

Bail Slip

The Appellants/Accused 1 to 3 namely i)Murugesan, S/o.Samiappan, 2)Manikandan, S/o.Samiappan, 3)Udayakumar, S/o.Arumugam be and hereby are directed to be released on bail vide court order dt.24/2/2011 in MP.1/2011 in CrI.A.119/2011.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

JUDGMENT RESERVED ON : 27.06.2018
JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON : 28.08.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R. PONGIAPPAN

Criminal Appeal No.119 of 2011

1. Murugesan (Age 38/2010)
S/o Samiappan
 2. Manikandan (Age 20/2010)
S/o Samiappan
 3. Udayakumar (Age 23/2010)
S/o Arumugam
- Appellants /Accused No.1to 3

Vs

State by the Inspector of Police
Srimooshnam Police Station
Cuddalore District
(Crime No. 173/2009)

Respondent / Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Appeal is filed under Section 374(2) of Criminal Procedure code, challenging the Judgment and conviction dated 31.01.2011 in SC No.12 of 2010 by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Cuddalore and acquit the appellants.

For Appellant : Mr. V. Parthiban for
Mr. S. Shankar
For Respondent : Ms. T.P. Savitha
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

J U D G M E N T

The Appellants are the accused No.1 to 3 in SC No.12 of 2010 on the file of Principal Sessions Judge, Cuddalore, wherein as many as 9 charges were framed against them as detailed below.

Sl.No	Name of the accused	Charges framed against the accused
1.	Murugesan S/o Samiyappan	307,506(ii) of IPC, section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of harassment of Women Act 1998 and section 3(1)(X), 3(2)(V) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989.
2.	Manikandan S/o Samiappan	324, 506 (ii), 307 r/w 34 of IPC, section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of harassment of Women Act 1998 and 3(1)(X), 3(2)(V) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989.
3.	Udayakumar S/o Arumugam	323 (4 Counts), 506 (ii), 307 r/w 34 of IPC, section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of harassment of Women Act 1998 and 3(1)(X), 3(2)(V) r/w 34 (IPC) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989.

After full trial, all the three accused had been convicted and sentenced as follows:-

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY

Sl.No	Name of the accused	Charges framed against the accused
1.	Murugesan S/o Samiyappan	● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for two years for the offence under section 3(1)(X) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/- in default to undergo simple imprisonment for six months ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year for the offence under section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of harassment of Woman Act, 1998 ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 months for the offence under section 324 IPC ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 1 month for the offence under section 323 IPC r/w section 34 IPC

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY

Sl.No	Name of the accused	Charges framed against the accused
2.	Manikandan S/o Samiappan	● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for two years for the offence under section 3(1) (X) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/- in default to undergo simple imprisonment for six months ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year for the offence under section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of harassment of Woman Act, 1998 ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 months for the offence under section 324 IPC ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 1 month for the offence under section 323 IPC r/w section 34 IPC

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY

Sl.No	Name of the accused	Charges framed against the accused
3.	Udayakumar S/o Arumugam	● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for two years for the offence under section 3(1) (X) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/- in default to undergo simple imprisonment for six months ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year for the offence under section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of harassment of Woman Act, 1998 ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 months for the offence under section 324 IPC ● Sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 1 month for the offence under section 323 IPC (4 counts). Such sentence on each count shall run concurrently

The appellants are acquitted of by the trial court from the other charges. Aggrieved by the conviction and sentence the Appellants / Accused No.1 to 3 are before this Court with this Criminal Appeal.

सत्यमेव जयते

2) The Case of the prosecution in brief is as follows:-
PW 1 to PW 20 are the members of the Hindu Adidravidar Community. All the accused comes under the community of Vanniyar, which not comes under the category of SC. Prior to the occurrence, PW 1 Pattusamy was elected in Local Body Election as the Vice President of the Village Panchayat. In the meanwhile, he regularly attend the Agricultural work in the field of PW 21 and on 21.10.2009 at about 7.00pm, near Ramanathan Statue in Narasingapuram, he demanded the PW 21 to pay the balance of wages to be paid by the PW 21, for that PW 1 and PW 21 were chatting loudly. At that time, all the accused came there and scolded the PW 1 in a public place and in the

presence of Public by referring his Caste name as

பற ஒக்காள ஒழி, தேவடியா மகனே வைஸ் பிரிசிடன்ட் ஆகி விட்டேன் என்று பாக்கிறியா உனக்கு என்னடா அதப்ப,,
உனக்கு இங்கு என்னடா வேலை

and insulted him on account of untouchability. Further, the first accused by using the iron door of an electric junction box (MO2) assaulted PW 1. In the same transaction, the accused No.2 and 3 assaulted the PW 1 by using iron rod and fisted him by hands and kicked him by legs.

3) On hearing the hues and cries of PW 1, PW 2 came and rushed to the risk of PW1. But the first accused had assaulted the PW 2 by using the same iron door of electrical junction box (M.O.2). In the mean time, the 2nd accused assaulted the PW 2 on his forehead, by using the iron rod. On seeing the said occurrence, PW 6 to PW 11, who are incidentally present in the market place, intervened but they were also assaulted by the accused through MO.1 and M.O.2 and having been abused in filthy words by referring to the caste, insulted them on account of untouchability. Moreover, at the time of occurrence, PW 12 to PW 19, who were the women force belonging to the Scheduled Caste Community alighted from the bus near to the place of incident to go to other place and saw the incident and when they came there, all the accused abuses them on account of untouchability by referring their caste and scolded in filthy words and chase them to go away from that place.

4) PW 1 rushed to the police station informed the matter to the police. Thereafter, PW 1 was taken to the Hospital by his wife. In the Hospital, PW 4 Doctor found the

1. lacerated injury measuring 3 x 1 cm on the back of his head and also found
2. swelling on the nose 2 x 1cm. Ex.P.3 is the Accident Register Copy issued by PW 4.

5) PW 3 who is also a Doctor attached with Viruthachalam Hospital, treated PW 2 for certain injuries alleged to have been sustained in the said accident. On examination, he found the swelling on PW 2's right leg. He had issued Accident Register copy under Ex.P.2.

6) Meanwhile, PW 23, the then Sub Inspector of Police, Srimushnam Police Station received the intimation from Viruthachalam Government Hospital. On receipt of the information, he came and enquired PW 1. He got the written complaint from PW 1. Thereafter, he registered a case in Cr.No. 173/2009 under section 147, 148, 294 (b), 323, 324, 307 IPC and section 3(2) (V) of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Act and section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of harassment of Women Act 1998. Ex.P.12 is the printed First Information Report. After the registration of the case, PW 23 informed about the incident

to his higher officials, since the incident related to the communal clashes between the members of the scheduled caste and scheduled tribes. As per the direction of the Superintendent of Police, Cuddalore, PW 24 Ramachandran, the then Deputy Superintendent of Police, Viruthachalam took up the matter for investigation. He visited the scene of occurrence and in the presence of PW 22 and Village Assistant, he prepared an Observation Mahazar under Ex.P6. He drawn a Rough Sketch under Ex.P.4. Further he examined the injured persons, other witnesses and record their statements. The statements recorded by PW 24 reveals that in the the alleged offence, only the appellants herein are involved. On the basis of the evidence assimilated by PW1, the investigating officer submitted an alteration Report to the jurisdiction Magistrate.

7) In continuance of the investigation, PW 24 arrested the 1st and 2nd accused in the presence of PW 22 and one another witness. During the time of interrogation, both the 1st and 2nd accused made voluntary confession and the same was recorded. In pursuance of the confession given by the 1st accused, M.O.2 was recovered as identified and produced by the 1st accused from the place wherein it was concealed. For the recovery of M.O2, PW 29 prepared Seizure Mahazar under Ex.P.8. The admitted portion of the confession statement given by the 1st accused is Ex.P.7. In the same way, as per the confession made by the 2nd accused, PW 24 recovered M.O.1 as identified by the 2nd accused, from the place where it was concealed under the cover of Mahazar. The Recovery Mahazar is marked as Ex.P.11. The admitted portion of the said confession of the 2nd accused is marked as Ex.P.10.

8) Thereafter, PW 24 has sent a requisition to the Tahsildar of Kattumannar Kovil for issuing the Community Certificate for PW 1, PW 2, PW 6 and PW 7 and to the accused. Considering the request made by PW 24, PW 5 Tahsildar issued a Community Certificate to the victims in this case stating that they belongs to Adidravidar and the accused belongs to the community of Hindu Vanniyar. After completing the investigation, PW 24 laid the Final Report against the accused for the various offences refered in the charge Sheet.

9) Based on the above materials, the trial Court framed as many as 8 charges as detailed in the tabular coloumn of this Judgment. All the accused denied the same. In order to prove the case, on the side of the prosecution, as many as 24 witnesses were examined as PW 1 to Pw 24, 16 documents were marked as Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.16. Besides 2 material objects.

10) Out of the above witnesses, PW 1 has stated in his evidence that prior to the occurrence, he was elected as a Vice President in Kollayur Panchayat. He belongs to (Hindu Parayar

Community) Adidraavidar community. He had further stated during the time of occurrence, when he was demanding PW 21 Karuthapillai for paying the wages near to Bazaar, all the accused came and the 1st accused scolded him in filthy words referring to his caste name and insulted him on account of untouchability. Further the 1st accused assaulted him by using iron rod of electrical boxes and causing injury on his face. At the same time, the 2nd accused by using the cycle chain assaulted and caused injury on his abdominal area. Further, the 3rd accused by using the iron rod assaulted on his head. Due to the assault made by the accused, PW 1 sustained injury on the jaw, head and in his leg, for which he took the treatment in Government Hospital, Viruthachalam for a period of 1 week.

11) PW 2 who is also one of the victim in this case has stated in his evidence that on 21.10.2009 at about 7.00 pm, when he was in bazaar at Nachiarpettai, the 1st accused in this case has assaulted the PW 1 by referring his caste name. He has further stated that the 2nd accused by using the switch board assaulted the PW 1. After assaulting the PW 1 by using the iron rod he assaulted him on his head. He has stated that, subsequent to the assault made by the accused No.1 and 2, Police came and made arrangement for admitting him in a Viruthachalam Government Hospital.

12) In turn, PW 3 who is the Medical Officer attached with Government Hospital, Viruthachalam has stated in his evidence that as on 22.10.2009 at about 4.15 hours, he has given treatment to PW 2 and found the following injuries.

- Sutured wound in the left side of the forehead
- Contusion 3cm x 2cm in the left leg

13) PW 4, who is also a Doctor in the same Hospital has stated on 22.10.2009, at about 9.30 am, he has treated the PW 1 and during the time of examination, he found the following injuries.

- Abrasion measuring 3 x 1 over the back side of the head
- Contusion measuring 2 x 1 over the nose

14) PW 5 Veerpandian, the then Tahsildar, Kattumannarkovil Taluk, deposed that based on the application given by PW 24 he issued Community Certificate, in which he certified that PW 1, PW 2, PW 6, PW 12 and PW 13 are belongs to the Community of Hindu Adidraavidar. Further he issued one another certificate, certifying that the accused in this case belongs to Hindu Vanniyar.

15) PW 6 Kolanjiappan, who is the resident of Nachiarpettai has stated that at the time of occurrence, the 1st accused in this case assaulted PW 1 and the 3rd accused

Udhayakumar by using the iron rod attacked him on the right hand. Further he has stated that for the injuries sustained by him, he took a local treatment. PW 7 who is the occurrence witness to the alleged occurrence has stated about the insult made by the accused by referring the caste name and also about the weapon used by the accused as well as with regard to the assault made by the accused.

16) PW 8 to PW 11 are all eyewitnesses to the occurrence had stated in their evidence as at the time of occurrence, the first accused in this case by using meter board assaulted PW 1. Further they had stated that the 2nd accused by using iron rod assaulted PW 2 and PW 6. PW 12 to PW 14, 16 to 19 are the residents of Nachiarpettai and belongs to Adidravidar Community. They have stated in their evidence that at the time of occurrence, all the appellants had abused them by referring their caste name and by saying

“வல்லாற ஒழி கண்டார ஒழி உங்களுக்கு என்னடி இங்க வேலை”

Further, they are all stated that on enquiry, it was found that there was a quarrel between the PW 1 and the accused. PW 11 has stated about the writing of complaint as per the instruction given by PW 1. PW 21 is the resident of same village prior to the occurrence he employed the PW 1 for his agricultural work. He has further stated before the occurrence, PW 1 met and asked the salary for two labourers. PW 22 the then Village Administrative Officer, Nachiarpettai has stated on 22.02.2009 at about 11.30 am, PW 24 Deputy Superintendent of Police arrested the 1st accused and in his presence, he recorded the confession statement given by the 1st accused. Further, he stated about the the recovery of M.O.1 and M.O.2. PW 23, PW 24 are the Police officers have stated about the registration of the case, details of investigation, arrest of the accused and filing of charge sheet in this case.

17) When the above incriminating materials were put into the accused under section, 313 of Cr.P.c, for which they denied the same as false. Further they did not chose to examine any witness on their side. Their evidence was totally denial. Having considered all the above, the trial Court convicted them as detailed in the 1st para of this Judgment. Challenging the above said conviction and sentence the accused No.1 to 3 are now before this Court with the present criminal appeal.

18) I have heard. Mr. V. Parthiban and Mr. S. Shankar learned Counsels for the appellants, and Ms. T.P. Savitha, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent and perused the records carefully.

19) The learned counsel for the appellants would submit that the evidence given by the prosecution witnesses is having

lot of contradictions. On seeing the First Information Report, PW 1 alleged during the time of occurrence, 13 named accused and 20 unnamed accused are participated in the occurrence. On the otherhand, when at the time of getting treatment, PW 1 and PW 2 told to the Doctor that 5 persons were assaulted during the time of occurrence.

20) He would further submitted that during the time of giving evidence, PW 1 has stated only the appellants are attacked them. So in regard to the number of persons involved in this occurrence does not advanced by the prosecution witnesses. Further according to the evidence given by the prosecution witnesses, 8 persons are the victims in this case. That apart, on the side of the prosecution, all the witnesses gave evidence against the appellants, are belongs to Scheduled caste. The learned Principal Sessions Judge, Cuddalore without considering the said lapses found in the prosecution cases, convicted the accused.

21) Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would however oppose this criminal appeal. According to him, there is no reason to reject the evidence of PW 1 and PW 2. The very fact that PW 1 and PW 2 admitted in the Hospital immediately after the occurrence would go to fortify that PW 1, PW 2 and PW 3 were present at the scene of occurrence. He would further submit that the evidence of PW 1 and PW 2 are duly corroborated by the medical evidence. According to him, it was right in convicting the accused under the respective charges. It does not warrant any interference at the hands of this Court.

22) I have considered the rival submissions and peruse the available records carefully.

23) With regard to the offence under section 3 (1) (x) of SC and ST Act, the prosecution has to prove that the investigation has completed within the purview of rule 7 of SC and ST Act. In this regard, on 22.10.2009, the Superintendent of Police Cuddalore issued proceedings appointing the PW 23, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sethiathoppu for investigating this case. Further, according to the evidence of PW 23, this case has been registered on 22.10.2009, now the evidence given by PW 24 reveals that the final Report in this case has been filed on 18.11.2009. So within a period of 27 days, the investigation for this case has been completed, final Report is also filed. Accordingly, section 7 (1) (2) of SC and ST Act 1995 has been complied by the Investigating Authorities. So there is no violation on the part of the prosecution in regard to the mandatory provisions regulated in the Act.

24) Secondly, in the trial Court, the complaint given by PW 1 was marked as Ex.P.1. It is true in the complaint, he has mentioned that 13 named accused were participated in the occurrence. However in the same complaint, he attributed the overtact only against the present appellants and not against the other persons mentioned in the complaint, for that the investigating Officer has stated during the time of investigation, it was found only 3 persons were participated in the occurrence. It shows that PW 1 has given the complaint in an exaggerated version and attempt to implicate more number of persons in this case. So considering the attempt made by PW 1, for accepting the case of the prosecution relying the evidence given by PW 1 alone is not sufficient. However, the First Information Report does not alone constitute evidence, which can however be used as a previous statement for the purpose of corroboration or contradiction of its maker under section 157 or section 145 of Indian Evidence Act. In the Judgment of Sheikh Hasib Vs State of Bihar (1972) 4 Supreme court Cases 773, it was held by our honourable Apex Court as follows

The Principal Object of the First Information Report from the point of view of the informant is to set the criminal law in motion and from the point of view of the investigation authorities is to obtain information about the alleged criminal activity so as to be able to take suitable steps for tracing and bringing to book the guilty party.

So the principle laid by our Honourable Apex Court shows that for deciding the case of the prosecution, the contents of the First Information Report alone is not sufficient. Now applying the said principle in this case on hand in the alleged occurrence, PW 1 alone is not a victim. Apart from PW 1, PW 2 also sustained injury other than that in the said transaction. All the appellants by referring the caste name of PW 13 to PW 17, insulted them in a public place, in view of the public. So in this case the evidence given by other victims cannot be rejected only due to the contradictions available from the evidence given by PW 1. Since, portion of evidence given by PW 1 alone is exaggerated one. The other words, the evidence given by PW 1 with regard to the insult made by the accused by referring the caste name and assault committed by them against PW 2 and PW 6 is cogent and convincing one.

25) In the trial Court, the Tahsildar who issued the Community Certificate to PW1, PW 2, PW 6, PW 12 and PW 13 was examined as PW 5. Further the certificate issued by Tahsildar was marked as Ex.P.4. Apart from that, he had issued the Community Certificate to all the accused under Ex.P.15, which

discloses that all the accused are belongs to Vanniyar Community. So according to the evidence given by PW 5, the victims in this case belongs to scheduled caste and the accused belongs to other community not comes under the category of scheduled caste. Since both of them are residing in the nearby villages. It is probable to the accused for knowing the community of the victims. Further more, all the evidence clearly stated that the alleged offence was happened in the public place in view of the public.

26) Secondly, at the time of the getting treatment, PW 1 and PW 2 have stated before the Doctor that 5 persons were assaulted at the time of occurrence. Now on deciding the value of the evidence given by the Doctor in this regard, he has mentioned the number of persons involved in the occurrence is based on the information given by the injured. Further, based on the Certificate, he deposed the evidence in the trial Court. Accordingly, the evidence given by the Doctor with regard to the number of persons involved in the occurrence amounts to hearsay evidence, so the evidence given by the Doctor shall not create a platform for rejecting the prosecution case. Moreover, there is no necessity to the accused for insulting the PW 12 to PW 14 and PW 16 by referring their caste name, since they are all came to the occurrence place incidentally. So the entire evidences and other circumstances clearly established that the petitioners insulted the victims by saying the caste name and committed this offence. The trial Court also considered the evidence given by the prosecution witness in same perspective and arrived the correct conclusion.

27) In general, to bring home, the offence under section 3 (1) (X) of SC and ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989, the following are the essential ingredients.

(a) The complaint should specifically state that the victim/complainant is a member of Scheduled Caste while the aggressor is a member of Non Scheduled Caste

(b) The aggressor /accused should have humiliated the victim/complainant with intent to humiliate on account of untouchability and such act of the accused should have been done in public view

(c) At the time of commission of such act, the accused should have knowledge that the victim/defacto complainant is a member belonging to Scheduled Caste.

It is true in a case in our hand the above ingredients are established through the appropriate evidence.

28) Even though, the persons belongs to communities other than the scheduled caste having been not examined in support of the prosecution, that alone is not a ground to disbelieve the entire prosecution case as false one. In otherwise, the evidence let in by the victim and other witnesses not in accordance within the legal frame work and not in cogent and convincing one. The Trial Court considered the said aspect in a perspective manner and convicted all the appellants for the offence under section 3 (1) (X) of SC and ST Act. So there is no need to interfere with the findings of the Trial Court.

29) Secondly, the Trial Court convicted all the accused under section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act ,1998 and further convicted the appellants for the offence under section 324, 323 of IPC. In this regard, section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act ,1998 reads as follows.

4. Penalty for harassment of woman - Whoever commits or participates in or abets (harassment of women) in or within the precincts of any educational institution, temple or other place of worship, bus stop, road, railway station, cinema theatre, park, beach, place of festival, public service vehicle or vessel or any other place shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years and with fine which shall not be less than then thousand rupees.

In this case, on go through the evidence given by PW 12 to PW 14 and PW 16 to PW 19 are all came to the occurrence place incidently after completing their cooly work, without knowing the issues already happened in the said place. But, without any reason, the accused threatened them and used the filthy words against them and chased them to go away from that place by referring the caste name. The said situation was constantly spoken by the above witnesses. So the abuse committed by the accused within the ambit, section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act ,1998. So, the conviction for the said offence is also having merits.

30) In respect to the assault made by the appellants, PW 1 has stated in the complaint lodged before the Police officer clearly mention the overtact of the accused. The said evidence was duly corroborated through the evidence of PW 2 and PW 6 with minor contradictions. Further, all the witnesses have stated the details of weapon used by the accused at the time of occurrence. Moreover, PW 3 and PW 4 are the medical officers who treated the PW 1, and PW 2 has stated at the time of giving treatment to PW 1 and PW 2, they are found with injuries, which

are all simple in nature. In otherwise, the evidence given by PW 22, the then Village Assistant, clearly shows that as per the disclosure statement given by PW 1 and PW 2, the weapons now marked in this case were recovered after identifying the same by the accused. In this regard, the cross examination on the side of the accused is not in a form of impeaching the credibility of evidence given by him. Moreover, in the trial Court, all the witnesses have been examined after 8 months from the date of occurrence. Further more, during the time of occurrence, among the crowd, the appellants assaulted the PW 1 and PW 2 alone. So being the human being, nobody can watch the every single movement of the accused at the time of occurrence. On go through the Judgment of our Honourable Apex court, reported in 2010(4) 495, it was held as follows.

As the mental abilities of a human being cannot be expected to attuned to absorb all the details of the incident minor discrepancies are bound to occur in the statements of witness.

So the principle laid by our Honourable Apex Court clearly discloses that the evidence given by the witnesses after the lapse of some period is having some minor contradictions. Accordingly, the catena of the entire evidence put forth by the prosecution has been proved that at the time of occurrence, the appellants by using the deadly weapon assaulted PW 1 and PW 2 and caused simple injuries. Thereby convicting the appellants for the offence under section 324 and 323 also does not need interference. Accordingly, this court held that the findings arrived by the trial Court is reasonable and well considered one and thereby the appeal is dismissed. The conviction and sentence awarded by the trial Court is hereby confirmed. The trial Court is directed to take steps to secure the accused for serving the remaining period of sentence.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vrn

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.2, Vridhachalam
2. -do-thro the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Cuddalore
3. The Principal Sessions Judge,
Cuddalore
4. The Inspector of Police
Government of Tamil Nadu
Srimooshnam Police Station
Cuddalore District.
5. The District Collector, Cuddalore
6. The Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai 4.
7. The Additional Public Prosecutor
High Court
Madras
8. The Section Officer
V.R. Section
Madras High Court
Chennai.

+1cc to Mr.S.Shankar, Advocate SR.NO.59722

KJI (CO)
sm:24.9.2018

सत्यमेव जयते Criminal Appeal No.119 of 2011

WEB COPY