

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Date : 18.01.2017

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.VENUGOPAL

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.291 of 2016

and

Crl.M.P.No.4650 of 2016

Kamaraj ... Appellant

-Vs.-

State by:

Inspector of Police

Karumanthurai Police Station

Salem District

(Crime No. 29 of 2012)

... Respondent

Appeal against the judgment dated 11.03.2016 made in S.C.No.90 of 2013 on the file of the Learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Salem.

For Appellant : Mr.S.Udaykumar
for
M/s.Karan & Uday

For Respondent : Mr. R.Ravichandran
Government Advocate

J U D G M E N T

The Appellant (Accused) has preferred the instant Criminal Appeal before this Court (as aggrieved person), as against the Judgment dated 11.03.2016 in S.C.No.90 of 2013 passed by the Learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Salem.

2. The Learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Salem, while passing the impugned Judgment in S.C.No.90 of 2013 dated 11.03.2016, at paragraph-27 had observed that 'PW.5 (Thangaraj) had stated that the Accused Kamaraj (Appellant) had informed that Banu Priya (his wife) should not proceed to Salem quite often''. But in this regard, on behalf of the Accused (Appellant), no question was put to PW.5. Likewise, PW.1 in his evidence had clearly deposed that her daughter, after her

marriage, had not gone for employment. On behalf of the Accused (Appellant side), no witnesses were examined to show that subsequent to the marriage of Banu Priya, she had gone for employment or had any relationship with other person. Therefore, the trial Court, on the basis of the witnesses examined on the side of the Prosecution (Respondent) that the Accused (Appellant) because of his habit of taking liquor and since he demanded money to be brought for purchasing a new bike, he beat Banu Priya quite often, scolded her and caused trouble to her and in regard to this, P.Ws.1 and 2, on numerous occasions, spoke to the Parents of the Accused and that on the day of occurrence, the Accused (Appellant) quarrelled with her and also caused cruelty by beating her and therefore, Banu Priya heart broken committed suicide, for which the Accused had abetted etc., and ultimately came to the conclusion that the Accused (Appellant) was guilty under Sections 498 (A) and 306 of IPC.

3. It comes to be known that the Accused (Appellant) was convicted and sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for a period of three years under Section 498 (A) of IPC and further, he was directed to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only), in default of payment of said fine amount, he was directed to undergo further three months Simple Imprisonment. Insofar as the offence under Section 306 of IPC was concerned, the Accused (Appellant) was imposed with a punishment of ten years Rigorous Imprisonment and apart from that, he was directed to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- (Rupees Two Thousand only), in default of payment of fine, he was further directed to undergo additional sentence of six months imprisonment. Moreover, the sentences were directed to run concurrently and the period already undergone by him was directed to be set off under Section 428 of Cr.P.C.

4. Assailing the legality, correctness and validity of the Judgment passed by the trial Court, in S.C.No.90 of 2013 dated 11.03.2016, the Accused (Appellant) has filed the instant Criminal Appeal before this Court contending that PW.1 had deposed that he went to the Police Station and gave Complaint Ex.P1 to PW.9 Special Sub-Inspector (Manivel). Further, it is represented on behalf of the Accused (Appellant) that Ex.P1 (Complaint), dated 06.08.2012, reveals that one month prior to the occurrence, the Accused (Appellant) demanded with the Deceased a Motorcycle to be purchased by her Parents and the Parents of the Deceased had compromised the issue with the aid of the Appellant's Parents.

5. The Learned Counsel for the Appellant urges before this Court that on 02.08.2012, the Appellant and the Deceased Banu Priya (his wife) went to her Parents' house for 'Aadi Function'

and both of them stayed there and on 03.08.2012, they returned from PW.1's house. Further, it is the stand of the Appellant that PW.1, father of the Deceased, gave Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) and some household things for 'Aadi Function' and that on 04.08.2012, at about 4.30 p.m, the occurrence took place. Therefore, the stand of the Accused (Appellant) is that there was no demand of Motor Bike either on 02.08.2012 or on 03.08.2012 and therefore, the conviction under Section 498 (A) of IPC was not established, but the trial Court had erroneously convicted the Accused (Appellant), which needs to be set aside by this Court, sitting in Appellate jurisdiction.

6. Advancing his arguments, the Learned Counsel for the Appellant submits that PW.1 had stated that one Annamalai informed PW.1's son Tamilarasan (PW.4) that the Accused assaulted the Deceased (his wife) and hanged her body. However, PW.12 (Doctor) says that the death was due to hanging. Besides this, Annamalai was not examined on the side of the Respondent / Prosecution. In effect, the argument projected on the side of the Appellant is that there was no evidence that the Accused (Appellant) abetted the Deceased (his wife) to commit suicide.

7. Continuing further, the Learned Counsel for the Appellant takes a forceful plea that PW.1 had stated that the Parents of the Appellant and the Accused (Appellant) were not seen at the scene of occurrence, while he went to the scene of occurrence. However, the Appellant and his Parents were present during RDO enquiry.

8. According to the Learned Counsel for the Appellant, PW.13 (Revenue Divisional Officer) in his evidence had stated that the Deceased had not died by committing suicide because of dowry harassment.

9. The Learned Counsel for the Appellant brings it to the notice of this Court that the evidence of PW.5 (Thangaraj), who turned hostile, supported the version of the Appellant that due to domestic petty quarrel that took place between the Appellant and the Deceased, in the absence of the Accused (Appellant), the Deceased (his wife) had committed suicide. Further, it is projected on the side of the Accused (Appellant) that the Accused (Appellant) went to buy milk in nearby Milk Society, when returned, found that both the doors of his house were locked and found through the hole of the door that his wife was hanging, then he broke some portion of the Wall and entered into the house and removed the hanging body to the Cot, as spoken to by PW.5. However, the trial Court had committed an error in arriving at a conclusion that the Accused (Appellant) had committed an offence under Section 498(A) and 306 of IPC and imposed necessary punishments, which has resulted in serious

miscarriage of justice.

10. Conversely, it is the submission of the Learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) that on behalf of the Respondent / Prosecution, witnesses PW.1 to PW.14 were examined, Exs.P1 to P24 were marked, also MO.1 to MO.3 were marked in the main case. Further, it is represented that that the trial Court, after analysing the entire oral and documentary evidence available on record, came to the conclusion that the Accused (Appellant) was guilty in respect of an offence under Sections 498(A) and 306 of IPC and imposed necessary punishments, which need not be dislodged by this Court at this distant point of time.

11. On behalf of the Appellant (Accused), a reliance is placed on the depositions of P.Ws.1 to 4 and also it is contended that the said witnesses are not interested witnesses, although they were related to the Deceased.

12. At the outset, it is to be pointed out that the first charge levelled against the Accused (Appellant) is that the marriage was fixed by the elders and the same took place on 07.11.2012 between the Deceased Banu Priya and himself and at the time of marriage, for the Appellant 10 sovereigns jewels and one sovereign Chain and as 'Seer Varisai' Iron Cot, Mattress, Bureau and Cooking Utensils were given and after marriage, within the jurisdiction of Karumanthurai Police Station at Naduveedhi Address, he was living with his Deceased wife separately and at that time, he demanded a Two-Wheeler to be purchased for him and to his wife and this was informed by the Deceased wife Banu Priya to her Parents witnesses Sadaiyan (PW.1) and Bakiyam (PW.2) and when they informed that they do not have means in this regard and after getting the money, they informed their Parents that they purchased the same and when he was called for 'Aadi 18th Function' along with his wife Banu Priya by the witnesses Sadaiyan (PW.1) and Bakiyam (PW.2), on 02.08.2012, he along with his wife went to their house and on the next day ie., on 03.08.2012, at about evening, when he along with his wife were proceeding to his place, he demanded Rs.10,000/- surely and because of that, PW.1 (Sadaiyan) gave Rs.10,000/- in his daughter's hand and the said amount was snatched by him and in the said amount, he consumed liquor and came to the house and when his wife Banu Priya asked him as to why he was consuming liquor with the money given by his father and spending lavishly, he scolded her by uttering that 'not giving money for purchasing Motorcycle, no use for you to remain alive or to die' and on 04.08.2012 at about 4.30 hours in the evening, his mother Lakshmi sent a feast to his wife and when that was brought by his wife, he scolded her as to why she got the feast from his mother and he pushed the said meals and beat

her by meting out cruelty and therefore, he had committed an offence under Section 498(A) of IPC.

13. The second charge levelled against the Accused (Appellant) was that he demanded with his wife a Motorcycle to be purchased by her Parents, as Dowry and in this regard wanted her to bring money and quite often he demanded the same and because of the cruelty, he had committed an offence under Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

14. The third charge levelled against the Appellant was that because of his continuous scolding of his wife (Deceased Banu Priya) to bring money for purchase of Motorcycle, he beat and caused cruelty to her, unable to bear the same, she on 04.08.2012, at about 4.30 in the evening, committed suicide in his house and therefore the said act was an offence punishable under Section 306 of IPC.

15. It is to be noted that P.Ws.1 and 2 are the Parents of the Deceased Banu Priya. P.W.3 and 4 are her Brothers. As a matter of fact, P.Ws.1 to 4 had clearly deposed that with the consent of two sides, the marriage between the Accused (Appellant) and Banu Priya (since Deceased) took place and at the time of marriage, 10 sovereigns of jewels were given to Banu Priya, one sovereign of jewel was given to the Accused (Appellant), and as 'Seer Varisai', a Cot, Bureau and cooking utensils were given. After marriage, both the Accused (Appellant) and the Deceased Banu Priya used to come to PW.1's (Complainant's) house. Further, subsequent to the marriage, during the third month, the Appellant in drunken state demanded with his wife Banu Priya money for purchase of Bike and also demanded jewels and caused cruelty to her. PW.1 (Complainant) went to the Accused (Appellant) house on numerous occasions and in this regard spoke to the Accused (Appellant) Parents for 'Aadi 18 Function', he called his daughter and the Appellant (his son-in-law) to his house and at about 9.30 a.m in the morning, they came to their house and stayed there during night and on the next day, he gave Rs.10,000/- and sent the two to their home and on Saturday at about 3'o clock in the evening PW.4 (Tamilarasan - son of PW.1) phoned up, and that the Accused (Appellant) brother Annamalai informed him that there was some problem at Banu Priya's house and asked them to come to Banu Priya's house, since he was also proceeding to her house and when PW.4 (Tamilarasan) went to Banu Priya's (Sister's) house, he found Banu Priya dead and since there was a suspicion over the death of his Sister, a Complaint was given to the Police.

16. PW.5 (who wrote Ex.P1 complaint) in his evidence had stated that on the day of occurrence, the Accused (Appellant) went to the Society for purchasing milk and he also went there

to deliver milk and when he was returning, at that time on hearing the noise from the house of the Accused (Appellant), he went and saw that the house doors of the Appellant, both in front and back were locked inside and that the Accused (Appellant) climbed the back wall and went to the house and by cutting the Saree of Banu Priya, which was found hanging, he made her to lie on the Cot and that while Banu Priya used to come to Salem frequently and to reprimand her, the Accused (Appellant) had informed PW.1 and since PW.1 had informed him about this, both of them went and saw Banu Priya and advised her not to go to Salem frequently.

17. It is the evidence of PW.11 (Village Administrative Officer) that on 06.08.2012, when he was in his Office at Karumanthurai along with his Assistant (Selvaraj), the Appellant (Accused) came there and gave a statement that the police was in search of him in connection with the death of his wife and he was afraid to go before them and that, he after consuming liquor picked up a quarrel with his wife Banu Priya by asking her to get money from her Parents for purchasing a two-wheeler bike and beat her. Further, PW.11 proceeds to state in his evidence that the Appellant had stated that his wife at 5 p.m., in the evening in his house had committed suicide by hanging and that he escaped and now was surrendering etc.,

18. PW.12 (Doctor) in his evidence had stated that Banu Priya had committed suicide and she was not murdered and not hanged in that way and further her hyoid bone was in good state and since she hanged herself on neck, the death would have occurred. It is the evidence of PW.12 (Doctor) that because of asphyxia, the Deceased since she hanged herself in the neck, would have died and the postmortem of the Deceased Banu Priya was Ex.P15 and his final opinion was Ex.P16 and Ex.P13 was the requisition of RDO, Athur. Furthermore, PW.12 had been proceeded to state in his evidence that he obtained the chemical report and in the said report, no poisonous substance is found mentioned and since the Deceased had hanged herself on neck, because of asphyxia, she would have died and that was his final opinion. Also, he had deposed in his cross-examination that over the body, in other places no injuries were found and since the Deceased had hanged herself and committed suicide, it was correct to state that the death would have occurred.

19. PW.13 (presently D.R.O.) in his evidence had stated that during 2012, when he was serving as Athur R.D.O., on 05.08.2012 at about 6.30 in the morning, a First Information Report registered under Section 174(3) of Cr.P.C was sent to him pertaining to the death of Banu Priya (23 years) within the jurisdiction of Karumanthurai Police Station and based on the said First Information Report, he went to Pagadupattu Village

from Athur at about 8.00 a.m., in the morning and in front of the house of Banu Priya at Nadu Street at Pagadupattu Village, common public were assembled and he went inside the house and Banu Priya's Parents Sadaiyan and Bakiyam (P.Ws.1 and 2) after identifying the body of Banu Priya, etc.,.

20. PW.13 adds in his evidence that it came to light on examination of Accused (Appellant) Parents and Brothers that the Appellant was in the habit of taking liquor and quite often with her Parents and Deceased Banu Priya, he used to pick up quarrel and between them, there was a family problem and ultimately, he sent a Report to Athur Judicial Magistrate No.2 on 06.08.2012 that the police can take action based on the Postmortem Report of Banu Priya and sent a copy of his Report to Vazhapadi Superintendent of Police and on 07.08.2012, the Vazhapadi Superintendent of Police altered Section from Section 174(3) of Cr.P.C., to that of Section 306 of IPC relating to the death of Banu Priya and that took the original First Information Report from him. Besides this, the Form for taking the photo of Banu Priya for conducting postmortem at Salem Government Hospital and other letters (inclusive of the same) was Ex.P17 and his Enquiry Report dated 05.08.2012 was Ex.P18 and Ex.P19 dated 06.08.2012 was the connected Postmortem Enquiry Proceedings Report and the statements recorded by him.

21. PW.13 in his evidence had deposed that in his proceedings in Ex.P19, he came to the conclusion that it was not brought forth in his Enquiry that in between them there was a quarrel that took place pertaining to the demand of jewels and money. However, he had stated that when he enquired Banu Priya's Parents, they had not stated in his enquiry that the Accused (Appellant) had demanded jewel and money and harassed her. Moreover, when Banu Priya was alive at that time, her Parents in their statements had not informed that her husband, Father-in-Law, Mother-in-Law had not caused cruelty based on the demand of dowry.

22. PW.14 (Investigating Officer) in his evidence had stated that on 04.08.2012 when he was serving as Sub-Divisional Deputy Superintendent of Police and was in office, at that time he received the copy of First Information Report in Karumanthurai Police Station Crime No.29 of 2012 registered under Section 174 of Cr.P.C and went to the scene of occurrence at about 10.30 p.m in the night, viz., Pagadupattu Village, in the presence of witnesses, viz., Village Administrative Officer (Nehru Jawahar) and Village Assistant (Selvaraj), he inspected the scene of occurrence at 23.45 hours and prepared Observation Mahazar, rough Plan and Ex.P20 was rough Plan and he obtained signature of witnesses in the Observation Mahazar. Furthermore, it is his evidence that on 06.08.2012, the Appellant surrendered

before the Village Administrative Officer (Nehru Jawahar) and he received the aforesaid V.A.O's report through Village Assistant (witness Selvaraj) at Vazhapadi Office and arrested the Appellant and when he enquired, the Accused (Appellant) on 07.08.2012 at about 6.00 a.m in the morning, in the presence of Village Administrative Officer - Nehru Jawahar and Village Assistant - Selvaraj, gave a confessional statement (Ex.P21 - admissible portion) and based on the said confession, the Accused (Appellant) informed that he would identify the Motorcycle used for escaping from the scene of occurrence and the saree used by the Deceased Banu Priya for committing suicide and in the said Ex.P21, he obtained signature of the Appellant and the witnesses and also at about 8.45 a.m, in the morning on 07.08.2012 in the presence of witnesses Nehru Jawahar and Selvaraj, he seized the TVS Sports Motorcycle bearing Registration No.PY-01-AY-7922, in front of Athur Railway Station through Mahazar and obtained the signature of witnesses. Apart from that, he seized the polyester saree measuring a length of 3½ feet (found in knot position) and obtained the signature of witnesses in the Mahazar after examining the witnesses Nehru Jawahar and Selvaraj and recording the statement, on the basis of his investigation, altered the Section to under Section 306 IPC and prepared the Alteration Report and sent the Accused (Appellant) with the remand report to the Athur Judicial Magistrate No.1. The Alteration Report was marked as Ex.P22. The case property seized under Form-95, which was sent to the Court, were marked as Ex.P23 and Ex.P24. The photographs taken in the form of CD by the Photograph Expert Arun was sent to the Court concerned and also he examined the Constable No.638 (Ramesh), Special Sub-Inspector Manivel and obtained their statements on the same day etc., and ultimately laid a final report under Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and under Section 498 (A) and 306 of IPC against the Accused (Appellant).

23. As far as the present case is concerned, the Accused (Appellant) had not demanded dowry and caused cruelty to her, per contra, he frequently asked his wife Banu Priya to get money for purchasing bike and in this regard, he asked his wife to bring money from her Parents. Admittedly, the marriage between the Accused (Appellant) and Banu Priya (since Deceased) took place on 07.11.2011 as per Ex.P2 (Marriage Invitation). Within nine months from the date of her marriage, she had died because she committed suicide by hanging. In fact, the trial Court at paragraph-26 of the impugned Judgment in S.C.No.90 of 2013 had clearly opined that false reasons were adduced on behalf of the Appellant that the Deceased Banu Priya when she was serving at a private hospital was in wrong relationship and because of reprimand, she had committed suicide. Further, it was the evidence of PW.1 that his daughter (Banu Priya) had failed in

10th Standard and she had studied Nursing Course and after marriage, she had not gone for employment.

24. It cannot be forgotten that an instigation, forcing a person to commit suicide, has to be gathered from the circumstances of the case. In a case of instigation, there may not be a direct evidence, having a direct nexus to the suicide. In fact, there is evidence in the present case for the mental cruelty and harassment meted out to Deceased Banu Priya by the Accused (Appellant) for 'abetting' suicide. In the present case, it appears that the Deceased had lost her charm of her prime life and ultimately she committed suicide by hanging. Also that the relationship between the Appellant and the Deceased wife were strained. The gravamen of the offence is quite punishable under Section 306 of IPC viz., abetting suicide. Moreover, Section 107 of IPC defines 'abetment' as:-

- "(i) instigation to commit an offence;
- (ii) engaging any conspiracy to commit an offence;
- (iii) aiding the commission of an offence."

25. It is to be remembered that an abetment involves mentality of instigating a person or intentionally aiding a person in doing a thing. After all, without a positive act on the part of the Accused either to instigate or aid in committing suicide, conviction by a Court of Law cannot be sustained. Suffice it for this Court to

make a pertinent mention that under Section 306 of IPC, there must be

- (a) 'Guilty Mind' to commit an offence;
- (b) Besides this, it requires an active or direct act, which lead the Deceased to commit suicide;
- (c) No option and that this act should have driven the deceased into such a decision that she committed suicide.

26. It is to be borne in mind that it is not necessary that an instigation should be only 'words' and may not be 'conduct'. A direct evidence of an instigation or aid is not necessary. In the considered opinion of this Court, the term 'abetment' means some active suggestion or support to the commission of the offence. In respect of an offence under Section 306 of IPC, 'abetment' must attract the definition of Section 107 of IPC.

27. An 'Attempt to commit suicide' and 'Abetment to commit suicide' are two different offences, which clearly stand on different platforms. Before finding an Accused guilty of an offence under Section 306 of IPC, the Court must scrupulously examine the facts and circumstances of the given case and evaluate the evidence adduced before it, with a view to find out whether the cruelty and harassment meted out to the victim and

left the victim with no other alternative, but to bring an end to life. In order to bring a case within the ambit of an ingredient of Section 306 of IPC, there have to be a case of suicide and in the commission of the said offence, the person, who is said to have abetted the said act of commission of suicide, should have played a significant role by an act of instigation or by doing a specified act to facilitate the commission of suicide. As such, the act of abetment by the person charged with the said offence should be proved by the prosecution in the manner known to law before he could be convicted under Section 306 of IPC.

28. It is to be pointed out that 'test of proof' should be of a reasonable person. However 'standard of proof' must be of a prudent man. Apart from that, a Court of Law can infer from the facts and circumstances of a given case and can raise presumption on the basis of available evidence on record. In respect of an offence under Section 306 of IPC, the relative's evidence is not to be termed as an interested one and therefore, it ought not to be believed. As a matter of fact, the victim of cruelty / harassment would definitely disclose the cruel acts meted out to her to her Parents, Brothers, Sisters and Friends, definitely she would not disclose the same to the outsiders, in the considered opinion of this Court.

29. Insofar as the offence under Section 498(A) of IPC is concerned, to attract an offence under this Section, it is the duty of the Prosecution to establish that a woman was subjected to cruelty as mentioned in clause (a) or clause (b) to explanation of Section 498 (A) of IPC. Further, the woman is/was married and that, the cruelty was practiced by her husband or his relatives.

30. One cannot ignore a prime fact that Section 498(A) of IPC indicates that whoever being the husband or relative of the husband of the woman subjects such woman to cruelty shall be punished with imprisonment for a term, which may extend to three years and she also be liable to fine. A reading of clause (b) of the explanation to Section 498(A) of IPC unerringly points out that the harassment of woman, where such harassment is with a view to coerce her or any person relating to her to meet any unlawful demand for property or valuable security or is on account of the failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand would amount to cruelty for the purpose of Section 498(A) of IPC as per the decision of Wazir Chand ..vs.. State of Haryana (AIR 1989 SC 378).

31. It is to be significantly pointed out that the presumption under Section 113(A) of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 is discretionary and the Court concerned can consider the

nature of 'cruelty' to which a woman was subjected to, especially in regard to the meaning of the word 'cruelty' occur in Section 498(A) of Indian Penal Code. Further, the maximum prescribed punishment under Section 306 of IPC is imprisonment for a period of ten years. It is to be pointed out that the said punishment is not a minimum one.

32. It is to be noted that mere demand of Dowry is punishable under Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and an element of 'cruelty' is not necessary.

33. Be that as it may, on a careful consideration of the respective contentions and also this Court taking note of the attendant facts and circumstances of the present case in a cumulative fashion, comes to an irresistible conclusion that the Accused (Appellant) was rightly found guilty in respect of the offences under Sections 498(A) and 306 of IPC. However, this Court, considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, is of the considered view that imposition of punishment of three years Rigorous Imprisonment by the trial Court under Section 498(A) of IPC is on the higher side. Hence, this Court reduces the same to that of 1½ years Rigorous Imprisonment. However, this Court is not displacing the imposition of fine in respect of an offence under Section 498(A) of IPC. Likewise, this Court, based on the strange and peculiar facts and circumstances of the instant case, is of the earnest opinion that the imposition of ten years Rigorous Imprisonment by the trial Court on the Accused (Appellant) is an excessive one and this Court, taking note of the fact that the Accused (Appellant) is a young man aged about 29 years, to subserve the ends of justice, reduces the imposition of punishment of ten years Rigorous Imprisonment to that of five years Rigorous Imprisonment. However, this Court is not upsetting the imposition of fine of Rs.2,000/- in respect of the offence under Section 306 of IPC. Further, it is ordered that the sentence imposed by this Court are ordered to run concurrently. The period already undergone by the Accused (Appellant) is to be given remission under Section 428 of Cr.P.C. Viewed in that perspective, the Appeal succeeds in part.

WEB COPY

34. In fine, the Criminal Appeal is allowed in part, in above terms. The judgment of the trial Court in S.C.No.90 of 2013 dated 11.03.2016 stands modified in above terms. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mra

To

1. The Sessions Judge,
Mahila Court,
Salem.
- 2 The Principal Sessions Judge, Salem
- 3 The Judicial magistrate, No.II, Attur
- 4 The Chief Judicial Magistrate, Salem
- 5 The Superintendent
Central Prison, Coimbatore
- 6 The District Collector Salem
- 7 The Director General of Police
Mylapore, Chennai 4
8. The Inspector of Police
Karumanthurai Police Station
Salem District.
- 9 The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras

ssk(CO)
md(08/02/2017)

CrI.A.No.291 of 2016 and
CrI.M.P.No.4650 of 2016