

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.02.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T. SELVAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

Crl.A.No.199/2017

Thangamuthu

Appellant / Sole Accused

Vs.

State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police
Chennimalai Police Station,
Erode District.
(Crime NO.79 of 2014)

Respondent/Complainant

Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374[2] of the Criminal Procedure Code against the judgment and order of conviction passed in SC.No.110/2015 dated 28.03.2017 on the file of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mahalir Needhi Mandram [Fast Track Mahila Court], Erode, Erode District.

For Appellant : Mr.C.Ramkumar

For Respondent : Mr.V.Arul, APP

JUDGMENT

[Judgment of the Court was delivered by N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.,]

Appellant, sole accused, in the case in SC.No.110/2015 on the file of the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, Mahalir Needhimandram, [Fast Track Mahila Court], Erode, Erode District, was tried for offences u/s.449, 302 and 307 [Part II] IPC. The Trial Court, under impugned Judgment dated 28.03.2017, found the appellant / accused guilty of the above said offences and sentenced him as follows:-

Conviction under section	Sentence Awarded
449 IPC	To undergo imprisonment for life with a fine of Rs.10,000/- and in default, to undergo 2 years simple imprisonment.
302 IPC	To undergo imprisonment for life with a fine of Rs.10,000/- and in default, to undergo 2 years simple imprisonment.
307 [part II]	To undergo imprisonment for life with a fine of Rs.10,000/- and in default, to undergo 2 years simple imprisonment.

The sentences were ordered to run concurrently. Aggrieved over the said conviction and sentences, the present appeal came to be filed by the appellant/accused.

2 The brief facts of the prosecution case, are as follows:-

[a] Deceased Valliammal is the wife of P.W.2-Karuppusamy and in-law of the appellant/accused P.W.1-Arunachalam is the son of P.W.2 and the deceased. P.W.3-Saraswathi is the wife of P.W.1/daughter of P.W.4 and the appellant accused. P.W.4-Sundarambal is the wife of the appellant/accused and mother of P.W.3. P.W.3 was given in marriage to P.W.1 and they were residing at Tiruppur. P.W.1 was running a Banian Company at Tiruppur. P.W.1's parents, viz, P.W.2 and the deceased were residing at Orathupalayam, Paaraikattu Thottam and were owning a Poultry Farm. The appellant/accused being the husband of P.W.4, used to torture her and also beat her under the influence of alcohol, due to which, P.W.4 used to leave her matrimonial home very often and go to her parental home at Ponnapuram. However, her daughter [P.S.3], son-in-law [P.W.1] and father of P.W.1 [P.W.2] used to pacify P.W.4 and effect compromise between P.W.4 and the appellant/accused and leave P.W.4 at her matrimonial home. This happened for many times. Four months prior to the occurrence, P.W.4, as usual, on account of the torture meted out by the appellant/accused, left her matrimonial home and went to her parental home. When the appellant/accused went and requested P.W.4 to join him, she refused. Again, the appellant/accused met P.Ws.1 to 3 and asked them to pacify P.W.4. The efforts of P.Ws.1 to 3 to pacify her proved futile. This decision of P.W.4, was informed by P.W.1 to the appellant/accused. Thinking that P.Ws.1 to 3 are in favour of P.W.4, the appellant/accused went to Ponnapuram and threatened his wife, P.W.4 that if she does not return to her matrimonial home, he will do away not

only her, but also their daughter, son-in-law and grandson.

[b] When the matter stood thus, on 21.03.2014, at about 7.00 p.m., P.W.1 went to his parental home along with his wife P.W.3, to see his parents, viz., P.W.2 and the deceased Valliammal. P.Ws.1 and 3 were cleaning the Poultry Farm. The deceased was cooking at her residence. P.W.2 was also present in the house. At that time, the appellant/accused entered into the house and cut the deceased on her head and left forearm with a sickle. She raised hue and cry. On hearing the same, when P.Ws.1 and 3 rushed to the house, they saw the appellant/accused coming out of the house with Sickle [M.O.5]. At that time, P.W.2 attempted to catch hold of the appellant/accused. The appellant/accused cut P.W.2 on his left hand, right hand, neck indiscriminately and as a result, he sustained injuries. Both P.W.1 and P.W.3 raised alarm. The appellant/accused fled away from the scene of crime. Neighbours gathered. When they went inside the house, they saw the deceased lying dead on the floor with cut injuries on her head and left forearm. She had succumbed to the injuries.

[c] P.W.5-Nataraj, a neighbour of P.W.2, on hearing the noise at about 7.00 p.m., on 21.03.2014, rushed to the scene and found the blood stains and seen P.W.2 with injuries. P.W.1 immediately called Ambulance and sent his injured father/P.W.2 to hospital. Thereafter, he went to Chennimalai Police Station and lodged the complaint under Ex.P.1 to P.W.17.

[d] P.W.17-Pankajam, Sub Inspector of Police, at the relevant time, after the receipt of the complaint from P.W.1 under Ex.P.1 on 21.03.2014 at about 9.00 p.m., registered the crime in Cr.No.79/2014 u/s.302 and 307 IPC. Ex.P.22 is the First Information Report. He despatched the originals of Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.22 to the jurisdictional Court, viz., District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Perundurai, through P.W.13-Muruganandam, Grade-I Police Constable and copies to the higher officials.

[e] P.W.18-Subramanian, Inspector of Police attached to the respondent police station, at the relevant point of time, on receipt of FIR in Cr.No.79/2014 on 21.03.2014, went to the place of occurrence at 10.15 p.m., and prepared the Observation Mahazar [Ex.P.2] and Rough Sketch [Ex.P.23] in the presence of P.W.6 and one Somasundaram. He recovered blood stains from the dead body of the deceased in a thread [M.O.1] ; blood stained earth [M.O.2] ; sample earth [M.O.3] and a pair of chappals [M.O.4] under the cover of Mahazar [Ex.P.3]. He recorded the statements of the witnesses. On the same day, at about 11.00 p.m., he held inquest on the dead body of the deceased in the presence of Panchayatdars and witnesses and prepared Ex.P.24-Inquest Report. He also took the photographs of the dead body

as well as the scene of crime in his mobile phone. Photographs and CD are marked as Ex.P.25 series. Thereafter, he sent the dead body for postmortem through P.W.14-Saravanakumar, Head Constable, along with a requisition to the hospital.

[f] P.W.8-Dr.Arthi, Assistant Surgeon attached to the Government Hospital, Kangeyam, examined P.W.2 on 21.03.2014 at about 8.35 p.m., and P.W.2 had informed her that a known person had attacked him with a sickle at his residence. She noted the following injuries on him:-

[1] Laceration of right forearm 3x2x2cm

[2] Laceration of left side of neck 5x3x2cm.

She also noted partial amputation of left elbow/forearm. Ex.P.6 is the Accident Register issued by her. She referred P.W.2 to CMCH for further treatment.

[g] P.W.19-Dr.Periasamy, Surgeon in the Plastic Surgery Department in Ganga Hospital, examined P.W.2 on 21.03.2014 at about 10.19 p.m. He found the following injuries on P.W.2:-

Examination of Left Upper Extremity:-

[1] Lacerated wound of 14x10cm over posterior aspect of left elbow exposing the dislocated elbow with bone fragments and crushed muscles. Bony tenderness/crepitus/abnormal mobility left elbow. Active finger movements normal. Radial artery pulsation well felt. No distal neuro vascular deficit. Examination of left shoulder/left wrist/left hand-Normal.

Examination of right upper extremity:-

[2] Sutured wound of 6cm over dorso ulnar aspect of left distal forearm. Hand deviated palmo ulnarly as wrist. Active finger movements normal. Radial artery pulsation well felt. Examination of right shoulder/right elbow/LS spine normal. Sutured wound of 6cm over lower neck present.

Ex.P.26 is the Wound Certificate issued by him, wherein he had opined that above injuries are grievous in nature.

[h] P.W.12-Dr.Malliga, Assistant Surgeon in the Government Hospital at Perundurai, at the relevant point of time, received the requisition sent by P.W.18 and commenced the postmortem on 22.03.2014 at 10.35 a.m., and found the following injuries:-

"External Injuries:-

[1] Deep and cut injury over the internal aspect of left upper arm size about 3"x3".

[2] A deep, sharp, cut injury over the

scalp in between the line of frontal and parietal bones running from left temporal bone to right temporal bone, brain matter seen through the cut injury size about 28cm x 2cm.

[3] Lacerated injury over the left parietal region size about 2x1cm."

Ex.P.16 is the Postmortem Certificate issued by him, wherein he had stated that the deceased would appear to have died of 14 to 16 hours prior to autopsy. Ex.P.17 is the Final Opinion, wherein he has opined that "the deceased would appear to have died of hemorrhage and shock due to the injuries sustained."

[i] The material objects collected from the dead body of the deceased were sent to the Forensic Laboratory and P.W.1-Venkateswaran and P.W.15-Bhavani, Scientific Officers, on examination of such material objects, issued Ex.P.9-Serology Report and Exs.P.19 and 20 - Chemical Report and Grouping Test Report [Biological Report]. P.W.16-Velmurugan, Scientific Officer examined the Viscera and issued Ex.P.21-Viscera Report, stating that no poison was detected.

[j] P.W.18, the Investigating Officer, in continuation of investigation, on 22.03.2014 at about 2.00 a.m., arrested the appellant/accused at his residence in the presence of P.W.7 and one Govindaraj and the appellant/accused came forward to give a voluntary confession statement, admissible portion of which is marked as Ex.P.4, pursuant to which, P.W.18 seized M.O.5-sickle and M.O.6-Shirt and M.O.7-Shirt, in the presence the said witnesses under Mahazar-Ex.P.5. The appellant/accused was sent for judicial remand and the material objects seized from the appellant/accused as well as from the dead body of the deceased, were sent to Court under Form 91. He examined P.W.2 in the hospital and recorded his statement. He also sent requisition to the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Erode, to record the 164 Cr.P.C. statements of the witnesses P.Ws.1, 3 and 4. He handed over the Case Diary to his successor for further investigation.

[k] P.W.20-Velumani, Deputy Superintendent of Police, on receipt of the Case Diary pertaining to Cr.No.79/2014 from P.W.18, commenced the investigation and after receipt of the medical reports and other documents and on completion of investigation, filed the Final Report u/s.450, 302 and 307 IPC against the accused before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Perundurai, who took it on file in PRC.No.7/2015 and issued summons to the accused and on his appearance, furnished him copies of the documents u/s.207 Cr.P.C. and having found that the case is exclusively tried by the Sessions Court, committed the same to the Court of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Erode, u/s.209 Cr.P.C., who in turn had made over the case to the learned Sessions Judge, Mahalir Needhimandram [Fast Track Mahila Court], Erode, who took it on file in SC.No.110/2015 and on appearance of the

appellant / accused, had framed the charges u/s.302 IPC and questioned him. The appellant / accused pleaded not guilty to the charge framed against him.

[l] The prosecution examined P.Ws.1 to 20 and marked Exs.P.1 to 26 besides marking M.O.1 to M.O.10.

[m] The appellant/accused was questioned under section 313 Cr.P.C., with regard to the incriminating circumstances against him in the evidence rendered by the prosecution and he denied it as false. D.W.1-Sivakumar, Inspector of Police was examined on the side of the appellant/accused and Ex.D.1-Complaint given by one Pappathi ; Ex.D.2-written statement of P.W.2 and Ex.D.3-Endorsement made in the Records produced from the Inspector of Police, Special Cell for Prevention of Land Grabbing, Tiruppur District, were marked.

[n] The Trial Court, on consideration and appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence and other materials, has convicted and sentenced the appellant/accused as above stated and hence, this appeal.

3 The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the entire occurrence took place due to sustained provocation as P.Ws.1 and 2 got the property in their name from P.W.4-wife of the appellant/accused. In fact, the above transfer was obtained only in order conduct the cases which were pending between P.W.4's family and others. However, despite repeated request made by the appellant/accused, P.Ws.1 and 2 have not re-conveyed the property. Ex.D.1 also clearly establishes the said fact and this has led to provocation, which culminated into sustained provocation and as a result, the occurrence had taken place. Hence, it is the contention of the learned counsel that the ingredients of the offence u/s.302 IPC has not been made out and prayed for allowing of this appeal.

4 Per contra, Mr.V.Arul, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State submitted that the theory of sustained provocation cannot be invoked at all. Even assuming that Ex.D.1 said to be true, the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2014 and the version of the eyewitnesses clearly shows that the appellant/accused trespassed into the house of the deceased and cut her indiscriminately while she was in the kitchen and cooking. When P.W.2 made an attempt to prevent the appellant/accused from escaping, he was also not spared and he also sustained grievous cut injuries. The evidence of the Medical Officers, viz., P.Ws.8 and 19 coupled with the Certificates issued by them, as well as the evidence of P.W.12-Medical officer who conducted autopsy and Ex.P.16-Postmortem Certificate clearly shows the nature of injuries on the deceased caused by the appellant/accused. Therefore, the learned

Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the theory of sustained provocation is not all applicable in the instant case and it is a clear case of murder. Hence, he submitted that the judgment of the Trial Court warrants no interference at the hands of this Court and prayed for dismissal of the appeal.

5 We have perused the entire materials and evidence on record.

6 In the light of the above submissions, now it has to be analysed whether the prosecution has proved the guilt of the appellant/accused beyond reasonable doubt. If so, whether the act of the appellant/accused would fall under any of the exception to section 300 IPC?

7 The deceased Valliammal is the mother of P.W.1 and wife of P.W.2 and mother-in-law of P.W.3. P.W.3 is the wife of P.W.1. P.W.4 is none other than the wife of the appellant/accused and mother of P.W.3. P.Ws.1 and 3, husband and wife, in their evidence have categorically stated that the appellant/accused used to ill-treat his wife - P.W.4, which made her to leave the matrimonial home frequently. Though compromise has been effected by P.Ws.1 to 3, the same has not been fructified. The appellant/accused also had a grudge against P.Ws.1 and 2 as they have conveyed the property which stood in the name of his wife-P.W.4.

8 When the matter stood thus, on 21.03.2014, at about 7.00 p.m., P.Ws.1 and 3 came to their native to meet P.W.2 and

the deceased/parents of P.W.1 and while they were cleaning the Poultry Farm, they heard the noise of the deceased Valliammal. When they rushed to the house, they saw the appellant/accused cutting the deceased as well as P.W.2 indiscriminately using M.O.5-Sickle. P.W.2-injured eyewitness to the occurrence has spoken about the occurrence in categorical terms and stated that the appellant/accused entered the house and inflicted cut injuries on the deceased using sickle, while she was in the kitchen and also cut him on his neck and shoulder. P.W.5, a neighbour of P.W.1, on hearing the hue and cry, rushed to the spot immediately and saw blood stains on the ground. He also saw P.W.2 with bleeding injuries. The version / evidence of P.Ws.1 to 3 clearly establishes the fact that it was only this appellant/accused who had entered the house of P.W.2 and inflicted cut injuries on the deceased as well as P.W.2. The evidence of the Investigating Officer also clearly proves the factum of arrest and recovery which has been corroborated by the evidence of P.W.7. The Grouping Test conducted on the materials seized from the appellant/accused, viz., Blood-stained lungi and shirt, also confirms the presence of human blood - "O" Group. This scientific evidence also clinchingly prove the complicity

of the appellant/accused with the crime.

9 P.W.4-Sundarambal, wife of the appellant/accused has also corroborated the version of P.Ws.1 to 3 about the motive aspect. P.W.17-Inspector of Police also registered the crime on the same day. The evidence of P.W.8, the doctor who treated P.W.2 at the first instance, had stated that P.W.2 came to hospital in an Ambulance at about 8.35 p.m. on 21.03.2014. P.W.8 also noted two injuries on him over his neck and forearm and also noted partial amputation of left elbow/forearm.

10 A perusal of the records also reveal that FIR has been registered on 21.03.2014 at about 10.15 p.m. without any delay and the same had reached the jurisdictional Magistrate Court on 22.03.2014 at about 7.20 a.m. P.W.13, in his evidence, has clearly stated that though he got FIR during night hours on 21.03.2014, he handed over the same to the learned Magistrate in the early Morning on 22.03.2014. Therefore, we are of the view that merely because FIR could not be handed over to the Magistrate concerned in his residence during night hours on 21.03.2014, that cannot be a ground to doubt the entire prosecution case when the evidence of the eyewitnesses has clearly established the role of the appellant/accused. Mere delay in despatching FIR cannot be fatal to the prosecution. Ex.P.6 also reveal a lacerated injury on P.W.2 besides a defensive injury found on the right forearm. In fact, there was a partial amputation on the left elbow/forearm on P.W.2, as noted by P.W.8-Medical Officer. P.W.19, yet another Medical Officer who treated P.W.2 in Ganga Hospital at Coimbatore has also spoken about the nature of injuries sustained by P.W.2 and stated that the injuries No.1 and 2 are grievous in nature. Ex.P.26 issued by him, also substantiates the said fact. The evidence of the Medical Officer, who conducted autopsy on the dead body of the deceased has vividly spoken about the nature of injuries sustained by the deceased which has resulted in her death. Hence, from the evidence of P.W.12 coupled with Ex.P.16-Postmortem Certificate, there is no iota of doubt in the mind of this Court that the death of the deceased is nothing but homicidal. Hence, this Court arrives at the irresistible conclusion that it was only this appellant/accused who had caused the death of the deceased and injuries on P.W.2 and that the prosecution has proved the guilt of the appellant/accused beyond all reasonable doubt.

11 Now turning to the contention of the learned counsel for the appellant that the act of the appellant/accused do not attract the ingredients of the offence u/s.302 IPC, the materials placed on record, in particular, the Postmortem Certificate-Ex.P.16, would clearly reveal the nature of injuries caused on the deceased. In fact, the appellant/accused had an intention to cause the death. The intention can be gathered

from the nature of injuries. When the death is caused with intention, then the act of the assailant will attract section 300 IPC alone. Even if it is done with an intention of causing such bodily injury as offender knows to be likely to cause death of the person to whom the harm is caused, is a murder. Admittedly, in the case on hand, the appellant/accused cut the head of the deceased with M.O.5-Sickle, which has been clearly spoken by the eyewitnesses. Even if the act of the assailant falls within Clause [3] or [4] to section 300 IPC, then he cannot escape from the punishment u/s.302 IPC. When the assailant is able to establish that his act fall within any of the Exception to section 300 IPC, he can seek the benefit. In the instant case, from the available materials, it could be seen that the act of the appellant/accused do not fall under any of the Exception to Section 300 IPC. It is not the case of the accused that the occurrence took place without any premeditation, in a sudden fight or heat of passion, upon a sudden quarrel etc., and he has not taken any undue advantage or acted in a cruel or unusual manner. Therefore, we are of the view that the contention of the learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant/accused has committed the offence due to sustained provocation, cannot be countenanced. To buttress this statement, the learned counsel relied upon Ex.D.1-complaint said to have been given by one Pappathi and others to show that P.Ws.1 to 4 were disinclined to re-convey the property to the said Pappathi. It is to be noted that the said complaint was given on 27.05.2013 whereas the occurrence is said to have taken place on 21.03.2014. It is further to be noted that it is the case of the appellant/accused that P.W.4 has transferred the property in the names of P.Ws.1 and 2 and when the appellant/accused asked them to re-convey, they refused to do so. There arose the dispute. The appellant/accused also relied upon Ex.D.2 to show that the property was transferred during December 2004. Therefore, it cannot be said that for more than 10 years after the alleged transfer of property, there was a persisting provocation on the part of the appellant/accused and the evidence on record aptly establishes the factum of the appellant/accused entering into the house of P.W.2 ; causing cut injuries on the deceased as well as on P.W.2 ; and thereafter, fleeing away from the scene of crime. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the act of the accused do not fall under the category of "provocation" and the contention of the learned counsel that the occurrence took place on account of sustained provocation, has no basis at all and the same is rejected.

12 The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in K.M.NANAVATHI Vs. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA reported in AIR 1963 SUPREME COURT 605, has held that:-

".....

85 The Indian Law, relevant to the present enquiry, may be stated thus : [1] The test of "grave and sudden" provocation is whether a reasonable man, belonging to the same class of society as the accused, placed in the situation in which the accused was placed would be so provoked as to lose his self control. [2] In India, words and gestures may also, under certain circumstances, cause grave and sudden provocation to an accused so as to bring his act within the first Exception to S.300 of the Indian Penal Code [3] The mental background created by the previous act of the victim may be taken into consideration in ascertaining whether the subsequent act caused grave and sudden provocation for committing the offence. [4] The fatal blow should be clearly traced to the influence of passion arising from that provocation and not after the passion had cooled down by lapse of time, or otherwise giving room and scope for premeditation and calculation.

86 Bearing these principles in mind, let us look at the facts of this case. When Sylvia confessed to her husband that she had illicit intimacy with Ahuja, the latter was not present. We will assume that he had momentarily lost his self control. But if his version is true-for the purpose of this argument, we shall accept that what he has said is true-it shows that he was only thinking of the future of his wife and children and also of asking for an explanation from Ahuja for his conduct. This attitude of the accused clearly indicates that he had not only regained his self control, but on the other hand, was planning for the future. Then he drove his wife and children to a cinema, left them there, went to his ship, took a revolver on a false pretext, loaded it with six rounds, did some official business there, and drove his car to the office of Ahuja and then to his flat, went straight to the bedroom of Ahuja and shot him dead. Between 1.30 p.m., when he left his house and 4.20 p.m., when the murder took place, three hours had elapsed and therefore, there was sufficient time for him to regain his self-control, even if he had not regained it earlier.

On the other hand, his conduct clearly shows that the murder was a deliberate and calculated one. Even if any conversation took place between the accused and the deceased in the manner described by the accused-though we do not believe that - it does not affect the question, for the accused entered the bedroom of the deceased to shoot him. The mere fact that before the shooting the accused abused the deceased and the abuse provoked an equally abusive reply could not conceivably be a provocation for murder. We, therefore, hold that the facts of the case do not attract the provisions of Exception 1 to S.300 of the Indian Penal Code."

13 Admittedly, the evidence of the eyewitnesses clearly indicates that the appellant/accused had an intention to take revenge on P.W.1's family and he had a time to think from the date of the alleged transfer of property during December 2005. Therefore, at any event, it cannot be said that the appellant/accused has lost his self-control for more than a year and committed the offence. Such theory of sustained provocation projected by the learned counsel for the appellant/accused has not legs to stand in the legal scrutiny. Though this Court is of the view that the judgment of the Trial Court insofar as convicting the appellant/accused for the offences u/s.449, 302 and 307[part II] IPC, warrants no interference at the hands of this Court ; the sentences imposed on the appellant/accused for the offences u/s.449 and 307 [Part II] IPC requires to be modified to meet the ends of justice.

14 In the result, the criminal appeal is dismissed. The conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant/accused for the offence u/s.302 IPC by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mahalir Needhi Mandram [Fast Track Mahila Court], Erode, Erode District, in SC.No.110/2015 vide Judgment dated 28.03.2017, are hereby confirmed. The conviction for the offences u/s.449 and 307 [Part II] IPC is confirmed but the sentences of life imprisonment awarded for the said offences is modified and the appellant/accused is directed to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of ten years for such offences. Fine amounts imposed for the said offences, viz., u/s.302, 307 [part II] and 449 IPC is maintained. It is made clear that the sentences are ordered to run concurrently.

15 It is reported that the appellant / accused is in jail. He is directed to undergo the remaining period of

sentence. The sentence already undergone by him shall be given set off u/s.428 Cr.P.C.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS IX)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To

- 1.The Sessions Judge, Mahalir Needhimandram
[Mahila Fast Track Court], Erode, Erode District.
- 2.The Principal District and Sessions Judge
Erode District.
- 3.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate
Perundurai.
- 4.The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Erode District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police
Chennimalai Police Station
Erode District.
- 6.The District Collector
Erode District.
- 7.The Director General of Police
Mylapore, Chennai-4.
- 8.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
9. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+1cc to Mr.C.Ramkumar, Advocate sr.no.13048

Cr1.A.No.199/2017

mr(co)
nr 22/03/2018