought to be proved by the prosecution beyond reasonable doubt. Recovery of tainted money without proof of demand, is fatal to the case of prosecution.

17. With these guidelines, the analysis of evidence placed before this Court indicates the circumstances under which, PW-3 [Mr.Arumugham] went to Electricity Board Office. His application Ex.P-15 seeking power supply for industrial purpose and Ex.P9 the rental agreement deed between the defacto complainant and his landlord, were seized by the trap laying officer on the day of trap at the accused office. Ex.P10 is the mahazar prepared for the seizure. These facts are not disputed by the appellant.

PW-3[Mr.Arumugham/the defacto complainant] though treated as hostile by the prosecution both in the chief as well as cross examination the demand of bribe by A1 and A2 on the earlier occasion, is spoken by PW-3[Mr.Arumugham]. He has deposed that on 05.02.2002, the accused told him to keep the money on the table so, he kept the money on the table and came out to give the pre-arranged signal. PW-4[Mr.Lakshmanan] has said that the money was received by A3 and he kept the money in the table drawer of A1 pointing out this discrepancy, much attack is made on the trial Court finding. If this part of evidence is seen in isolation, the submission of the learned counsel appearing for the appellant may appear to be correct, but it is necessary to visualise the case holistically for just conclusion.

18. The presence of PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] and PW-4 [Mr.Lakshmanan] in his room on 05.02.2002 at 05.00 p.m., is not denied by the accused. The application of PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] was scrutinized by A1 and returned back to A3 to note down the documents required. This is not denied. The money recovered from the table drawer of A1. PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] a rustic witness, who has spoken about his application and the demand of bribe by A1 in unequivocal term. He has no axe to grind against the officials of Electricity Board Department.

19. The accused, who has seen the money given by PW3 [Mr.Arumugham] to A3 and part of it placed on his table or into his table drawer. Either way, he had seen the money transferred to his possession. After PW-3[Mr.Arumugham], PW4[Mr.Lakshmanan] and A3 left his room, the tainted money was lying in his table drawer with his full knowledge. In these circumstances, the demand and acceptance hold to be proved. Presence of money in his drawer is within his knowledge. If there was no raid on that day, A1 would have taken home the money kept in his drawer.

20. In State of Kerala and others v. C.P.Rao reported in [(2011)6 SCC 450], the Hon'ble Apex Court while reiterating its earlier dictum, has held that mere recovery by itself, would not prove the charge against the accused and in the absence of any evidence to prove payment of bribe or to show that the accused had voluntarily accepted the money knowing it to be bribe, conviction cannot be sustained.

21. From the deposition of PW3[Mr.Arumugham] and PW4 [Mr.Lakshmanan], the fact that A3 received the tainted money of Rs.750/-in front of A1, is well established. A1 had seen A3 receiving the money and keeping Rs.250/- with him, had kept Rs.500/- in the drawer of A1. This clearly proves the voluntary acceptance of money knowing it to be bribe. Because only after receipt of the money, A1 has taken up the application for scrutiny and has instructed PW3[Mr.Arumugham] to bring few more documents for considering his application.

22. The conduct of the parties and their reaction are the essential factors and circumstances to prove the demand and acceptance. In this case, the proven facts clearly indicate that the application of PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] was not accepted for scrutiny, till the bribe money is paid. Thereafter, the application has been checked and the applicant has been directed to get few more revenue records for processing his application. Though PW-3[Mr.Arumugham] was treated as hostile witness, his evidence substantially prove the case of demand and acceptance of illegal gratification. Minor contradiction regarding the manner the tainted money transferred pales to insignificant, when the tainted money proved to be found in the drawer of A1 and A1 was present when the money was received by A3 and kept in A1's drawer.

23. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sat Paul v. Delhi Administration reported in [1976 SCC (cri) 160] cited supra, has analysis English and Indian judgment on the credibility and reliableness of the witness turned hostile and has summed up as below:

"52. From the above conspectus, it emerges clear that even in a criminal prosecution when a witness is cross-examined and contradicted with the leave of the court, by the party calling him, his evidence cannot, as a matter of law, be treated as washed off the record altogether. It is for the judge of fact to consider in each case whether as a result of such cross-examination and contradiction, the witness stands thoroughly discredited or can still be believed in regard to a part of his testimony. If the judge finds that in the process, the credit of the witness has not been completely shaken, he may, after reading and considering the evidence of the witness, as a whole, with due caution and care, accept, in the light of the other evidence on the record, that part of his testimony which he finds to be creditworthy and act upon it. If in a given case, the whole of the testimony of the witness is impugned, and in the process, the witness stands squarely and totally discredited, the judge should, as a matter of prudence, discard his evidence in toto."

24. The accompanying witness Mr.Lakshmanan examined as PW-4 is a responsible officer of the Rank of Deputy Registrar Co-operative Society. He has deposed about the demand, acceptance

and recovery. His evidence stands unimpeached. As submitted by the learned Government Advocate(crl.side) appearing for the respondent, it is not the quantity of the witnesses, but it is the quality of the witness, which need to be considered to base for conviction. In this case, the trial Court, after proper appreciation of evidence, has rightly acquitted A2 and held the appellant[A1] guilty. The evidence let in by the prosecution had inspired the confidence of the trial Court and this Court does not find any wrong in the said conclusion. The minor error due to typing or memory lapse of witnesses cannot be sufficient to reverse the conclusion of the trial court.

25. In the result, this criminal appeal is dismissed. The conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant passed by the learned Special Judge cum Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dharmapuri in C.C.No.4 of 2008 dated 30.06.2011 are hereby confirmed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

/TRUE COPY/

Sub Assistant Registrar

ari

To

1. The Special Judge/ Chief Judicial Magistrate, dharmapuri.
2. The Chief Judicial Magistrate -I, Dharmapuri.
3. Director General of Police, Chennai 4
4. The Deputy Supdt of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, Dharmapuri,
5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

+1 C.C. to M/S.MR.THIYAGARAJAN Advocate SR.NO. 72275/17

Judgment made in
Crl.A.No.460 of 2011

VGII(CO)
T.R (31/10/2017)