

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON: 24.07.2018

PRONOUNCED ON: 07.08.2018

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P. No.6481 of 2018 & Crl.M.P. Nos.3306 and 3307 of 2018

Dr. Vijayan

...Petitioner

vs.

1 The State represented by
the Inspector of Police
Mount Traffic Investigation Wing
Chennai 600 043

2 Sekar

... Respondents

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking to call for the records pertaining to the charge sheet laid in Cr. No.929 of 2012 as against the petitioner and pending on the file of the I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Chengalpet under S.C. No.187 of 2014 and quash the same as illegal, arbitrary, erroneous and unsustainable in law and on facts.

For petitioner Mr. R. Singaravelan, Sr. Counsel
for Mr. P. Vajravelu

For R1 Mr. C. Iyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

For R2 Mr. K. Sankaran

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been preferred seeking to call for the records pertaining to the charge sheet laid in Cr. No.929 of 2012 as against the petitioner and pending on the file of the I Additional District and Sessions Court, Chengalpet under S.C. No.187 of 2014 and quash the same.

2 A vignette of the facts leading to the filing of this quash petition is as under:

2.1 On 25.07.2012, a surreal, but, tragic incident occurred, in which, one Sruthi, a 7 year old girl and a student of Zion Matriculation Higher Secondary School (for short "Zion School"), while returning home from school, by school bus bearing Registration No.TN 23 S 9952 (for short "9952"), slipped through a gaping hole on the floor of the bus and fell while the bus was in motion, resulting in its rear tyres running over her and snuffing out her life instantly.

2.2 On the complaint lodged by her uncle Sekar not only against the bus driver but also against the Management of Zion School, the Inspector of Police, Mount Traffic Investigation Wing, registered a case in Cr.No.929 of 2012 on 25.07.2012 under Sections 279 and 304(II) IPC and Sections 182-A and 190 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, (for short "the MV Act") against four accused, including Dr. Vijayan, the Correspondent of Zion School. After completing the investigation, the police filed a final report against eight accused, including Dr. Vijayan (A3) and Yogesh Sylvera (A8) before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Tambaram, for the offences under Sections 279, 304(II), 109, 201 and 465 IPC and Sections 182-A, 190 and 177 of the MV Act. The case was committed to the Court of Session in S.C. No.187 of 2014 and is now ripe for trial before the I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Chengalpet. At this juncture, Dr.Vijayan (A3) is before this Court for quashing the prosecution as against him in S.C. No.187 of 2014.

3 Heard Mr. R. Singgaravelan, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. P. Vajravelu, learned counsel on record for Dr.Vijayan (A3), Mr.C. Iyapparaj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent-State and Mr. K. Sankaran, learned counsel for the second respondent/de facto complainant.

4 The thrust of Mr. Singgaravelan's arguments is two fold as under:

a No charge under Section 304(II) IPC can be framed against Dr.Vijayan (A3) on the materials gathered by the police, especially in the light of the following rulings:

S.No	Cause Title	Mode of citation
1	Girishbhai Maganlal Pandya vs. State of Gujarat	(2016) 1 Guj LH 126
2	Kurban Hussein Mohamedalli Bangawalla vs. State of Maharashtra	AIR 1965 SC 1616

S.No .	Cause Title	Mode of citation
3	Suleman Rahiman Mulani and another vs. State of Maharashtra	AIR 1968 SC 829
4	Ishwarlal Girdharilal Parekh vs. State of Maharashtra and others	AIR 1969 SC 40
5	State vs. Hari Sing	AIR 1969 Rajasthan 86
6	Ambalal D. Bhatt vs. The State of Gujarat	(1972) 3 SCC 525
7	Baijnath Singh vs. The State of Bihar	AIR 1972 SC 1485
8	Satya Prakash vs. State of Rajasthan	1986 Cri.L.J. 542
9	Dr. V. Rugmini vs. State of Kerala and others	1987 Cri.L.J. 200
10	Malay Kumar Ganguly vs. Dr. Sukumar Mukherjee and others	(2009) 9 SCC 221
11	Alister Anthony Pareira vs. State of Maharashtra	(2012) 2 SCC 648
12	Dr. P.B. Desai vs. State of Maharashtra	AIR 2014 SC 795
13	Prabhakaran vs. State of Kerala	(2009) 1 SCC (Cri) 873

b The allegation of the police against Dr.Vijayan (A3) is that the bus involved in the incident was being run by Zion School and therefore, despite having knowledge about the gaping hole on the floor of the bus, Dr.Vijayan (A3), being the Correspondent of Zion School, had not taken any steps either to close it or withdraw the operation of the bus; whereas, on the complaint given by Dr.Vijayan (A3), S-15 Selayur Police Station have registered a case in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 and after completing the investigation, have filed a charge sheet in C.C. No.170 of 2017 before the Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram, for the offences under Sections 420, 465, 380, 468 and 471 IPC against Yogesh Sylvera (sole accused); in that final report, the Inspector of Police, S-15 Selayur Police Station has opined that Yogesh Sylvera had stealthily removed the blank, but, signed transfer forms relating to bus no.9952 from one N.R.Enterprises run by N. Ravi, brother of Dr.Vijayan (A3) and had created documents as if the bus was run by Zion School; in other words, in the final report in C.C. No. 170 of 2017, the opinion of the Inspector of Police is that Zion School was not running that bus and that it was Yogesh Sylvera who is running that bus, he having manipulated the documents.

5 On the strength of the final report in C.C. No.170 of 2017 before the Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram, Mr. Singgaravelan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Dr.Vijayan (A3), contended that the said final report demolishes the final report in S.C. No.187 of 2014 before the I Additional District and Sessions Court, Chengalpet and therefore, the proceedings against Dr.Vijayan (A3) in S.C. No.187 of 2014 should be quashed.

6 At the first blush, the arguments of Mr. Singgaravelan did appear convincing to this Court, but, on a closer scrutiny of the facts in both the cases, viz., S.C. No.187 of 2014 and C.C. No.170 of 2017, the fallacy in his submissions came to light, about which, this Court proposes to discuss threadbare in the latter paragraphs.

7 Coming to the first ground, Mr. Singgaravelan, learned Senior Counsel, submitted that Dr.Vijayan (A3) was the Correspondent of Zion School and the affairs of the bus were handled by his brothers, viz., Balraj (A4) and Ravi (A7) along with Yogesh Sylvera (A8) and therefore, the provisions of Section 299 r/w 304 (II) IPC cannot be stretched too far for including Dr.Vijayan (A3), Correspondent of Zion School in the offence. He further submitted that, even according to the prosecution, Dr.Vijayan (A3) was not travelling in the bus in question and as such, there is no way by which he would know that there was a gaping hole in the bus. Further, according to the learned Senior Counsel, by no stretch of imagination, can Dr.Vijayan (A3) allow such a mishap to occur, had he known about the presence of a gaping hole on the floor of the bus.

8 The submissions of the learned Senior Counsel overlook the statements of five witnesses, which were not filed along with the typed set of papers by the learned counsel on record for Dr.Vijayan (A3) for the reasons best known to him. When a quash application is filed, it is imperative that the statements of all the witnesses, both favourable and unfavourable to the quash petitioner, should be filed. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor produced the case diary and on a reading of the case diary, this Court found that the police have recorded the statements of five parents, whose children were studying in Zion School, at the relevant point of time and that their children were also using the same bus for going to and coming from school.

9 One Kemin (LW 15), father of Jebastin and Sebastin, studying in VII standard and III standard respectively, has stated that he is a driver employed in the State Transport Corporation; his two children are studying in Zion School; everyday, they would go to school by bus no.9952 and return home

in the evening by the same bus; the said bus has a mark "P2"; on 06.07.2012, his son Jebastin told him about the presence of a hole on the floor of the bus; when the bus came to drop the children on 07.07.2012, he himself saw the hole on the floor of the bus; on 18.07.2012, he met Dr.Vijayan (A3) and Balraj (A4) and told them about the hole and asked them to close it; and Balraj (A4) told him that the bus has been taken on lease .

10 Similarly, Stephen (LW 13), a Junior Technician in a company, has stated that his two children, viz., Sai Prasad and Sriram are studying in III standard and I standard respectively in Zion School; he paid Rs.7,500/- per child towards bus fees; everyday, they would go by bus no.9952 which has a mark "P2" and would return home by the same bus; on 20.07.2012, Sai Prasad told him that there is a hole near the sixth row; on the next day, he (Stephen) himself saw the hole when he went to receive his children in the bus stop; he asked the driver and cleaner of the bus to immediately close it; he also informed this to Dr.Vijayan (A3) and his brother, Balraj (A4) and since they did not take any action, on 25.07.2012, the tragedy happened.

11 Selvakumar (LW 14), in his statement, has stated that his two children, viz., Ramila Devi and Kalpana Devi are studying in V standard and VI standard respectively in Zion School; he paid Rs.7,500/- per child towards bus fees; on 12.07.2012, when he went to receive his children from the bus stop, his daughter Ramila Devi told him about the hole on the floor of the bus; on 13.07.2012, he himself saw the hole near the sixth row and asked Seeman, bus driver and Shanmugam, bus cleaner, to look into it; and he also informed Dr.Vijayan (A3) and Balraj (A4) about this in person.

12 Beginning from Girishbhai Maganlal Pandya (supra) upto Prabhakaran (supra) relied on by the learned Senior Counsel, the Courts have expatiated on the contours of Section 304(II) IPC and have also set aside the proceedings as against the indicted persons in those cases. In this case, there are three witnesses, viz., Stephen (LW13), Selvakumar (LW 14) and Kemin (LW 15), who have, in no uncertain terms, stated that their children told them about the hole on the floor of the bus; they themselves saw the hole; on a particular day, they met Dr.Vijayan (A3) and Balraj (A4) and told them about the hole, for which, Balraj (A4) is said to have told them that the bus has been taken on lease. Investigation done by the police shows that the R.C. Book of bus no.9952 stands in the name of Zion School and the insurance is also in the name of the said school. All the witnesses have identified the bus and the bus no.9952 has also been seized by the police and it is a material object. It is not the case of Dr.Vijayan (A3) that the bus no.9952 was not at all involved in the incident. It is his case that he had no knowledge about the hole on the floor of the bus. To

attribute knowledge of Dr.Vijayan (A3) about the hole in the bus, there are three witnesses, as stated above, who have informed him about the hole. It is not the case of Dr.Vijayan (A3) that the said bus was transporting goods and not children. His contention that he did not anticipate or foresee that such an incident would ever happen does not cut ice with this Court. When children are travelling in the bus, dictates of common sense would state that they will not be seated in their seat silently like they are seated in their classroom. They will be boisterous and chirpy. For the Correspondent of a school to believe that they will be seated like hermits and be in meditation during travel and thereby, would not be victims of a fall, defies logic.

13 In exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., this Court cannot render a finding that Stephen (LW 13), Selvakumar (LW 14) and Kemin (LW 15) are uttering falsehood by saying that they had met Dr.Vijayan (A3) and apprised him of the gaping hole. This Court cannot conduct a mini trial while dealing with a quash application. The standards laid down by the Supreme Court are that, this Court should proceed by accepting the statements of witnesses, and the prosecution can be quashed only if no offence is made out even after accepting the statements as gospel truth. If this parameter is applied, the statements of the aforesaid witnesses to the effect that they apprised Dr.Vijayan (A3) in person about the hole on the floor of the bus have to be accepted and when accepted, the prosecution against him cannot be quashed at the threshold. Hence, the first contention of Mr.Singgaravelan stands rejected.

14 For appreciating the second contention of Mr.Singgaravelan, it may be apposite to state certain minimum facts. Investigation in Mount Traffic Investigation Wing P.S.Cr. No.929 of 2012 relating to the demise of Sruthi was taken up by one Mr. S. Dinakaran, Inspector of Police, at the relevant point of time, who arrested Dr.Vijayan (A3) and others and completed the investigation and filed a charge sheet, as stated above, on 14.11.2012 before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Tambaram. In that charge sheet, both Dr.Vijayan and Yogesh Sylvera have been shown as A3 and A8 respectively. Aftermath the committal of the case to the Court of Session in S.C. No.187 of 2014, Dr.Vijayan (A3) has approached S-15 Selayur Police Station and has lodged a complaint on 13.04.2015, alleging that the bus no. 9952 was illegally run by Yogesh Sylvera with fake documents. Thereafter, Dr.Vijayan (A3) has preferred CrI.O.P. No.11414 of 2015 under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for a direction to S-15 Selayur Police Station to register an FIR on his complaint, wherein, this Court has passed the following template order on 09.06.2015:

"The petitioner seeks direction upon the first respondent/police to register an FIR against the second respondent, based on the complaint, dated 13.04.2015.

2. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, representing the respondent/police submitted that on complaint given by the petitioner, petition enquiry is pending in CSR No.642 of 2015.

3. In view of the above submission, this Criminal Original petition is closed with direction to the first respondent/police to complete the enquiry as expeditiously as possible and proceed further in accordance with law by registering a crime, if any cognizable offence is made out, by following the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Re. Lalita Kumari vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others reported in 2013 (4) Crimes 243 (SC)."

15 On the strength of the above template order, one Mr.Thirumalai, Inspector of Police, S-15 Selayur Police Station, registered an FIR in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 against Yogesh Sylvera on 22.11.2015 for offences under Sections 420 and 460 IPC. Thereafter, Dr.Vijayan (A3) has preferred CrI.O.P. No.5932 of 2016 under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for a direction to the Inspector of Police, S-15 Selayur Police Station, to complete the investigation in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 within a reasonable period. This Court disposed of the said petition vide order dated 17.03.2016, the relevant portion of which reads thus:

"5 Considering the averments made in the affidavit and also perusing the typed set of papers that the case has been registered on 22.11.2015, the respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 and file a final report, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

6 The Criminal Original Petition is disposed of with the above direction."

16 On the transfer of Mr. Thirumalai, Inspector of Police, S-15, Selayur Police Station, the investigation in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 was continued by Mr. S. Chellappa, Inspector of Police, S-15 Selayur Police Station, who completed the investigation and filed a final report in C.C. No.170 of 2017 before the Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram, alleging inter alia that:

(a) Yogesh Sylvera (A8) had stolen transfer forms of bus no. 9952 from N.R. Enterprises run by N. Ravi (A7), brother of Dr.Vijayan (A3) (who,

incidentally is also an accused in S.C. No.187 of 2014 before the I Additional District and Sessions Court, Chengalpet);

(b) after stealing the papers, he had purchased the bus in the name of Zion School in order to get tax rebate and;

(c) he (Yogesh Sylvera) was running the bus no. 9952 even without the knowledge of Dr.Vijayan (A3).

17 On the directions of this Court, Mr. Chellappa, Inspector of Police, S-15 Selayur Police Station, appeared in person before this Court. The questions posed to him by this Court and the answers given by him to those questions are tabulated hereunder:

S.No.	Court question	Answer
1	Are you aware of the case relating to the death of Sruthi that was investigated by the Inspector of Police, Mount Traffic Investigation Wing?	Yes. I am aware of that.
2	Are you aware that charge sheet has been filed by the Inspector of Police, Mount Traffic Investigation Wing and case has been committed to the Court of Session?	Yes. I am aware of that.
3	Are you aware that Dr. Vijayan (A3), Correspondent of Zion School, is an accused in Sruthi death case?	Yes. I am aware of that.
4	Are you aware that the bus no. 9952 is a material object in Sruthi death case, i.e., S.C. No.187 of 2014?	Yes. I am aware of that.
5	Are you aware that Yogesh Sylvera is also an accused in Sruthi death case, i.e., S.C. No.187 of 2014?	Yes. I am aware of that.
6	Are you aware that the bus no. 9952 stands in the name of Zion School?	Yes. I am aware of that.
7	Did you inform the Inspector of Police, Mount Traffic Investigation Wing, that you are conducting the investigation in Cr. No.3596 of 2015?	No.
8	Did you obtain leave under Section 173(8) Cr.P.C. from the Sessions Court to conduct further investigation?	No.

18 From the answers elicited from Mr. Chellappa, Inspector of Police, S-15 Selayur Police Station, it is obvious to this Court that only in order to torpedo the trial in S.C. No.187 of 2014, Dr. Vijayan (A3), an influential and affluent person, has made a clever use of the judicial system to first give a complaint before S-15 Selayur Police Station, get an innocuous direction from this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to S.15 Selayur Police Station to have an FIR registered, then get a general direction from this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to complete the investigation and have a final report filed in C.C.No.170 of 2017, for destroying and torpedoing the prosecution in S.C.No.187 of 2014 before the I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Chengalpet. If this is not a devious subterfuge, what else is this?

19 In Ram Lal Narang vs. State (Delhi Administration) [(1979) 2 SCC 322], the Supreme Court has clearly held that investigation need not stop with the filing of the final report. If the police get any additional materials in favour of the accused, it is within their power to conduct further investigation, after formally getting leave from the Court and submitting additional final report in support of the accused or gather further evidence to strengthen the case against the accused. This can be best explained with the following illustration.

20 "X", a Zamindar, is charge sheeted by "A" police station for causing the murder of "Y" on 20.07.2012 at 5.45 p.m. If, on the complaint of "X", "B" police station files a charge sheet that "X" was admitted to the hospital on 20.07.2012 at 5.45 p.m., pursuant to the injury suffered by him on the attack by "Z", without reference to the investigation conducted by "A" police station, what else can the latter investigation be called other than a naked attempt by "X" to demolish the prosecution against him in the "A" police station murder case? The act of Dr. Vijayan (A3) in the case at hand is nothing short of that.

21 It is the case of Mr. Singgaravelan, learned Senior Counsel and the Selayur Police that Yogesh Sylvera (A8) had purchased the bus in the name of Zion School even without the knowledge of Dr.Vijayan (A3) in order to avail tax benefits. The learned Senior Counsel further submitted that if the bus had been used as a route bus, Yogesh Sylvera (A8) would have to pay tax on the basis of number of seats, whereas, there is exemption from payment of tax for school buses.

22 There is a patent fallacy in the aforesaid argument. Had Yogesh Sylvera (A8) purchased the bus in the name of Zion School and while plying it as a route bus, say, between Chennai

and Madurai, the bus got involved in an accident, in which, Dr.Vijayan (A3) is being prosecuted on the ground that the R.C. Book stands in the name of his institution, then, the issue would be totally different. In this case, admittedly, the bus was being used by Zion School for the conveyance of its pupils. The allegation against Dr. Vijayan (A3) is not that he was operating a school bus as a route bus. Even assuming for a moment that the R.C. Book had not been in the name of Zion School, but, if there are overwhelming evidence to show that the bus was used by Zion School for conveyance of its students and that Dr.Vijayan (A3) was informed well ahead of the incident which occurred on that fateful day, about the presence of a big hole on the floor of the bus, despite which, he had not bothered to make amends, resulting in the death of a child, he would still be liable for prosecution. At the risk of repetition, the R.C. Book of bus no.9952 stands in the name of Zion School, with the seal of the Correspondent and the insurance also stands in the name of Zion School and five parents have stated that the bus bears the mark "P-2" and they were sending their children to the school by that bus. When there are such overwhelming materials to show that bus no.9952 was being operated by Zion School, the argument that Yogesh Sylvera (A8) had purchased the bus without the knowledge of Dr.Vijayan (A3) in the name of Zion School for the purpose of tax rebate, sounds Gilbertian.

23 The contention that the finding of the Inspector of Police, S-15, Selayur Police Station in C.C. No.170 of 2017 (Cr. No.3596 of 2015) to the effect that the signature found in the R.C. Book above the seal of the Correspondent, Zion School, is not that of Dr. Vijayan (A3) would exonerate Dr.Vijayan (A3) from the present prosecution, deserves to be stated only to be rejected, because, the present prosecution relating to Sruthi's death is not predicated on the R.C.Book of bus no.9952. The R.C. book is only a corroborative piece of evidence to establish that bus no.9952 belongs to Zion School. Even if the name of Zion School is not found in the R.C. Book, that cannot absolve Dr. Vijayan (A3) from criminal liability in the teeth of the statement of ten persons, including five parents, who have stated that Sruthi fell from Zion School's bus, out of whom, three parents have stated that they reported the matter to Dr.Vijayan (A3) and Balraj (A4) on certain dates, much before the incident. That is why, this Court is constrained to hold that the very prosecution in C.C. No.170 of 2017/Cr. No.3596 of 2015 by S-15 Selayur Police Station is a red herring that has been cleverly engineered to side track the trial in S.C. No.187 of 2014 relating to the death of Sruthi.

24 In this case, S-15 Selayur P.S. have not conducted parallel investigation. They have conducted investigation after the charge sheet has been filed by Mount Traffic Investigation

Wing in S.C. No.187 of 2014. Thus, in the opinion of this Court, Dr.Vijayan (A3), in collusion with S-15 Selayur Police Station, has created false evidence to subvert the process of justice. Ergo, this Court has no option except to exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction and quash the entire prosecution in Selayur P.S. Cr. No.3596 of 2015 and the consequential proceedings in C.C. No.170 of 2017 before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Tambaram.

25 M.K.Priya, mother of the deceased Sruthi, filed Crl.O.P. No.21935 of 2016 for a direction to the Trial Court to complete the trial in S.C.No.187 of 2014 on a day-to-day basis under the supervision of this Court. When the said petition came up for hearing, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor informed this Court that Dr.Vijayan (A3) has given a complaint and therefore, an FIR has been registered in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 by S-15 Selayur Police Station. Considering the submission so made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, this Court, vide order dated 18.10.2016, issued the following direction:

"8 However, the second respondent police is directed to complete the investigation in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, not later than three months, from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Thereafter, the Trial Court is directed to complete the trial in S.C. No.187 of 2014, expeditiously."

26 The aforesaid petition also has been dealt with by this Court in a routine fashion, without delving deep into the facts of the case in S.C. No.187 of 2014 and S-15 Selayur P.S. Cr. No.3596 of 2015. In retrospect, this Court feels that M.K. Priya, mother of Sruthi, must have got wind of the machinations of Dr.Vijayan (A3) that he is attempting to subvert the proceedings in S.C. No.187 of 2014 and that is why, perhaps, she has filed Crl.O.P. No.21935 of 2016 for expeditious trial in S.C. No.187 of 2014 to be monitored by this Court. Incidentally, though M.K. Priya has not been arrayed as a party respondent in this quash application, she appeared before this Court in person and pleaded for justice.

27 In the light of the aforesaid discussion, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Connected Crl.M.Ps. stand closed. The prosecution in C.C. No.170 of 2017 before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Tambaram, is hereby quashed. The Trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial in S.C. No.187 of 2014, uninfluenced by what is stated above and complete the same as expeditiously as possible. The defence that Dr.Vijayan (A3) was not aware of the hole in the bus no.9952 and that the bus was run by Yogesh Sylvera (A8) are still kept open for consideration by the Trial Court during trial, after the charges

are framed. The Trial Court shall ensure that the accused cross-examine the witnesses on the same day they are examined in chief, as held by the Supreme Court in Vinod Kumar vs. State of Punjab [(2015) 3 SCC 220]. If the accused adopt dilatory tactics, they can be remanded to custody under Section 309 Cr.P.C. as laid down by the Supreme Court in State of Uttar Pradesh v. Shambhu Nath Singh [JT 2001 (4) SC 319]. If the accused abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered against them under Section 229-A IPC.

The Director General of Police, Chennai, is directed to appoint an officer of the rank of Inspector General of Police to conduct an enquiry into the entire circumstances under which the investigation in Cr. No.3596 of 2015 has been conducted by S-15 Selayur Police and take appropriate action against the officer concerned in accordance with law.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1 The Director General of Police
Kamarajar Salai
Chennai - 600 004
- 2 The Inspector of Police
Mount Traffic Investigation Wing
Chennai 600 043
- 3 The Inspector
S-15 Selayur Police Station
Chennai
- 4 The I Additional District and Sessions Judge
Chengalpet
- 5 The Judicial Magistrate
Tambaram
- 6 The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras
Chennai 600 104

+3cc to Mr.P.Vajravelu, Advocate, S.R.No.54596

CrI.O.P. No.6481 of 2018

GSP(09/08/2018)