

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 05.02.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.SATHYANARAYANAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

CRL.A.No.11/2018

1.Aran @ Aruchamy

2.Kittusamy

.. Appellants /
A1&A2

Versus

The State rep.by

The Inspector of Police

M-2 Thondamuthur Police Station

Coimbatore City.

.. Respondent /
Complainant

Prayer:- Appeal filed under section 374 [2] Cr.P.C., against the judgment of conviction dated 17.11.2017 made in SC.No.181/2017 on the file of the learned I Additional District and Sessions Court, Coimbatore.

For Appellants : Mr.C.M.Gunasekaran for
Mr.V.Purushothaman

For Respondent : Mr.R.Prathap Kumar, APP

JUDGMENT

[Judgment of the Court was delivered by M.SATHYANARAYANAN, J.,]

The appellants are the accused in SC.No.181/2017 on the file of the Court of I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Coimbatore. They stood charged and tried for the commission of the offence u/s.302 IPC. The Trial Court, vide impugned judgment dated 17.11.2017, has convicted the appellants / accused for the commission of the said offence and sentenced each of them to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life and also to pay a fine of Rs.5000/- each, with a default sentence to undergo three months simple imprisonment. Aggrieved by the said conviction and sentence recorded by the Trial Court, the

appellants are before this Court by way of the present criminal appeal.

2 The facts leading to the filing of this criminal appeal, relevant and necessary, for the disposal, are as follows:-

2.1 The defacto-complainant/P.W.1-Sakthivel, is a resident of Vellarukkanpalayam Village, Coimbatore Taluk and District and he was employed in CRI Pumps. Ponnusamy is his brother-in-law. The appellants/accused had enmity with Ponnusamy over money transaction.

2.2 On 07.07.2016 at about 7.30 p.m., the defacto-complainant/P.W.1, Ponnusamy, brother-in-law of P.W.1 and his cousin brother Pabbusamy were conversing with each other at Ration shop which was located in their village and at about 8.00 p.m., on the same day, both the accused came there and asked money from Ponnusamy-brother-in-law of P.W.1/defacto complainant and he refused to part with the amount. A-1 abused Ponnusamy and took an empty brandy bottle ; broken it by slamming it on the steps of the ration shop and stabbed Ponnusamy and his brother, viz., A-2/2nd appellant, went to the shop of one Palanisamy and took a 7UP bottle ; broke it and stabbed Ponnusamy. The defacto complainant/P.W.1 and others tried to prevent the said attack and in the scuffle, the 1st appellant/A-1 sustained injuries and on seeing the commotion and on hearing alarm, public started gathering in the said place and on seeing them, both the appellants/accused fled away from the scene of occurrence and thereafter, the injured Ponnusamy initially was taken to Thondamuthur Primary Health Centre / Government Hospital and on medical advise, he was taken to the Government Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore and was admitted as an in-patient and without responding to the treatment, he died on 11.07.2016.

2.3 P.W.1/defacto complainant-brother-in-law of the injured Ponnusamy, went to Thondamuthur Police Station and lodged a complaint under Ex.P.1 on 07.07.2016 at about 23.45 hours and the Sub-Inspector of Police attached to the said Police Station, registered FIR in Cr.No.221/2016 for the alleged commission of the offences u/s.294-B, 307 and 506[iii] IPC and the Printed FIR is marked as Ex.P.10.

2.4 P.W.8-Mr.S.Saravanan, Inspector of Police attached to Thondamuthur Police Station, on receipt of Ex.P.10-FIR, registered by Mr.Arun, Sub-Inspector of Police, took up the investigation and went to the scene of crime at about 1.45 a.m. on 08.07.2016 and in the presence of P.W.6-Kumarasamy, and Samiraj, had prepared the Rough Sketch [Ex.P.11] and Observation

Mahazar [Ex.P.12]. P.W.8, on the same day, at about 2.45 p.m., in the presence of P.W.6 and Samiraj, has collected sample earth [M.O.3] and blood stained earth [M.O.4] ; broken brandy bottle [M.O.1] and broken 7UP bottle [M.O.2] under the cover of Mahazar [Ex.P.13]. At about 7.00 a.m., he went to Coimbatore Medical College Hospital, wherein the injured Ponnusamy was admitted and recorded his statement and also seized the cloth worn by him, which are marked as M.Os.5 to 7 under the cover of Mahazar [Ex.P.14]. Thereafter, P.W.8 examined P.W.1 and P.W.2, one Ramesh Babu @ Babuchamy ; P.W.5-Saraswathi [wife of the deceased Ponnusamy] ; P.W.4-Palanisamy ; Senthilkumaran and Manian and recorded their statements and after examining them, he became aware of the genuineness and truth of the said occurrence and thereafter, started searching for the accused along with P.W.1-Sakthivel.

2.5 P.W.8, the Investigating Officer, on receipt of secret information, went to Baniyan Tree Bus Stop at Pudhur and on identification, effected arrest of A-1 and A-2 at about 8.30 a.m., on 08.07.2016 and interrogated them. The 1st appellant/A-1 had told P.W.8 that he sustained self-inflicted injury on his forehead as well on the left forehead and thereafter, he was taken to Thondamuthur Government Hospital and was given treatment and subsequently, took both the accused along with the property to Thondamuthur Police Station at about 10.00 a.m. At 10.30 a.m, in the Police Station, P.W.8 had seized the cloth worn by A-1 and A-2 which are marked as M.Os.8 to 11 under the cover of Mahazar [Ex.P.15] in the presence of P.W.6 and another. Thereafter, he sent the accused persons for judicial custody and also informed their relatives.

2.6 P.W.8, after obtaining appropriate orders, forwarded the seized articles for chemical analysis through Form-95 and from 11.07.2016 onwards, continued with the investigation and he received the information that the injured Ponnusamy, who was admitted in the Government Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore, died at about 1.45 a.m., without responding to the treatment. Thereafter, he altered the sections from 294[b], 307 and 506[ii] IPC to one u/s.294[b], 302 and 506[ii] IPC and forwarded the Alteration Report [Ex.P.16] to the jurisdictional Magistrate Court.

2.7 P.W.8, along with the Head Constable Chandramohan, went to the Government Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore, and conducted inquest on the dead body of the deceased between 6.00 a.m. and 10.00 a.m, in the presence of panchayatdars as well as the witnesses and also examined P.Ws.1, 5, 3, Manian and P.W.6 and recorded their statements and also prepared the Inquest Report [Ex.P.17]. P.W.8 sent the body of the deceased Ponnusamy through Monika-Grade-I Constable for postmortem.

2.8 P.W.7-Dr.Perranandham, was the District Police Surgeon and Assistant Professor in the Head of the Department of Forensic Medicine attached to Coimbatore Medical College Hospital at the relevant point of time. P.W.7, on receipt of the requisition along with the body at about 10.55 a.m. on 11.07.2016 from P.W.8, found that rigor mortis was present all over the body except both feet and commenced the postmortem at about 11.00 a.m. on the same day and noted the following features:-

"The following ante mortem injuries noted over the body:-

1. Dark brown colour abrasion 2x1 cm noted over right forehead, 5x3 cm noted over right cheek, 3x2 cm noted over dorsum of right side nose, 2x1 cm noted over right upper lip, 1x1 cm noted over back of left elbow and 1x1cm noted over outer aspect of right upper chest.
2. Sutured star shaped penetrating wound with serrated edges 4x3 cm x bone deep noted over right side chest just lateral to right nipple corresponding to 6th rib. On dissection the wound passes inwards, backwards cutting the underlying muscle vessels and nerves.
3. Sutured penetrating wound with serrated edges 5x2 cm x peritoneal cavity deep noted over right ileac region. On dissection, the wound passes inwards, backwards cutting the underlying muscle, vessels, nerves and enter into peritoneal cavity deep.
4. Double layer sutured penetrating wound with serrated edges 3x1cmxperitoneal cavity deep noted over epigastric region. On dissection, the wound passes inwards, downwards, laterally cutting the underlying muscle, vessels and nerves enter into peritoneal cavity and piercing the liver which is found sutured measuring 4x1 cm with gel foam packed.
5. Sutured penetrating wound with serrated edges 3x1cmxperitoneal cavity deep noted over left upper abdomen 4cm above and 5cm lateral to umbilicus. On dissection, the wound passes inwards, backwards cutting

the underlying muscle, vessels, nerves and enter into the peritoneal cavity.

6. Sutured penetrating wound with serrated edges 5x1 cm x peritoneal cavity deep noted over left lumbar region, 6 cm from left anterior superior iliac spine. On dissection, the wound passes inwards, upwards cutting the underlying muscle, vessels and nerves, enter into peritoneal cavity and piercing the mesentery which is found sutured measuring about 2x1 cm. Mesentery found contused.
7. Sutured penetrating wound with serrated edges 5x1x4 cm noted over back of left side hip, 2 cm above left iliac crest. On dissection the wound passes inwards, backwards cutting the underlying muscle, vessels and nerves.
8. Vertical surgical sutured stapled wound 24x1 cm x peritoneal cavity deep noted over front of abdomen.

On dissection of Thorax and abdomen: Both side Pleural cavities each contain about 100ml of straw colour fluid. Peritoneal cavity about 100 ml of straw colour fluid. Contusion seen over small intestine.

Other findings:-

- Hyoid bone - intact.
- Heart: all chambers contain about few cc of fluid blood, Coronaries-patent.
- Stomach contains about 300 ml of green colour fluid, no specific smell, mucosa pale.
- Small intestine contains about 10 ml of bile stained fluid, no specific smell, mucosa pale.
- Liver, spleen, kidneys, brain and lungs - cut section pale.
- Urinary Bladder - empty.
- Viscera preserved and sent for chemical analysis.
- Blood preserved for analysis.''

P.W.7, after the conclusion of the postmortem, has given the opinion that the "deceased would appear to have died of multiple penetrating injuries with corresponding internal injuries and

its complications." The Postmortem Certificate is marked as Ex.P.6. He has also given his final opinion under Ex.P.8 on 11.07.2016 stating that "the cause of death is already given in the Postmortem Certificate and the Viscera does not contain any poison."

2.9 P.W.8, the Investigating Officer, in continuation of his investigation, on 31.08.2016 had examined Mrs.Rajeswari-Chief Writer attached to the Court of Judicial Magistrate No.6, Coimbatore, P.W.7-Doctor who conducted autopsy as well as Thiru Chandramohan, Head Constable and Thiru.Arun, Sub Inspector of Police, who registered FIR. The requisition for sending the seized articles for Chemical Analysis was marked as Ex.P.18 and the Biological Report was marked as Ex.P.19 and the Serology Report was marked as Ex.P.20. After completing the investigation, has filed the Final Report before the Court of Judicial Magistrate No.6, Coimbatore, charging both the accused for the commission of the offence u/s.302 read with 34 IPC.

2.10 The Court of Judicial Magistrate No.6, Coimbatore, on receipt of the Final Report, took it on file in PRC.No.1/2017. The Committal Court had summoned the accused and furnished them with the copies of the documents u/s.207 Cr.P.C., and having found that the case is exclusively tried by the Court of Sessions, committed the same to the Principal District and Sessions Court, Coimbatore and the said Court, in turn, had made over the case to the Court of I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Coimbatore, who took it on file in SC.No.181/2017.

2.11 The prosecution, in order to sustain their case, examined P.Ws.1 to 8 and marked Exs.P.1 to 21 as well as M.Os.1 to 11.

2.12 The accused was questioned under section 313[1][b] Cr.P.C., with regard to the incriminating circumstances made out against them in the evidences rendered by the prosecution and they denied it as false. The accused did not file any documents nor let in any oral evidence.

2.13 The Trial Court, on consideration and appreciation of the oral and documentary evidences and other materials, had convicted the appellants/accused for the commission of the offence u/s.302 IPC and imposed the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for life with a fine and default sentence. Challenging the legality of the conviction and sentence of the Trial Court, the appellants/accused has preferred this appeal.

3 Mr.C.M.Gunasekaran, the learned counsel appearing for the appellants / accused has drawn the attention of this Court to the oral and documentary evidences and other materials and made the following submissions:-

- The origin and genesis of the case has been totally burked/suppressed by the prosecution. P.W.1 would not have been present/witnessed the alleged occurrence. The conduct of P.W.1 immediately after seeing his brother-in-law attacked and not taking any steps to take him to the hospital, is also suspicious and it cannot be termed as a normal human conduct in the light of the fact that his close relative said to have sustained injuries on account of the attack inflicted by both accused.
- The complaint-Ex.P.1 came to be lodged very belatedly and the material documents, which came into being, also despatched to the jurisdictional Court, after much delay and no explanation at all has been offered by the prosecution. Even according to the prosecution, the injured Ponnusamy was initially taken to Thondamuthur Government Hospital / Primary Health Centre and thereafter, he was taken to the Government Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore, and the Accident Register maintained in the Primary Health Centre has not been marked as well as the Casualty Medical Officer, who treated the injured at the first instance, has not been examined. Even in respect of the admission of the injured in the Government Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore, the Accident Register has not been marked and the said documents are crucial documents as they reveal the real thing that had happened immediately after the alleged occurrence.
- It is also the admitted case of the prosecution that A-1 sustained injuries and he was taken to the Government Hospital/Primary Health Centre at Thondamuthur. No documents relating to the said treatment, have been marked and in the absence of any plausible or probable explanation as to the sustainment of the injury by A-1, the entire case of the prosecution is to be thrown out.
- Even assuming that the evidence tendered by the prosecution is trustworthy, still there is no iota of material to connect the 2nd appellant/A-2 with the commission of crime.
- The prosecution did not make any attempt to examine any independent witness and they had examined only the close relatives and except P.W.1, all of them have turned hostile.

- The arrest and recovery is also highly doubtful in the light of the testimony of P.W.1

4 In sum and substance, it is the submission of the learned counsel for the appellants/A-1 and A-2 that the infirmities pointed out go deep into the root of the matter and the Trial Court, without properly appreciating the oral and documentary evidences and other materials, has erroneously reached the conclusion to convict and sentence the appellants/accused and in any event, the Trial Court, at least, ought to have ordered benefit of doubt and acquitted them and prays for interference.

5 Per contra, Mr.R.Prathap Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would submit that the evidence of the sole eyewitness is believable and trustworthy and it is also supported by the scientific and other evidences and the infirmities pointed out by the learned counsel for the appellants/accused are minor and trivial in nature and since the prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt and the Trial Court has rightly convicted and sentenced both the appellants/accused and prays for dismissal of the appeal.

6 This Court paid its anxious consideration to the rival submissions made and also perused the oral and documentary evidences and other materials placed on record including the impugned Judgment as well as the original records.

7 The following questions arise for consideration:-

[a] Whether the prosecution has proved its case against the appellants/accused beyond reasonable doubt?

[b] Whether the impugned judgment of the Trial Court in convicting and sentencing the appellants/accused is sustainable?

8 P.W.1-Sakthivel, is the brother-in-law of the deceased Ponnusamy and he lodged a complaint under Ex.P.1 based on which, Ex.P.10-FIR came to be registered by one Mr.Arun, Sub Inspector of Police. It is to be noted at this juncture that the Sub Inspector of Police who registered FIR, was examined during investigation ; but he was not examined as a witness during the course of trial. A perusal of Ex.P.1-complaint and the contents of the same would disclose among other things that on account of previous enmity, Ponnusamy was attacked by A-1 and A-2 by use of brandy bottle and broken 7UP bottle respectively and in the process, A-1 had also sustained injuries and thereafter, services of 108 Ambulance was summoned and the injured Ponnusamy was taken in the Ambulance accompanied by P.W.1 and P.W.2 to Thondamuthur Government Hospital, where he was

admitted. P.W.1/defacto complainant in his cross-examination would depose that the provision shop of Palanisamy is not located in the place of occurrence and that, it is located adjacent to the house of the said Palanisamy. P.W.1 would further depose that he did not accompany the injured to the hospital since his sister-P.W.5 / wife of the injured and her two children became unconscious and he lodged the complaint with Thondamuthur Police station at about 8.30 a.m., and 9.00 a.m. on 08.07.2016 and denied the suggestion that the said complaint was given only on 11.07.2016. He would further depose that at the time of giving the complaint, he saw both the accused in the police station and he was also informed that the accused were taken to the police station on the night hours on date of occurrence, i.e., 07.07.2016. It is also deposed by P.W.1 that the written complaint was received by the police at about 11.00 a.m on 08.07.2016 and one week thereafter, he was furnished with the copy of FIR and he also did not identify the place of occurrence to the said police and it was done by P.W.6 and Samiraj. P.W.1 would also state that on hearing alarm, people of the locality came and he did not mention their names in the complaint and denied the suggestion that he was not at all present in the scene of occurrence and also denied the suggestion that the injured Ponnusamy was attacked by using M.Os.1 and 2.

9 P.W.2, who was also examined as an eyewitness, had turned hostile and so also, P.Ws.3 and 4.

10 P.W.5-wife of the deceased Ponnusamy and sister of P.W.1 would depose that she became aware of the stab injury inflicted upon her husband and thereafter, she along with another person and her daughter went to Thondamuthur Government Hospital and her husband had told her that the accused demanded money and as he refused to part with the same, he was stabbed and thereafter, Ambulance came and he was taken to the Coimbatore Medical College Hospital and on seeking the injury and blood, P.W.5 became unconscious and three days thereafter, her husband died on 11.07.2016 and till such time, he was conversing with her normally. In the cross-examination, P.W.5 would depose that when she went to Thondamuthur Government Hospital, it was 8.15 p.m. and treatment was given to her husband in the said hospital and for further treatment, he was referred to the Coimbatore Medical College Hospital, and nearby to Thondamuthur Government Hospital, there is also a Police Station and since she and others were concerned with the health of her husband, they did not thought fit to lodge a complaint.

11 P.W.6-Kumarasamy, who was the witness to the arrest and recovery had turned hostile. P.W.7-Doctor who conducted the postmortem, would depose that after completion of the autopsy,

the weapons used for commission of the offence, have not been shown to him.

12 The testimony of P.W.1 would disclose among other things that he went to Thondamuthur Police Station on 07.07.2016 and lodged a complaint at about 8.15 a.m. and 9.00 a.m. and it was a written complaint. A perusal of Ex.P.10-FIR would disclose that the complaint-Ex.P.1 came to be registered only at about 23.45 hours on 07.07.2016 by one Mr.Arun, Sub Inspector of Police, attached to the said Police Station. Though the said official was examined as a witness during the course of investigation, he was not examined during the course of trial. It is also to be pointed out at this juncture that P.W.1 in his cross-examination, would admit that he did not write the complaint and the complaint was written in the Police Station whereas Ex.P.10-FIR would disclose as if a written complaint under Ex.P.1 was lodged by P.W.1. It is also very pertinent to point out at this juncture that from the testimony of P.W.1, when he went to lodge the complaint, he saw both the accused in the Police Station where he was informed that on the previous night, i.e., on the date of occurrence [07.07.2016] itself, they were taken to the Police Station and whereas, according to the evidence of P.W.8-Investigating Officer, both the accused were arrested on 08.07.2016 at about 8.30 a.m. and that apart, the witness to arrest and recovery, viz., P.W.6, had turned hostile. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the appellants, the alleged arrest and recovery of the incriminating articles in the light of the testimony of P.W.6 is highly doubtful and so also the lodging of the complaint under Ex.P.1 by P.W.1 in the light of the answers elicited from him during the cross-examination.

13 This Court had also summoned the Case Diary and verified with the same and also taken into consideration the testimony of P.W.5-wife of the deceased who deposed that she met her husband in Thondamuthur Government Hospital and that he told her that he was stabbed by A-1 and A-2/appellants herein. It is also the evidence of P.W.8-Investigating Officer that he had also examined the injured Ponnusamy on 07.07.2016 and he told him that accused persons demanded money and since he refused to part with the same, he was stabbed. It is settled position of law that the dying declaration does not necessarily mean that it should be given before the jurisdictional Magistrate only and any declaration given on the verge of death can also be taken as a dying declaration and curiously and for the reasons best known to the prosecution, the statement of Ponnusamy [deceased] though available in the Case Diary, has not been marked.

14 The testimony of P.W.5 would disclose that the injured Ponnusamy was initially taken to Thondamuthur Government Hospital and he was given treatment and thereafter, he was taken to the Coimbatore Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore for better and further treatment. The prosecution has failed to seize the Accident Register maintained by Thondamuthur Government Hospital pertains to the injured/deceased Ponnusamy and not even the Casualty Medical Officer / Doctor attached to the said hospital and that apart, though the injured was admitted in the Medical College Hospital at Coimbatore and he survived for three days, the Accident Register at the time of his admission, has also not been marked and the prosecution has failed to come out with any tenable explanation as to the said lapse or infirmity.

15 It is also the case of the prosecution that the 2nd appellant/A-2 took a 7UP Bottle [M.O.2] from the shop of one Palanisamy, broken it and thereafter, stabbed the deceased. As already pointed out, P.W.1 in the cross-examination, admit that near the scene of crime, the shop of Palanisamy is not located and that it is located adjacent to the house of the said Palanisamy. P.W.4 had also turned hostile. Therefore, the presence of the 2nd appellant/A-2 at the alleged scene of occurrence is also doubtful in the light of the said infirmity. It is also to be noted at this juncture that according to the prosecution, A-1/1st appellant during melee, sustained injuries and according to P.W.8, he was taken to Thondamuthur Government Hospital and was given treatment. But none of the records, pertain to the injuries and treatment, have been marked. It is also the submission of the learned counsel for the appellants that the prosecution is bound to explain the injuries sustained by the accused and in the case on hand, the prosecution has failed to come out with any explanation as to how and in what manner, the 1st appellant/A-1 had sustained injuries.

16 All the material documents had belatedly reached the jurisdictional Magistrate Court and it is also adding doubt to the case of the prosecution as to the exact time at which the FIR came to be registered and the investigation commenced. The learned counsel for the appellants would submit that the Serology report marked as Ex.P.20 would disclose that all the articles were tainted with human blood and some of the articles with 'A' blood group and therefore, the prosecution had proved that it was the accused who attacked Ponnusamy and caused his death.

17 A perusal and consideration of the materials would disclose that the blood group of the deceased have not been made known and and it is to be pointed out at this juncture that admittedly, A-1/1st appellant had also sustained injuries during the course of the event and as such, Ex.P.20-Serology Report is of no help to the prosecution case to sustain the guilt of the accused. As already pointed out, the arrest and recovery of the articles is also doubtful and it is also substantiated by the fact that the Seizure Report [Ex.P.14] contains lot of corrections and in fact, some words were also struck off and it is also adding doubt as to the arrest of the accused/appellants and recovery of incriminating articles and in Form-95, under which the articles were also despatched, also contains lot of corrections.

18 In the considered opinion of the Court, the infirmities pointed out above, cannot said to be trivial in nature and further, the investigation in the present case has not been conducted properly in the light of the infirmities pointed out above and though faulty investigation per se would not lead to acquittal ; the infirmities pointed out, are grave in nature and it had shaken the very foundation laid down by the prosecution. This Court, on an independent application of mind and on appraisal of the oral and documentary evidences and other materials, is of the considered opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove the guilt on the part of the appellants/accused beyond any reasonable doubt and as such, the appellants/A-1 and A-2 are entitled for benefit of doubt.

19 In the result, the Criminal Appeal is allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed on the appellants by the learned I Additional District and Sessions Court, Coimbatore, in SC.No. 181/2017 dated 17.11.2017, are hereby set aside. The appellants are acquitted of charges framed against them.

20 It is reported that the appellants are in jail. Hence, the appellants are directed to be released forthwith unless their presence/custody is required in connection with any other case/proceedings.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

AP

To

1. The I Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Coimbatore.
- 2.The Principal District and Sessions Judge
Coimbatore.
- 3.The Judicial Magistrate No.VI
Coimbatore.
- 4.The Chief Judicial Magistrate
Coimbatore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police
M-2 Thondamuthur Police Station
Coimbatore District.
- 6.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
- 7.The Director General of Police
Mylapore, Chennai-4.
- 8.The District Collector,
Coimbatore District.
- 9.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.
10. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Coimbatore.

Cr1.A.No.11/2018

VSNII (CO)

SSM(18/03/2019)