IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 18.09.2019
Pronounced on : 17.10.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P.No.27590 of 2015
and
Crl.M.P.Nos.1 of 2015 & 12953 of 2016

1.S.Thillai Selvan
2.R.Rathinakumar
3.R.Vijayakumar ... Petitioners/A3 to A5

Vs.

The Special Police Establishment,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
Economic Offences Wing,
3rd floow, 'A' Wing,
“Rajaji Bhavan”,
Besant Nagar,
Chennai-600 090. ... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records pertaining to the above case and pass orders in the interest of justice quashing proceedings relating to it taken on file of the Additional Chief Metroopolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai, in C.C.No.2037 of 2006 as regards the petitioners.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Diwakar

For R1 : Mr.K.Srinivasan, Special Public Prosecutor [CBI Cases]

ORDER

The petitioners/A3 to A5 in C.C.No.2037 of 2006 are facing trial for the offence under Sections 120-B r/w 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC and substantive offence under Section 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC before the learned Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai.

2.The brief facts of the case is that the FIR came to be registered in RC.4(E)/2004/CBI/EOW/Chennai by the respondent Police on 20.05.2004, on the complaint received on 06.05.2004 from the defacto complainant/The Manager, Punjab National Bank, Mylapore Branch, Chennai. The complaint is that M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders represented by V.M.S.Jafarullah/A1 had approached the Mylapore, Chennai Branch of the erstwhile Nedungadi Bank Limited (eNBL) in 1997 for credit facilities to run the business of trading in timber logs procured both from the domestic as well as international markets. Initially, various facilities were sanctioned by the bank on 12.12.2017 and subsequently enhanced/reduced from time to time. The loan from primary as well as collateral security consisting of seven immovable properties belonging to the proprietor and guarantors. The eNBL was merged with Punjab National Bank on 01.02.2003. After the merger, an internal investigation was conducted, which revealed that proprietor and the guarantors of M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders had multiple documents of title to the properties and fraudulently mortgaged immovable properties with several banks and raised substantial credit facilities with them. With the intention of creating forged documents, the fraudulent acts of the accused have resulted in financial loss to the bank to the tune of Rs.331.16 lakhs including interest upto 30.04.2004. Thereafter, on receipt of the complaint, investigation was carried by the respondent.

3.The 1st petitioner is the Proprietor of M/s.S2G, Business Solution, Anna Salai, Chennai was helping V.M.S.Hajee Mohammed/A2 in discounting the bills of exchange on his behalf through banks on commission basis. The 2nd petitioner is the Assistant of A3, at his instance, he had opened current account Nos.1401 and 1460 in the name of M/s.Senthil Trading Services, Chepauk, Chennai and M/s.T.M.Trading Agencies respectively with Federal Bank Limited, Mylapore approaching himself as proprietor. The 3rd petitioner has floated a non-existing company viz., M/s.Senthil Trading Services in conspiracy with A1 to A4, for drawing false and forged bills of exchanges by preparing false and forged invoices, delivery challans etc. in the name of M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders, without actually doing any sale or purchase of timber.

4.In furtherance of the conspiracy, A1 and A2 in connivance with the petitioners/A3 to A5 had filed false, forged proforma invoices, delivery challans, bills of exchange in respect of M/s.Senthil Trading Services. A3 to A5 got issued Inland L.Cs for Rs.49,98,660/- and Rs.49,28,000/- favouring the above company falsely showing as if they have supplied to M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders and got the bills of exchanges discounted through Federal Bank Limited, Chennai and taken amount for themselves. For the above purpose, the petitioner had opened bank account with Federal Bank of India, Royapettah Branch in the name of M/s.Senthil Trading Services, Chepauk, Chennai.

5.By filing false, forged sale deeds of properties in Nedungadi Bank Limited, Mylapore Branch, Chennai, M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders represented by its Managing Director A1 and A2 have availed cash credit limit of Rs.91.32 lakhs, foreign L.C limit, import L.C limit and Inland L.C. The cash credit limit of Rs.91.32 lakhs and the amounts pertaining to the above mentioned import L.C.s and Inland L.C.s for a total sum of Rs.122.48 lakhs have been devolved and remained unpaid.

6.M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders represented by its Proprietor A1 in conspiracy with A2 to A5 have created the following Inland L.Cs:-

Sl.No.	L.C No.	Name of the Importer	Amount
1.	98.99/1	M/s.KMB Timber and Saw Mills	2000000
2.	98.99/2	M/s.Lawrence Saw Mills	2000000
3.	3/99-00	M/s.Senthil Trading Services	4928000
4.	2/99-00	M/s.Kanagam Timber Traders	4983561
5.	1/00-01	M/s.R.S.Timber Trader	4987465
6.	2/00-01	M/s.R.S.Timber Trader	4830000
7.	3/01-02	M/s.Senthil Trading Services	4998660
		Total	28727686

Out of the above seven Inland L.C. Amounts as on 31.01.2003, an amount of Rs.37,31,660/- was due to the bank in respect of ILC No.3/01-02 favoring M/s.Senthil Trading Services. Thus, the petitioners in conspiracy with the other accused by creating forged documents had cheated the public sector bank.

7.The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that the trial proceedings pending before the trial Court is improper, illegal, irregular and bad in law. In the complaint, it is not stated on which date internal investigation was conducted and the alleged defraud was unearthed. Further, the state government has declared the office of the Inspector of Police according to the Geographical Area and its jurisdiction to lodge complaint in the commission of offence. The respondent being a specialized investigating agency and were only constituted for investigation under special acts and therefore the respondent is incompetent to conduct investigation in the above case. The complaint pertains to default in payment of loan to the bank. Hence the dispute is only civil in nature.

8.The learned counsel for the petitioner further contended that the petitioners name does not find place in FIR and there are no materials to show how these petitioners have conspired with the other two accused in committing the above offence. The complaint is bereft of facts. Further, no reason was given for the delay in lodging the complaint. The trial Court failed to look into the fact that the charge sheet is not on the basis of the FIR and no statement have been recorded from the complainant giving reason for the delay in lodging the complaint. There is vast variance between the FIR and the main charges in the charge sheet. The charge sheet is with infirmities, vagaries and irregularities. Further, as per Section 173 (2) of Cr.P.C, the reports submitted has to be accompanied with all documents relied in support of the case along with separate statement of witnesses. In this case all the documents and statements have not been filed. Further, as per Section 167 of Cr.P.C., the copies of the Case Diary has not been sent. In view of the delay in filing the charge sheet beyond the period of six months the trial Court ought not to have taken the charge sheet on file. Further as per Section 190 (2) of Cr.P.C., taking cognizance by the trial Court is not proper. Thus, the petitioners primordial submission is that their names does not find place in the FIR and no reason was given in the charge sheet as to how they have been arrayed as an accused. Likewise, the delay in lodging the complaint as well as the delay in filing the charge sheet are not explained. Though, number of witnesses have been cited in the charge sheet there is nothing to check their authenticity and the respondent being a specialized agency is not empowered to investigate the case and it is only vested with the local police, who are empowered to carryout the investigation. The filing of the charge sheet before the trial Court is without sanction of law.

9.The learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon the following citations:-

i)State of Haryana and others Versus Ch.Bhajan Lal and others reported in 1992 Crl.L.J.527(1). It is held that "the investigation - commencement of -same subject to two conditions; (1) Police Officer should have reason to suspect commission of cognizable offence; (2) he has to subjectively satisfy himself as to existence of sufficient ground for entering on investigation."

ii)Dr.S.M.Kaligudd and others Versus State of Karnataka and others reported in 1998 Crl.L.J.1183. It is held that "Criminal P.C.(2 of 1974), S.2(5)-Police Station - State Government notification declaring office of Deputy Inspector General as Police Station - Jurisdiction of said Police Station restricted to specified geographical area and certain specified offences only under Special Acts - FIR against employees of Municipal Corporation - Same disclosing commission of offence only under IPC or under State Police Act - Investigation thereof by officer in charge of police Station constituted under said notification

- Not competent."

iii)Mitter Sen and others Versus the state of U.P. reported in AIR 1976 SC 1156. It is held that "(A) Criminal P.C (2 of 1974), S.154 - First Information Report - Evidentiary Value of Discrepancy in F.I.R and prosecution case - Effect of."

iv)P.Sirajuddin etc., Versus the State of Madras etc., reported in AIR 1971 SUPREME COURT 520. It is held that "Preliminary enquiry necessary before lodging FIR - duty of enquiring officer. The enquiring officer must not act under any preconceived idea of guilt of the person whose conduct was being enquired into or pursue the enquiry in such a manner as to lead to an inference that he wa bent upon securing the conviction of the said perso by adopting measures which are of doubtful-validity or sanction. The means adopted no less than the end to be achieved must be impeccable. In ordinary departmental proceedings against a government servant charged with delinquency, the normal practice before the issue of a charge-sheet is for someone in authority to take down statements of persons involved in the matter and to examine the documents which have a bearing on the issue involved."

v)Dhananjoy Chatterjee alias Dhana Versus State of W.B. reported in (1994) 2 SCC 220. It is held that "Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 - Ss. 154 and 162 - Vague and indefinite telephonic message making the investigating agency only to rush to the scene of occurrence - Does not constitute FIR."

vi)Thulia Kali Versus the State of T.N. reported in AIR 1973 SUPREME COURT 501. It is held that "Criminal P.C (5 of 1898), S.154 - Importance of the First Information Report - Delay in giving information."

vii)Wilayat Khan and others Versus the State of U.P. reported in AIR 1953 SUPREME COURT 122. It is held that "(B) Criminal P.C (5 of 1898), S.154-Discrepancy in evidence. Where telegram about murder, given almost immediately after the murder was committed, does not mention the names of the assailants, the omission is a strong circumstance in favour of accused."

viii)Kartar Singh (In Cri.A.No.159 of 1975); Mukund Singh (In Cri.A.No.382 of 1975) Versus State of Punjab reported in AIR 1977 SUPREME COURT 349. It is held that "Criminal P.C (5 of 1898), S.154 -F.I.R. Made soon after incident - None-mention of some accused's name-Supplementary statement recorded by informat giving some more details within few minutes of making F.I.R - Held, F.I.R could be relied upon and was not discredited."

xi)Marudanal Augusti Versus State of Kerala reported in AIR 1980 SUPREME COURT 638. It is held that “appellate Court must keep in mind very vital consideration as to whether or not view taken by lower Court could be reasonable possible.”

x)Ram Jag and others Versus the State of U.P. reported in AIR 1974 SUPREME COURT 606. It is held that “Criminal P.C. (5 of 1898), S.154 -Delay in filing F.I.R. -Effect. Whether the delay is so long as to throw a cloud of suspicion upon a variety of factors. Even a long delay can be condoned if the witnesses have no motive for implicatin the accused. On the other hand, prompt filing of the report is no an unmistakable guarantee of the truthfulness of the version of the prosecution. It is true that witnesses cannot be called upon to explain every hour's delay in filing information and a commonsense view has to be taken in ascertaining whether the First Information Report was lodged after an undue delay so as to afford enough space for manipulating evidence.”

xi)Narapureddigari Narayanareddi and others Versus State and another reported in AIR 1952 MADRAS 821. It is held that “(c) Criminal P.C. (5 of 1898), S.154 -Variance between First Information Report and the case. Complete variance between the first information report and the case for which the accused have been committed not in regard to minor details or unimportant matters or side issues but in regard to main charges is enough to throw out the case as an unreliable one which will not commend itself to any tribunal.”

xii)K.N.Sadagopan Versus T.C.Govindarajan reported in 1998 CRI.L.J.143. It is held that “matters of appreciation of evidence to be dealt with by trial Court.”

xiii)R.S.Sodhi Versus State of U.P. reported in 1994 CRL.L.J. 111(1). It is held that “Constitution of India, Art.14, Art.32 -Natural justice - Investigation or alleged fake police encounters - Allegations levelled against local police - investigation by state police will lack credibility - investigation by independent agency desirable - CBI directed to investigate into the matter.”

xiv)Satya Narain Musadi and others Versus State of Bihar reported in AIR 1980 SUPREME COURT 506. It is held that “Court can look at report under S.173(2), Criminal P.C as well as its accompaniments for taking cognizance of offfence.”

xv)Union of India and another Versus W.N.Chadha reported in AIR 1993 SUPREME COURT 1082. It is held that “it is no doubt true that the fact that a decision, whether a prima facie case has or has not been made out, is not by itself determinative of the exclusion of hearing, but the consideration that the decision was purely an administrative one and a full-fledged enquiry follows is a relevant and indeed a significant factor in deciding whether at that stage there ought to be hearing which the statue did not expressly grant."

xvi)In re Burla Jayarami Reddi and others reported in AIR 1957 ANDHRA PRADESH 561 (V 44 C 190 Oct.). It is held that "object of - Omission to send copies of diary with remand report - Effect."

xvii)Jay Sankar Jha Versus the state reported in 1982 CRI.L.J.744 (J). It is held that "Criminal P.C (2 of 1974), S.167(5), S.397 -Summons case - Continuation of investigation beyond the period of six months from date of arrest- No attempt by investigating office to satisfy magistrate as required by S.167 (5) - Investigation is illegal - Subsequent proceeding is without jurisdiction and hence liable to the quashed."

xviii)Prabhakar V.Sinari Versus Shanker Anant Verlekar reported in LAWS(SC)-1968-11-5. It is held that "whether a complaint which had been filed against the appellant and four other persons by the respondent for various alleged offences could be entertained without necessary sanction being obtained for the prosecution of the appellant, who at the material time, was the Deputy Superintendent of Police, under S.197 of the Criminal Procedure Code."

The citations relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case.

10.The learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI cases appearing for the respondent would submit that after thorough investigation, examination of witnesses, collection of documents, charge sheet has been filed against the petitioners and other two accused citing LW1 to LW26 and annexing documents LD1 to LD393. In this case, the trial had commenced and PW1 was examined on 07.06.2010. Almost all witnesses have been examined and documents have been marked as exhibits. When the trial was at the penultimate stage of questioning of accused under Section 313 of Cr.P.C, the above petition was filed and the trial was stalled successfully. The specific instances of the petitioners are as follows:-

> "12.To fraudulently avail the above said facility, R.Vijayakumar (A-5) opened a Current Account No.1401 on 23.02.2000 in the name of M/s.Senthil Trading Services, No.26, Arunachalam Street, Chepauk, Chennai at Federal Bank, Royapettah High Road Branch, Chennai. The account was

introduced by Thillaiselvan (A-3) who holds an Account No.3750 in that Bank (LD-371). It is mentioned in the letter dtd.23.02.2000, M/s.Senthil Trading Services that the account is for trading in exterior materials (LD-374). Shri Sundarajan, Manager (PW-9), Federal Bank, Royapettah High Road Branch, Chennai in his deposition at Page No.4 and the account opening form with enlosures (LD No.371 to 374) would establish the above said facts.

13.To fraudulently avail the above said facility, Rathinakumar (A-4) opened a Current Account No.1460 on 17.05.2001 in the name of T.M.Trading Agencies at Federal Bank, Royapettah High Road Branch, Chennai. The account was introduced by Thillaiselvan (A-3) who holds an Account No.3750 in that Bank (LD-376). Rathinakumar (A-4) had given a letter to the Branch Manager, Federal Bank that they are planning to trade exterior and interior materials at Chenna in the Current Account (LD-380). Shri Sundararajan, Manager (PW-9), Federal Bank, Royapettah High Road Branch, Chennai in his deposition at Page No.4/5 and Account Opening Form with enclosures (LD-376 to 380) would establish the above said facts.

14.The opening of the LC No.NBL/MYL/3/99-2000 dt.24.02.2000 (LD-242) at the request of M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders in favour M/s.Senthil Trading Services for purchase of 365.5786 cft of Merabau Round Logs for value of Rs.49,28,000/- based on Invoice (LD-240) of M/s.Senthil Trading Services and Delivery Challan dated 24.02.2000 (LD-241), Bill of Exchange (LD-239) with the signature/sign of V.M.S.Jafarullah (A-1) and Vijayakumar (A-5) showing the said sale will be established by Shri Sasidharan, Manager, PNB (PW-3) in his deposition at Page-4 and the documents viz., the said LC for Rs.49,28,000/- the Invoice, Delivery Challan of M/s.Senthil Trading Services. (LD No.239 to 242).

15.The submission of the said LC for Rs.49,28,000/- by Vijayakumar (A-5) to Federal Bank, Mylapore Branch, Chennai, Letter from Federal bank to Nedungadi Bank dt.24.02.2000 seeking confirmation of the genuineness of the ILC documents (LD-238), Reply dtd.24.02.2000 from Nedungadi Bank to Royapettah, dt.24.02.2000 (LD-237) and discounting of the same for Rs.46,37,500 and issuing a Banker's Cheque in the name "Nedungadi Bank Account

Jafarullah" for Rs.46,37,500/-, deposit of Bankers' cheque bearing No.85351 into the Current Account No.722 of V.M.S.Jafurallah (A-1), held with Nedungadi Bank vide payment challan dt.24.02.2000 (LD-308), would be established by Shri Sasidaran (PW-3), Manager, Nedungadi Bank in his deposition in page No.4. Thereafter, the money was used by Jafarullah (A-1).

16.The falsity of the transaction is very apparent form the above evidence that, the account of M/s.Senthil Trading Services was opened by A-5 on 23.02.2000 with the introduction of A-3 mentioning tht business trading in interior materials. The very next day i.e. on 24.02.2000, an invoice, delivery challan and bill of exchange dt.24.02.2000 was prepared showing i.e, M/s.Senthil Trading Services represented by Vijayakumar (A-5) sold wood logs Maharaja Timber Traders represented by V.M.S.Jafarullah (A-1) and the payment was settled by an ILC for Rs.49,28,000/- opened by Punjab National Bank at the request of Maharaja Timber Traders to M/s.Senthil Trading Services, C/o Federal Bank. Immediately after discounting of LCs with Federal Bank, Royapettah High Road Branch, Chennai, Vijayakumar (A-5) takes the Banker's cheque in the name of Nedungadi bank A/c. Jafarullah for Rs.49,37,500/- and the said Banker's Cheque was deposited by Jafarullah (A-1) in his account No.722 held with Nedungadi bank, Mylapore Branch on 24.02.2000. In genuine business, the seller M/s.Senthil Trading Services has to use the fund for hisbusiness, but the happenings here clearly shows that there was no sale purchase transaction and the invoice, bill of exchange, deliver challan are false and the funds were fraudulently raised through ILC and were reverted back to VMS Jafarullah (A-1), the buyer himself. Thereby the bank was defrauded of the said amount.

17.Instance-2: The opening of the LC No.NBL/MYL/LC3/01-02 dt.15.09.01 (LD-217) at the request of M/s.Maharaja Timber Traders in favour M/s.Senthil Trading Services for purchase of 439.5045 cft of Merabau Round logs for value of Rs.49,98,660/- based on the application of V.M.S.Jafarullah (LD-216), Proforma Invoice dt.14.09.2001 (LD-214) and Invoice and Delivery Challan dated 17.09.2001 (LD-218-219) of M/s.Senthil Trading Services, Bill of Exchange (LD-220) with the signature/sign of V.M.S.Jafarullah (A-1) and Rathanakumar showing the said sale, will be established by Shri Sasidharan, Manager (PW-3) Punjab National Bank in his deposition in Page No.5 and the documents viz., the said LC, invoices, delivery challan, bill of exchange. (LD-215 to 220).

18.The submission of the said LC for Rs.49,98,660/- (LD-217) by Rathnakumar (A-4) to Federal Bank, Mylapore Branch, Chennai, Letter from Federal bank of Nedungadi Bank seeking confirmation of the genuineness of the ILC documents and reply dtd.17.09.01 from Nedungadi bank to Federal Bank, Royapettah and discounting fo the same for Rs.48,32,588 on 17.09.2001 and credit of Rs.48,32,000/- into the account of M/s.Senthil Trading Services, reflected in the Statement of Account (LD-384). On the same day transfer of Rs.48,32,000/- from Senthil Trading Services to T.M.Trading Services in Account No.1460 of Rathnakumar (A-4) by Cheque No.205542 (LD-384 & LD-385). On 19.09.2001, Rathnakumar (A-4) had transferred Rs.36,40,000/- and Rs.42,00,000/- vide cheuqe No.130763 and 13074 (LD-381) respectively in favour M/s.Maharaja Forest Product, which is a Proprietorship firm of V.M.S.Hajee Mohammed (A-2), reflected in the statement of Account of Maharaja Forest Products (LD-387). These transactions in the Federal Bank Account will be established by Shri R.Sundararajan (PW-9), Sr. Manager, Federal Bank in his deposition at Page No.5 and Shri Kesavan (PW-5), Manager, Union Bank of India in his deposition in page No.2 along with above said documents."

The above witnesses and documents would clearly reveal the active role played by the petitioners in commission of the offence.

11.He would further submit that the FIR is only to set the law into motion. On collection of materials the role played by the petitioner were revealed. There is no infirmity in the trial Court taking cognizance of the charge sheet filed by the respondent. The respondent is having jurisdiction to investigate the case in Tamil Nadu as per the statute and got specific jurisdiction in cases involving funds of central government including the public sector banks. The defacto complainant/Punjab National Bank is a public sector bank. Further, the petitioners, who committed grave offences of forgery, cheating, misappropriation and defrauded the bank does not have any locustandi or competence to question the investigating agency. As per the evidence gathered during investigation the role of the petitioners came to light and hence they were charge sheeted. The petitioners have also involved in other cases of similar nature:-

> "19.In a case registered against the same set of accused in R.C.No.4/E/2002-CBI/EOW/Chennai which went on trial in C.C.No.10793/2003 in the Ld.ACMM, Egmore, Chennai, the accused were convicted for four years.
>
> 20.In an another case registered against the same set of accused in RC.No.2/E/2002-CBI/BSFC/Bangalore which went on trial in C.C.No.1702/2002 in the XI Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases, Chennai, the accused were convicted.
>
> 21.It is submitted that the petitioners/accused No.3 to 5 being habitual offenders desperately resorted to dealy the trial of thhis case by filing petition for stay on the basis of false and frivolous grounds since they had foreseen that evidence in this case is strong against them to be convicted."

Hence, he strongly objected to quash the proceedings against the petitioners.

12.Considering the rival submissions and on perusal of the materials, this Court finds that the petitioners actively connived with A1 and A2 in creating forged documents. Using the same, they had cheated huge sums of money from the public sector bank. Further, the trial is at the stage of questioning under 313 Cr.P.C. The witnesses have been examined and the trial is at the penultimate stage.

13.The contention of the petitioner is that their names does not find place in the FIR and they were subsequently arrayed as accused in the charge sheet is proper. It is settled proposition that the FIR is not an encyclopedia. Only after investigation, the active role of the petitioners have been found. Further in the absence of any specific motive the contention of the petitioner cannot be countenanced.

14.On perusal of the charge sheet, it is found that the copies of statement of witnesses (LW1 to LW26) and documents (LD1 to LD396) have been filed along with charge sheet. The respondent is authorized and empowered person to investigate the cases involving public sector undertakings and the trial Court has jurisdiction to try the above case. The contention of the petitioner is that, procedure under Section 167 of Cr.P.C is not followed. In this case, it will not occur for the reason. Admittedly, the petitioners/accused Nos.3 to 5 were not arrested during investigation. Hence, the contention of the petitioner are not sustainable both on law and facts.

15.With the above discussions and direction, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

16.It is seen that the case is of the year 2005. Due to the pendency of the above case, the trial Court could not proceed with the trial. Hence, the trial Court is directed to complete the trial as expeditiously as possible, considering the long pendency of the case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(Insp.cell)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vv2

To

1.The Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore, Chennai.

2.The Special Police Establishment,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
Economic Offences Wing,
3rd floow, 'A' Wing,
"Rajaji Bhavan",
Besant Nagar,
Chennai-600 090.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

4. The Section Officer,
Criminal Section/Record,
High Court, Madras -104
(Send back records)

+1cc to Mr.S.Diwakar, Advocate SR.No.86704

Crl.O.P.No.27590 of 2015

RSK(CO)
GMY(08/11/2019)