IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Friday, the Thirteenth day of April Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION NOS.10351, 9946, 9947,

10049 and 10264 of 2018 &

CRL.MP.NOS.5572 TO 5575 OF 2018

P.VANANGAMUDI	[PETITIONER / ACCUSED IN CRL.OP.NO.10351 OF 2018]
V.BALAJI	[PETITIONER / ACCUSED IN CRL.OP.NO.9946 OF 2018]
[*]1 K.S.SARWANI D/O.SURIYANARAYANA, 2 K.RAJESH S/O.R.KANNAN,	**[PETITIONERS / ACCUSED IN CRL.OP.NO.9947 OF 2018]**

[*]Amended as per the order of this Hon'ble Court dated 13/04/2017 made in CRL.MP.NO.5546 OF 2018 IN CRL.OP.NO.9947 OF 2018

D.JAISHANKAR	[PETITIONER / ACCUSED IN CRL.OP.NO.10049 OF 2018]
S.K.ASOK KUMAR	[PETITIONER / ACCUSED IN CRL.OP.NO.10264 OF 2018]

Vs

THE STATE REP BY, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION, CHENNAI CITY-V, CHENNAI-600 016. CR.NO.01/AC/2018/CC-V.	[RESPONDENT IN CRL.OP.NO.10351 & 10049 & 10264 OF 2018]
THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION, CHENNAI CITY III, CR.NO.1 OF 2018.	[RESPONDENT IN CRL.OP.NO.9946 & 9947 OF 2018]

X.GERARD [PETITIONER / DEFACTO COMPLAINANT]
[Ordered as per order of this Hon'ble Court dated 13/04/2018 made
IN CRL.MP.NO.5572 OF 2018 IN CRL.OP.NO.9947 OF 2018,
IN CRL.MP.NO.5573 OF 2018 IN CRL.OP.NO.9946 OF 2018
IN CRL.MP.NO.5574 OF 2018 IN CRL.OP.NO.10351 OF 2018
IN CRL.MP.NO.5575 OF 2018 IN CRL.OP.NO.10264 OF 2018

For Petitioner : MR.N.R.ELANGO SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
M/S.M.GURUPRASAD Advocate
[IN CRL.OP.NO.10351 OF 2018]

For Petitioner : M/S.N.BAASKARAN Advocate
[IN CRL.OP.NO.9946 OF 2018]

For Petitioner : MR.A.THIYAGARAJAN Senior Counsel for
M/S.M.SUNIL KUMAR Advocate
[IN CRL.OP.NO.9947 OF 2018]

For Petitioner : M/S.UM.RAVICHANDRAN Advocate
[IN CRL.OP.NO.10049 OF 2018]

For Petitioner : M/S.D.SHIVAKUMARAN Advocate
[IN CRL.OP.NO.10264 OF 2018]

For Respondent : PUBLIC PROSECUTOR [IN ALL THE PETITIONS]

For Defacto Complainant : M/S.X.GERARD PARTY-IN-PERSON
[IN CRL.MP.NOS.5572,5573, 5574 & 5575 OF 2018]

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10351 of 2018/A-1, first Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.9947 of 2018/A-2, 2nd petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.9947 of 2018/A-6, Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.9946 of 2018/A-3, Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10264 of 2018/A-4, and Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10049 of 2018/A-5, seek anticipatory bail in Crime No.1/AC/2018/CC-V, registered by the respondent for the offence under Sections 120B, 420, 467 and 468 of IPC and Section 13(2) r/w 13(1) (b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2. Heard Mr.N.R.Ilango, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Mr.M.Guruprasad, counsel for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10351 of 2018/(A-1), Mr.A.Thiyagarajan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Mr.M.Sunilkumar, counsel for the petitioners 1 and 2 in Crl.O.P.No.9947 of 2018/(A-2 & A-6), Mr.K.Srinivsan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Mr.N.Baskaran, counsel for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.9946 of 2018/(A-3), Mr.D.Shivakumaran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10264 of 2018/(A-4) and Mr.UM.Ravichandran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10049 of 2018/(A-5) and Mr.X.Gerard the Intervener/in person and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent.

3. Based on three petitions dated 06.11.2016 and 21.11.2016 by the Intervener Mr.X.Gerard, Advocate, preliminary enquiry was conducted and thereafter a regular case was registered against the accused in Crime No.1/AC/2018/CC-V, against the petitioners under Sections 120B, 420, 467 and 468 of IPC and Section 13(2) r/w 13(1) (b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 by the respondent.

4. Brief facts of the prosecution case: The allegation against A-1/Dr.P.Vanangamudi, is that for the admissions for students under 15% NRI Quota rules and procedures were flouted and violated and admissions were made without essential certificates and documents and thereby A-1 amassed huge wealth by corrupt and fraudulent manner disproportionate to the known source of income. The further allegation is that A-1 with the coordination of A-2, Dr.K.S.Sarwani, Professor and HOD, Department of Inter Disciplinary Studies and the Department of Distance Education, Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University, Taramani, collected nearly 25 to 30 lakhs per applicant and arranged false visa from foreign countries through their middleman in East Asian Countries, by forging attendance of NRI students. The further allegation is that A-1 had received enormous amounts as illegal gratification by inducing the students who want to stay abroad by permitting them to stay away by forging the attendance in University, as if they had attended the classes. The further allegation is that A-1 with the assistance of other accused namely A-2 to A-5, had misappropriated the building funds and other construction funds and made expenditure beyond the sealing limit. The further allegation is that A-1 with the assistance of the other accused for appointment of 30 Assistant Professors and 30 appointments in non-law subjects planned to collect Rs.20 to Rs.30 lakhs for each post by stating that the amount is to be paid to the Garden as well as to the Honourable Law Minister. The further allegation is that huge amounts have been realized by the A-1, A-3, A-4 and A-6 in paper chasing and malpractice in examination by passing failed candidates by utilizing unqualified examiners for this purpose. The further allegation is that huge amounts were diverted and paid for aesthetic wood work, beautification, landscaping, furniture, large number of computers and unwanted books for the University by the first accused with the assistance of the other accused (A-2 to A-5) without obtaining prior sanction of Finance Committee, Purchase committee, Senate and Syndicate. During the preliminary enquiry there was suspicion that the Rules and Procedures were violated and flouted in respect of admissions in NRI quota during the tenure of the A-1 as Vice Chancellor and in particular during the academic year 2016-17 admitted in NRI quota, only 18 applications were in order, remaining 75 applications, several certificates and documents which are essentially required have not been enclosed. Likewise one Vivek Jayaraman S/o V.Jayaraman, Thiruvarur, was admitted under NRI quota without certificates which are mandatory for admission.

5. During the enquiry records relating to Thiru.Vivek Jayaraman, who was admitted under category III NRI sponsor in three years LLB (Hons) course vide Provisional Admission No.959/Regr./Law Admns./2015 dated 19.10.2015 were perused and that the following essential copies of the documents were not available namely:

> NRI status certificate issued by the Indian Embassy of the respective country with seal; copy of the NRE (Non Residential External) or NRO Bank Account Pass Book of the NRI; Certificate of Relationship (between the NRI and the candidate issued by the competent Authority); Eligibility Certificate: Candidates with qualifying degree from Deemed University/DDE of Tamil Nadu State Universities should obtain an Eligibility Certificate by submitting an Indian Bank Challan in the prescribed form for a sum of Rs.500/- whereas Rs.600/- for the other State Universities along with a requisition letter to the Registrar; Joint Declaration by the parent and student; Affidavit by the student and parent/Guardian.

Further, A-3 during the course of enquiry admitted that the above documents were not available with the application and thereby it was found that the said Vivek Jayaraman did not satisfy the eligibility for admission under the NRI quota and that there was suspicion that the admission could have been done due to pecuniary advantages. During the academic year 2013-14, A-1 is one of the coordinators; during the academic year 2014-15, A-3 and A-4 were chief coordinators and A-2 and A-5 were one of the coordinators and during the academic year 2015-16, A-2, A-3 and A-4 were one of the coordinators. The further allegation is that though Dr.P.Vanangamudu/(A-1) attained superannuation on 31.10.2016, Mr.V.Balaji/(A-3) the Registrar i/c who is subordinate to A-1 issued order of re-employment to A-1 till 30.06.2017 in violation of the Rules. Since it appeared from the enquiry that the accused conspired together and committed the offences by abusing their official position as Public Servants in the Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University and obtained pecuniary advantage the case was registered.

6. Mr.N.R.Ilango, learned Senior Counsel for (A-1)/Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10351 of 2018 would submit that the case is registered only on suspicion and that no prima facie material to substantiate the allegations have been brought forwarded by the respondent after several enquiries. He would submit that the petitioner has put in about 30 years of service and that other than being the Administrative head of the University, he has not interfered with he admission of the students under the NRI quota. He would submit that every academic year the admission of students were made by the Admission Committee and that Prof. D.Gopal and Prof. M.S.Soundarapandian, were appointed as Members of the Admission Committee in respect of admission under NRI quota. He would submit that during the preliminary enquiry no averments have been stated against the Vice Chancellor as if the documents were forged. He would also submit that the procedure adopted by the University is that as soon as the applications were received they were handed over to the contractual labours for scrutiny and thereafter after scrutiny they were sent to the Experts of the Anna University and that the marks were uploaded in the website of the University and thereafter the candidates selected were segregated based on the cut-off marks and thereafter call letters were sent to the concerned candidates. He would submit that the system of NRI has been introduced in the University only to augment the revenue of the University. He would also submit that on earlier four occasions complaints were given by the Intervener to the Governor, Vice-Chancellor, Directorate of Vigilance and Anti-Corruption and Law Secretary, pursuant to which enquiries were conducted on four occasions and that the petitioner/(A-1) has attended all the enquiries and given his explanation and that all the authorities including the Directorate of Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, had accepted the same. He would also submit that pursuant to the registration of a case once again preliminary enquiry was conducted and the petitioner/(A-1) had appeared before the concerned respondents and lastly search was also conducted at his residence. He would submit that the petitioner/(A-1) made himself available for enquiry and that he was also present all along with the respondent at the time of investigation and also during the entire search proceedings at his residence and that a seizure Mahazar was prepared in the presence of witnesses. Nothing incriminating had been recovered from him. The petitioner has given proper explanation and accounted for whatever has been seized from his residence. He would submit that A-1's daughter was earlier working at Singapore and presently working in Australia and his wife is a Doctor and that they have sufficient source of income and would submit that the search conducted at his house would reveal that there is no disproportionate income and further nothing incriminating had been recovered from his house.

7. The learned Senior Counsel would also submit that in respect of NRI quota there are three categories and in one category NRI should be a parent, in second category the NRI should a guardian and in third category the NRI should be a sponsor and thereby for admission of the candidates to NRI quota it is not necessary that the student should be a NRI. Even a student who studied and lives in India can be admitted under the NRI quota if either his parent or guardian or sponsor is an NRI. Thereby the allegations of fabrication of visa and travel documents and tampering of attendance are without any basis and exaggerated for the purpose of fixing somebody. He would submit that the case attained significance since there was allegation against the one Vivek Jayaraman who is stated to be close to persons in power and thereby the petitioner is unnecessarily victimized and hounded. The first accused was the former Vice Chancellor and he has put in 30 years of untainted service and that he is prepared to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed on him.

8. Mr.A.Thiyagarajan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for A-2/Dr.K.S.Sarwani and and A-6/K.Rajesh would submit that pursuant to the petitions by the Intervener Mr.X.Gerard, the Law Secretary to the Government of Tamil Nadu, directed the Director of Legal Studies to conduct an enquiry and report to the Government and accordingly, the Director of Legal Studies and Convener of Law University has summoned the accused and enquired the matter and submitted a report to the Law Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu. He would submit that even after completion of three enquiries, the Intervener had filed a direction petition before this Hon'ble Court seeking direction to the respondent to register a case based on his second complaint dated 21.11.2016 and this Court passed an order to directing the respondent to register and investigate the case. The Intervener by suppressing the earlier complaint dated 06.11.2016 and the enquiries conducted and investigation made by the respondent police officer, had obtained the order from this Court. He would also submit that the complaint given by the Intervener was motivated. He would submit that the Intervener has personal animosity against the petitioners since his wife Smt.K.Sangeetha, was appointed as a lecturer on contract basis in Dr.Ambedkar Law University, on 19.07.2006 and that her service has been periodically renewed every year, though she was not holding P.hd. Degree or passed NET or SLET, and while so the Intervener's wife had applied for regularizing her services and that since the petitioners have not obliged to fulfil the petitioner's demand to regularize his wife as a permanent lecturer against the rules the Intervener had preferred the complaint against the first accused and other members in the Administrative side and thereby a mala fide complaint has been given against them. He would further submit that A-2 was working as a Professor and Head of Department of Inter Disciplinary Studies and the Department of Distance Education and A-6 was working as the Controller of Examinations and that they have nothing to do with the admissions under the NRI quota. He would submit that the petitioners are still working in the University and that they continued to attend the office till date and that they have not absconded and they have been appearing before the authorities in all the enquiries including the enquiry conducted by the respondent. He would also submit that the petitioners were very much available along with the respondent during the house search conducted at their residence and that they undertake to cooperate with the respondent in his further investigation.

9. Mr.K.Srinivasan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.9946 of 2018 (Mr.V.Balaji/(A-3), would submit that he was not at all the co-ordinator for the admission during the relevant time when Vivek Jayaraman was admitted as alleged by the Intervener. He would submit that Prof. D.Gopal and Prof. M.S.Soundarapandian, were appointed as Chairman of the Committee. He would also submit that the wife of the Intervener had filed four writ petitions in the High Court right from the year 2008 and the Mr.V.Balaji/(A-3) was arrayed as respondent in all the four writ petitions and that the allegations against him were made out of personal malice. He would submit that he was working as Registrar in charge of the University during the relevant period and he was not working as Co-ordinator for the admission under the NRI quota and he was not responsible for the admission of NRI quota students at any time.

10. Mr.D.Shivakumaran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10264 of 2018 (Dr.S.K.Askok Kumar (A4) would submit that (A-4) was working as Librarian and he was given additional change as Deputy Registrar-in-charge that too only a coordinator for 3 years LLB degree course offered in the affiliated Government Law Colleges. Thus, when he is a coordinator only for affiliated Government Law Colleges which neither offer Honours degree nor have any NRI quota, there is absolutely no reason to array him as an accused and even as a witness he may not be required in the case. He would submit that he was not at all Co-ordinator for the admission of students to NRI quota and that he is not responsible for the admission of students to NRI quota at the relevant point of time. He would submit that the petitioner's house was searched and no incriminating material or document was found and there was no seizure of cash or valuables or documents from his residence. He would submit that the investigation is over and that the case is all borne out by records and that there was no material attracting the provisions of the Act against the petitioners. He would submit that the petitioners are having permanent place of residence and that they will neither abscond nor evade the due process of law. The allegation against the petitioner is that he has assisted the Vice Chancellor and no other allegation is made against the petitioners and that a false case has been foisted against them. The petitioner had fully cooperated during the search and no incriminating documents or materials were recovered at the time of search. He would submit that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation.

11. Mr.UM.Ravichandran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.10049 of 2018 (Mr.D.Jaishankar-(A-5) would also submit that the petitioner (A-5) was not at all Co-ordinator for the admission of students to NRI quota and that he is not responsible for the admission of students under the NRI Quota at the relevant point of time. He would submit that on 24.3.2008 at 6.10 A.M., respondent conducted search in the petitioner's residence and nothing incriminating had been recovered from his residence. He would submit that the petitioner is ready and willing to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court and he is prepared to furnish solvent sureties for release on anticipatory bail and he further undertakes that he will not abscond or tamper with the witnesses.

12. All the learned counsels appearing for the accused in unison would submit that the petitioners have appeared for preliminary enquiry and also made themselves available for enquiry conducted by all the authorities and also in the enquiry conducted by the respondent and they were also cooperating with the investigation. They would submit that the petitioners are very much available for investigation and that other than A-1 all others continue to be in service and are attending work every day and that they have not absconded. The learned counsels would submit that during the entire period of search they were present and the respondent had not arrested them. The learned counsels would by referring to the Status Report filed by the respondent would submit that even as per the Status Report the respondent had stated that the documents are available with the Office of the Dr.Ambedkar Law University. The learned counsels would also submit that the petitioners are not absconding and they are very much available for enquiry and investigation. The learned counsels would submit that the entire case of the prosecution is borne out by the documents. He would also submit that the process of selection in respect of admissions to NRI quota was done by the Chairman, Law Admissions and that Prof. D.Gopal and Prof. M.S.Soundarapandian, were responsible for the admissions and that all the incriminating documents were kept in the custody of the University. The learned counsels would also submit that simultaneously search was conducted in the houses of all the accused wherein no incriminating materials were found from any of the accused. Whereas all the accused have accounted for the properties purchased by them with prior permission from the Head of Department by showing the source of income. The learned counsels would also submit that on the earlier complaints in respect of the same allegations dated 06.11.2016 and 23.11.2016, enquiry was also conducted by the Director of Legal Studies, Law Secretary and the petitioners have been all along cooperating. The learned counsels would also submit that the petitioners are prepared to appear for enquiry. The learned counsels would submit that the complaint given by the Intervener due to personal animosity against the first accused and other members in the Administrative Department of Dr.Ambedkar Law University and is tainted with malice.

13. The respondent filed Status Report contending that during the preliminary enquiry it was ascertained that Rules and Procedures were not followed by the accused and in respect of the admission in NRI quota during the tenure of the first accused/Vice-Chancellor and particularly during the academic year 2016-2017 and that one Mr.Vivek Jayaraman was admitted in NRI quota without obtaining certificates which are mandatory. A perusal of records of Mr.Vivek Jayaraman, under category III NRI sponsor in three years LLB (Hons) course vide Provisional Admission No.959/Regr./Law Admns./2015 dated 19.10.2015 the following essential copies of the documents were not available:

1) NRI status certificate issued by the Indian Embassy of the respective country with seal;
2) Copy of the NRE (Non Residential External) or NRO Bank Account Pass Book of the NRI;
3) Certificate of Relationship (between the NRI and the candidate issued by the competent Authority)
4) Eligibility Certificate: Candidates with qualifying degree from Deemed University/DDE of Tamil Nadu State Universities should obtain an Eligibility Certificate by submitting an Indian Bank Challan in the prescribed form for a sum of Rs.500/- whereas Rs.600/- for the other State Universities along with a requisition letter to the Registrar;
5) Joint Declaration by the parent and student (Annexure -X in the prospectus;
6) Affidavit by the student (Annexure-XI) and parent/Guardian in 20/- Rs. Stamp paper (Annexure-XII in prospectus).

and he would also submit that A-3 during the course of enquiry admitted that the above documents were not available with the application submitted by Vivek Jayaraman.

14. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor in consonance with the Status Report filed would submit that the accused persons have appeared for all the enquiries and were also available when the search was conducted at the respective residences. He would further submit that the records pertaining to all the allegations made in the complaint have to be collected from the various faculties of the Dr.Ambedkar Law University regarding the concerned allegation at the relevant period during which the petitioners have worked in the respective departments. Further after collection of the documents the signatures and the handwriting have to be compared by handwriting expert to find out who is responsible for the malpractices alleged in the complaints.

15. Mr.X.Gerard/Intervener would vehemently oppose the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners stating that in 15% quota in NRI students admission in Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University, Tharamani, Accused No.1 with the co-ordination of Accused No.2 collected nearly Rs. 25 to 30 lakhs per applicant and arranged false visa from foreign countries through his middle man in East Asian Countries and most of the students are not NRI and that the petitioners are persons who had collectively colluded with each other and by hatching conspiracy and fabricated the documents and had committed offence of grievous nature and thereby they have to be taken into custody and they have to be examined. He also relied on the judgment in ***Sudhir vs. State of Maharashtra*** reported in ***(2016) 1 SCC 146***; and ***State represented by CBI vs. Anil Sharma*** reported in ***(1997) 7 SCC 187***, stating that the petitioners holding high position who are wielding considerable influence should not be granted pre arrest bail since it would be causing handicap to the investigating agency and if pre arrest bail is granted there is chance of tampering with the records and interference with the investigation. He would also submit that when serious allegations of misappropriation of public funds and corruption are there, considering the gravity of the offence and circumstances of the case anticipatory bail should not be granted to the accused.

16. At this juncture, the learned counsels for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are academicians working in the Law University and that still continued to work. The learned counsels the would submit that the petitioners were all along cooperating with the investigating agency at the time of investigation and they were all very well available at the time of their house search wherein no incriminating documents have been found and seized or recovered from the possession of the petitioners. Whereas the petitioners have accounts for the properties acquired by them and that they have records to prove that the properties have been purchased with prior permission from the head of department and that the entire case of the prosecution is borne out by documents and that the petitioners themselves are available for interrogation and they should not be made scape goat for various reasons. The learned counsels would submit that admittedly as per the Status Report filed by the respondent the documents are all available with the custody of the University and that there is no possibility of tampering or that there is no apprehension of absconding of the petitioners.

17. I have gone through the FIR and the Status Report. Though a detailed Status Report has been filed, it is the admitted case of the respondent that A-2 (Ist Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.9947 of 2018) has retired and all the other petitioners are working in the University till the date and they were available during all the enquiries and were also available at the place of search and all along have been cooperating with the investigation. In the status report filed by the respondent nowhere it has been stated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required. Admittedly, nothing has been stated as if some recoveries have to be made from the petitioners or that there is a chance that they will abscond or evade the due process of law or that they would interfere with the investigation. Admittedly, it has also been stated that the documents are available in the University. In view of the above I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions:

18. The petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or their appearance within 15 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order, before the learned Special Court for the cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, Chennai on each of them executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only), with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Special Court for the cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, Chennai and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioners who are having passport shall surrender their passport before the Special Court for the cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, Chennai. The petitioners shall not leave out of Chennai, without prior permission from the respondent.

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police every day at 9.00 a.m., and 6.00 p.m., for a period of one week and thereafter, as and when required by the respondent for interrogation.

[c] if the petitioners fail to surrender before the concerned Court within 15 days, the order granting anticipatory bail to them shall stand dismissed automatically.

[d] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed by the said Court and as if the petitioners are released on bail by the learned rial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].**

[**g**] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

-sd/-
13/04/2018

This order, on being produced, be punctually observed and carried into execution by all concerned

TRUE COPY

Sub-Assistant Registrar (Statistics/C.S.)
High Court, Madras - 600 104.

TO

1 THE SPECIAL JUDGE FOR
V & AC CASES, CHENNAI.

2 THE SPECIAL COURT FOR
PREVENTION OF ANTI CORRUPTION ACT
CITY CIVIL COURT, CHENNAI-104.

3 THE X ADDITIONAL JUDGE
[SPECIAL JUDGE, PC ACT COURT, CHENNAI.

4 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

5 THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION,
CHENNAI CITY-V,
CHENNAI-600 016.

6 THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION,
CHENNAI CITY III,

+1CC to M/S.M.GURUPRASAD Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR NO.7338

+2CC to M/S.N.BAASKARAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR NO.7322

+3CC to M/S.M.SUNIL KUMAR Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR NO.7323

+1CC to M/S.UM.RAVICHANDRAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR NO.7335

+1CC to M/S.D.SHIVAKUMARAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR NO.7324

CRL.O.P.Nos.10351, 9946, 9947,
10049 and 10264 of 2018 &
CRL.MP.NOS.5572 TO 5575 OF 2018

Date :13/04/2018

MK:23/04/2018