IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 22.08.2019

PRONOUNCED ON : 29.08.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.RC.No.357 of 2019
Crl.MP.No.5104 of 2019

G.Venkatanarayanan Petitioner/Petitioner/A1

Vs

The Inspector of Police, CBI
Anti Corruption Branch, Chennai-6
Respondent/Respondent/Complainant

Prayer:- This Criminal Revision Petition is filed, against the order dated, 26.03.2019, made in Crl.MP.No.5445 of 2017, in CC.No.22 of 2014, by the XII Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Ramesh, SC for Mr.C.Arunkumar

For Respondent : Mr.K.Srinivasan, SPP-CBI

ORDER

1. This Criminal Revision Petition is filed to set aside the order dated, 26.03.2019, made in Crl.MP.No.5445 of 2017, in CC.No.22 of 2014, by the XII Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases, Chennai, whereby, the court below had dismissed the application preferred by the Petitioner under Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act.

2. The facts, leading to filing of this Criminal Revision Petition, are as follows:-
   a) The Petitioner/A1, G.Venkatanarayanan is employed as Scientist-E at Bureau of Indian Standards and his wife/A2, K.Suja, is employed as Chief Manager at Indian Bank. Based on source information, the Respondent had registered a case in First Information Report No.RC MA1 2013 A0021, dated 01.05.2013, for the offences punishable under Sections109 of IPC read with 13(2) read with 13(1) (e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, as against the Petitioner/A1 and A2 and commenced the investigation. On

21.11.2014, the Respondent had filed the final report, before the Principal Special Court for CBI Cases at Chennai for the offences under Sections 120B of IPC read with 13 (2) read with 13(1) (e) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, alleging that the Petitioner/A1, while functioning as a public servant in the capacity of Director, Scientist E, Office of Bureau of Indian Standards, CIT Campus, Taramani, Chennai and his wife/A2, who was working as Chief Manager, Corporate Office, Banking Operations Department, Indian Bank, Chennai, had entered into criminal conspiracy for acquisition of disproportionate assets and in pursuance to the said conspiracy, during the period from 01.01.2005 to 11.02.2013, they amassed disproportionate assets in their name to the extent of Rs.1,68,19,754.76/- which works out to 128.97% disproportionate to their known sources of income, for which they cannot satisfactorily account for.

b) The case was taken in CC.No.22 of 2014 by the XII Court for CBI Cases at Chennai and summons were issued. On receipt of the summons, the accused appeared before the Court and the Court had complied with the procedural requirements under Sections 207 read with 238 of Cr.PC and proceeded to frame charges on 30.01.2015. As the accused had denied the charges, the case was posted for examination of witnesses. As on today, the Prosecution had examined 42 witnesses out of 46 witnesses cited and tendered 71 documents as exhibits. The accused had cross-examined all the witnesses.

c) Ignoring the valuation report of the Panel Valuer of Bank, a valuation report, Document No.51, in respect of the property of the Petitioner/A1 had been obtained from LW.31, namely, T.P.S.Ravi Kumar, Assistant Valuation Officer, Unit-II, Valuation Cell, Income Tax, Kannamai Building. While so, in November 2017, the Trial Court had issued summons to LW.31, to be examined and to tender the Inspection Report, along with the Covering letter, dated 11.07.2014, as an Exhibit on 22.11.2017.

d) At this stage, on 22.11.2017, before the court below, the Petitioner/A1 herein had filed a miscellaneous application in Cr.MP.No.5445 of 2017, under Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act, seeking to deny permission to the Respondent to examine LW.31, as a Prosecution witness and to tender the Document No 51 namely the Valuation Report and Covering letter (vide F.No AVO-II/MDs/CBI/2014-15 dated 11.07.2014) as a Prosecution Exhibit through the above witness, on the grounds that the valuation report of LW.31 will not serve any purpose and it is impermissible to look into such a report and admitting such evidence would be a wasteful exercise of precious judicial time.

e) Before the court below, the Respondent had filed a counter, contending that the petitioner cannot object for examination of the prosecution witness at it threshold and that it is the prerogative of the Prosecution to examine the witness as per the schedule of the list of witnesses and that the Petitioner had misconstrued the provision of 136 of Evidence Act and that the court below after having satisfied with the final report and the list of witness and the documents, had ordered and issued summons to those witness and were examined as prosecution witness and that if at all the Petitioner has any objection on the veracity of the documents, same can be exercised at the time of cross examination and at the stage of arguments and the Petition is filed only to delay the process further and sought for dismissal of the petition.

f) The court below, after hearing both sides, had, by a detailed and reasoned order, dismissed the petition, as there are no merits in the objections raised by the Petitioner/A2. Hence, this Civil Revision Petition has been filed, seeking the relief as stated above.

3. This court heard the submissions of the learned counsel on either side.

4. The learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1, assailing the impugned order, would submit that the Prosecution has not taken into consideration the valuation report of the Panel Valuer of the Bank and that pursuant to the letter dated 4.11.2013, of DIG, ACB, CBI, Chennai, the Prosecution had referred the property in question to be valuated by the Valuer of the Income Tax Department and obtained a Valuation Report, enclosed as LD51 through LW.31 and that the property in question does not belong to the Petitioner/A1 and that the impugned order is illegal, permitting the document LD51, to be tendered as an exhibit and permitting LW.31 to be examined as a Prosecution witness is illegal, as the court below erred in taking into consideration the amended provision of Section 142A of the Income Tax Act, which was not in existence at the relevant point of time while conducting the inspection, while ignoring the statutory provision which was in force at the relevant point of time and that on a comparative reading of Section 142 prior to amendment and Section 142A after amendment with effect from 01.10.2014, it is clear that valuation carried out under these provisions mandates only for that purpose and nothing other than what is provided for. He would further submit that Sections 142 and 142A of the Income Tax Act make its clear that only the Assessing Officer, as defined in Section 2 (7A) can make a reference to the Valuation Officer and none other than the Assessing Officer is authorised to refer for making an assessment. He would further submit that when a Valuation Officer is appointed under a particular Act, he can discharge his functions within the statutory limits, under which he is appointed and it is not open to the Valuation Officer to act in his capacity as Valuation Officer other than in discharge of his statutory functions and would rely on the decision

reported in 2003 6 SCC 342 (Amiya Bala Paul Vs. Commissioner of Income Tax, Shilong).

5. The learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1 would submit that the Respondent has miserably failed to adhere to the CBI Crime Manual and that the Trial Court also erred in citing a notification/ memorandum, dated 5.2.2007 though the Respondent neither mentioned the above notification in their counter nor circulated the same during the course of arguments and that quoting above notification, the Trial Court had opined that the DIG, ACB/CBI is authorised to make a reference for the assistance of the valuation cell and in such circumstances, he would pray for quashing the impugned order. In support of his contentions, the learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1 would rely on the decisions reported in 2015 (13) SCC 257 (M/s.Nova Ads and Metropolitan Transp.Corp.& Ors) and 1988 (1) SCC 226 (Vineet Narain and Union of India).

6. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI Cases would submit that after collection of evidence through the Investigating Officer, the assistance of the Officer of the Income Tax to value the property in question was sought for and after valuation, the Investigating Officer had collected the Valuation Report prepared by LW.31 and filed along with the final report as LD.51 and that the Prosecution has every right to examine any witness and mark any document, which are relevant to the facts of the case and to establish the case of the Prosecution and that if any objection is to be raised, the same can be done at the time of examination of the witnesses and marking of documents and that the Petitioner/A1 has no right to interfere either with the examination of witnesses or with the trial and that the Prosecution had already examined most of the listed witnesses and that whenever valuation of the property of the Income Tax Assessee is to be assessed, a request to be made by the Assessing Officer to the Valuation Officer to value a particular property for the purpose of assessment or re-assessment of such property and that there is no prohibition under the Act or the CBI Manual to call for a report from the Income Tax Department and that in this case, the Circulars and Instructions issued by the Government of India provide for reference by Officers above the rank of DIG to obtain assistance of the Valuation Cell of the Income Tax Department to value the property in connection with the investigation of cases relating to disproportionate assets and thereby the decision relied on by the learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1 cannot be made applicable to the case on hand and that the stage has not been set in for invoking Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act and that this Criminal Revision Petition has been filed, only with a view to protract the trial proceedings and would pray for dismissal of this Civil Revision Petition, relying on the decision of the Honourable Supreme

Court reported in AIR 2001 SC 1158:2001 3 SCC 1 (Bipin Shantilal Panchal Vs. State of Gujarat and another).

7.I have given my careful and anxious consideration to the rival contentions put forward by either side and thoroughly scanned through the entire materials available on record.

8.The Petitioner/A1 along with his wife/A2 were charge sheeted for the offences under Sections 120B of IPC read with 13(2) read with 13(1) (e) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and they are facing trial. Before the court below, as many as 30 witnesses have been examined and the case is at the stage of further examination of witnesses. The court below, had issued summons to LW.31 T.P.S.Ravikumar, Assistant Valuation Officer, Unit-II, Valuation Cell, Income Tax, Kannamai Building, Chennai to be examined and to mark the Document No.51, valuation report along with a covering letter dated, 11.07.2017 prepared by him, on 22.11.2017.

9.LW.31 is the Assistant Valuation Officer, Unit II, Valuation Cell, Income Tax, Kannammai Building, Chennai. Document No.51 is the Valuation Report in respect of the property situated at No.26, Sannathi Street, Valasaravakkam, Chennai and it is mentioned in the said report that the valuation had been carried out as per Section 142A of the Income Tax Act.

10.The main ground raised by the learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1 is that as per Section 142A of the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Officer is not entitled to provide valuation report to the CBI for investigation purpose and in this case, LW.31, who is the Valuation Officer of the Income Tax Department, has no right to carry out inspection and value the property in question and provide valuation report to the CBI for investigation purpose.

11.But, it is the contention of the Respondent that it is the prerogative of the Prosecution to schedule list of witnesses and documents proposed to be marked and that it is the policy decision and practice that any valuation of building involved in disproportionate assets cases, is being normally done by the Valuation Officer from Income Tax Department, Banks and other Central Government Officers as per the guidelines of the Income Tax Rules and the Policy Guidelines as per Circular No.21/40/99-PD dated 24.06.2002 and Circular No.21/40/99-PD(Pt) dated 26.11.2001. It is for the Judge to decide the admissibility of evidence under Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act and considering the said aspects, the impugned order came to be passed, dismissing the petition.

12.It is apposite to quote relevant provision of law. Section 142A of the Income Tax Act as under:-

“'142A. Estimation of value of assets by Valuation Officer.— (1) The Assessing Officer may, for the purposes of assessment or reassessment, make a reference to a Valuation Officer to estimate the value, including fair market value, of any asset, property or investment and submit a copy of report to him.

(2) The Assessing Officer may make a reference to the Valuation Officer under sub-section (1) whether or not he is satisfied about the correctness or completeness of the accounts of the assessee.

(3) The Valuation Officer, on a reference made under sub-section (1), shall, for the purpose of estimating the value of the asset, property or investment, have all the powers that he has under section 38A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957).

(4) The Valuation Officer shall, estimate the value of the asset, property or investment after taking into account such evidence as the assessee may produce and any other evidence in his possession gathered, after giving an opportunity of being heard to the assessee.

(5) The Valuation Officer may estimate the value of the asset, property or investment to the best of his judgement, if the assessee does not co-operate or comply with his directions.

(6) The Valuation Officer shall send a copy of the report of the estimate made under sub-section (4) or sub-section (5), as the case may be, to the Assessing Officer and the assessee, within a period of six months from the end of the month in which a reference is made under sub-section (1).

(7) The Assessing Officer may, on receipt of the report from the Valuation Officer, and after giving the assessee an opportunity of being heard, take into account such report in making the assessment or reassessment.
Explanation.—In this section, "Valuation Officer" has the same meaning as in clause (r) of section 2 of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957).”

13.Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act reads as under:-

“136. Judge to decide as to admissibility of evidence.— When either party proposes to give evidence of any fact, the Judge may ask the party proposing to give the evidence in what manner the alleged fact, if proved, would be relevant; and the Judge shall admit the evidence if he thinks that the fact, if proved, would be relevant, and not otherwise. If the fact proposed to be proved is one of which evidence is admissible only upon proof of some other fact, such last-mentioned fact must be proved before evidence is given of the fact first mentioned, unless the party undertakes to give proof of such fact, and the Court is satisfied with such undertaking. If the relevancy of one alleged fact depends upon another alleged fact being first proved, the Judge may, in his discretion, either permit evidence of the first fact to be given before the second fact is proved, or require evidence to be given of the second fact before evidence is given of the first fact ".

14.After reading the provisions of Section 142A of the Income Tax Act, the Trial Court has held that whenever valuation of the property of Income Tax Assessee is to be assessed, a request is to be made by the Assessing Officer to the valuation officer, to value the particular property, for the purpose of assessment or re-assessment of such property and that the said provision does not prevent the same Valuation Officer to render his assistance or service whenever sought for by the Law Enforcing Agency.

15.In so far as the another ground raised by the learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1 that the procedures contemplated under the CBI Manual have not been adhered to, is concerned, it is apposite to refer to the relevant provisions of the CBI Manual, at this juncture.

16.The Chapter 16 of the CBI Manual deals with the obtaining of technical assistance in investigation by the Investigating Officers. Clause 16.4(d) reads as follows:-

"Various IITs and Engineering Colleges, P.W.D. Highways Research Laboratory, chemical Examiners and Fingerprint Bureaux in each State can also be contacted and their services utilized.

17.Clause 16.12 of Chapter VI of the CBI Manual deals with the obtaining of technical assistance in the investigation of the cases of the following types.

(a) Cases involving accounts, viz., Bank Accounts, Accounts of Private companies/firms, individuals, insurance companies, public sector undertakings etc.

(b)Cases involving Railway and Postal Accounts.

(c)Disproportionate Assets cases.

(d)Cases involving assessment of income tax, wealth tax, estate duty etc., and conduct of income-tax officials.

(e)Cases which involve sharing of information with a view to enabling the Income Tax Department to recover the evaded tax and to maintain the record relating to recoveries and communication of information in this respect to the Branches to enable them to make necessary entries in the register for recoveries.

(f) to (i)........

18. Further, 16.18.2 (h) deals with the Technical Assistance to be obtained by the Officers at the Rank of DIG and above and the same reads as follows:-

(h) to attend to other cases in which specific request for technical assistance is received through officers of the rank of DIG an above.

19. Clause 16.19 of Chapter VI of the Manual, deals with the Valuation of Immovable property and it reads as follows:-

"16.19 Whenever any Branch/Cell of the CBI has a case under inquiry / investigation, relating to execution of sub-standard work or valuation of a house or any other immovable property, in which it is necessary to take the help of the Senior Technical Officer (Engineering) for a thorough and expeditious inquiry/investigation, a requisition should be sent to him giving the following information:-

(a) Nature and Volume of the work.

(b) Name of the Department to which the work pertains ;

(c) Points on which technical assistance is required.

(d) Indication about the gravity and urgency of the matter."

20. Clause 16.23 of Chapter VI reads as under:-

"16.23 Preliminary evaluation of immovable properties should be got done by the Branches from the Senior Technical Officer (Engineering), CBI, to avoid infructuous references to the evaluation cells of the C.T.E/C.P.W.D. For this purpose, the following information should be collected by the Branch and furnished to the Senior Technical Officer (Engineering):-

(a) Period(s) of construction.

(b) Cost of materials and labour wages prevailing at the time of construction of the building.

(c) Drawing of the building.

(d) Specifications following for the construction and

(e) Other relevant information such as valuation report of the Government Approved Valuer, if available.”

21.The Trial Court, after quoting the relevant Rules of the CBI (Crime) Manual, 2005, as extracted above, has held that as per Clause 16.23 of Chapter VI, the CBI has to furnish the information regarding the immovable property and that before utilizing the services of the Senior Technical Officer (Engineering), the CBI, as per 16.22 in Chapter VI of CBI Manual [Crl] 2005 should give a brief explanatory note on the issues involved to avoid any ambiguity. The Trial Court has further held that even though a Valuation Report of the concerned immovable property of an approved valuer is already available, it is still open to the CBI, to further evaluate the value of the building for the purpose of investigation in the cases of Disproportionate Assets and therefore, the argument put forth by the learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1 that since the valuation report of Approved Valuer for Indian Bank was already available, there is no necessity for the CBI to reevaluate the same property, cannot be accepted.

22.The Trial Court, has further held that as per the instructions issued by the Government of India, CBI, Policy and Coordination Division, North Block, New Delhi dated 29.11.2001, to all the Superintendents of Police, CBI Branches with regard to Standardizing the procedure for investigation into the Assessment of Wealth possessed by the public servants and as per the Official Memorandum in No.21/40/99-PD(PT), dated 5.2.2007, with respect to instructions given to obtain Assistance of Valuation Cell of Income Tax in valuation of property in disproportionate assets cases and as per the Circular dated 24.6.2002 of DIG of Police, clarifying the power of the Investigating Officer, to obtain the assistance of valuation Cell of the Income Tax Department to evaluate the property in connection with the investigation of cases relating to possession of disproportionate assets and after following the instructions in Rule 16.18.2(h) of Chapter VI of the Manual 2005, the DIG had made a request to the Income Tax Department, Valuation Cell, Chennai to evaluate the immovable property of the Petitioner/A1 and accordingly, after evaluation, LW31 furnished his report LD.51. Therefore, there is no violation of any procedure to make the LD.51 inadmissible in evidence. Further, mere mentioning of Section 142(A) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, in the Valuation Report cannot be taken as such report is to be filed only before the Assessing Officer and not to any other Law Enforcing Agency.

23.The Trial Court has further held that on a careful reading of

Section 136 of Indian Evidence Act, it is clear that except the Judge, no other party to the proceeding has a right to question the evidence either orally or documentary whether relevant or not by way of filing separate Criminal Miscellaneous Petitions and if the Judge thinks that the proposed evidence would be relevant, he is empowered to allow the party to proceed with the evidence and mark the documents as exhibits in a case.

24.In this case, after going through the entire material records, the Trial Court found that the evidence of the proposed witness LW.31 would be relevant and so, caused service of summons on LW.31 to adduce evidence during trial, on the side of the Prosecution. Therefore, it is clear that after due application of mind and having considered the relevancy of facts to the case, such summon was caused to be served upon the witness to depose evidence before this Court. The final report had been filed and the copies have been furnished to the Petitioner/A1 on 5.1.2015 and trial had commenced on 23.4.2015 and LW.31 had been summoned. Though the Petitioner/A1 was aware of LW.31 and LD.51, despite the presence of such witness, the Petitioner/A1 filed the present application on 22.11.2017 and subsequent to it, PW.32 to PW.42 were examined by the prosecution. The learned counsel counsel for Petitioner/A1 before the Trial Court had commenced his argument in part on 6.3.2018 and continuously sought adjournments and completed the argument on 26.2.2019 and the learned Public Prosecutor had completed his arguments on 19.3.2019.

25.The Trial Court has finally held that the CBI has every right to investigate the matter by obtaining technical assistance from the Income Tax Department wherever necessary to evaluate the immovable property under scrutiny and that the decisions relied on by the learned counsel for the Petitioner/A1 are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case on hand and hence, they were not considered by the Trial Court.

26.In AIR 2001 SC 1158:2001 3 SCC (Bipin Shantilal Panchal Vs. State of Gujarat and another), it was held as under:-

> 13. It is an archaic practice that during the evidence-collecting stage, whenever any objection is raised regarding admissibility of any material in evidence the court does not proceed further without passing order on such objection. But the fallout of the above practice is this: Suppose the trial court, in a case, upholds a particular objection and excludes the material from being admitted in evidence and then proceeds with the trial and disposes of the case finally. If the appellate or the revisional court, when the same question is recanvassed, could take a different view on the admissibility of that material in such cases the appellate court would be deprived of the benefit of that

evidence, because that was not put on record by the trial court. In such a situation the higher court may have to send the case back to the trial court for recording that evidence and then to dispose of the case afresh. Why should the trial prolong like that unnecessarily on account of practices created by ourselves. Such practices, when realised through the course of long period to be hindrances which impede steady and swift progress of trial proceedings, must be recast or remoulded to give way for better substitutes which would help acceleration of trial proceedings.

14. When so recast, the practice which can be a better substitute is this: Whenever an objection is raised during evidence-taking stage regarding the admissibility of any material or item of oral evidence the trial court can make a note of such objection and mark the objected document tentatively as an exhibit in the case (or record the objected part of the oral evidence) subject to such objections to be decided at the last stage in the final judgement. If the court finds at the final stage that the objection so raised is sustainable the Judge or Magistrate can keep such evidence excluded from consideration. In our view there is no illegality in adopting such a course. (However, we make it clear that if the objection relates to deficiency of stamp duty of a document the court has to decide the objection before proceeding further. For all other objections the procedure suggested above can be followed.)

15. The above procedure, if followed, will have two advantages. First is that the time in the trial court, during evidence-taking stage, would not be wasted on account of raising such objections and the court can continue to examine the witnesses. The witnesses need not wait for long hours, if not days. Second is that the superior court, when the same objection is recanvassed and reconsidered in appeal or revision against the final judgement of the trial court, can determine the correctness of the view taken by the trial court regarding that objection, without bothering to remit the case to the trial court again for fresh disposal. We may also point out that this measure would not cause any prejudice to the parties to the litigation and would not add to their misery or expenses.

16. We, therefore, make the above as a procedure to be followed by the trial courts whenever an objection is raised regarding the admissibility of any material or any item of oral evidence."

27.The Trial Court, applying the decision relied on by the Prosecution reported in AIR 2001 SC 1158:2001 3 SCC (Bipin Shantilal Panchal Vs. State of Gujarat and another) to the case on hand, has ultimately held that it is well settled law that if the Petitioner/A1 wanted to raise objection, he can do so at the time of marking LD.51 through LW.31 and at this stage, the objection raised by the Petitioner/A1 cannot be considered as there are no merits and that the Valuation Officer or the Assessing Officer is empowered to evaluate the immovable property under Section 142A of Income Tax Act and that the Circulars and the Official Memorandum relate to investigation of cases of Disproportionate Assets empower the DIG to utilize the services of the Income Tax Department whenever necessary.

28.In the opinion of this Court, the Petition filed by the Petitioner/A1 is premature. As stated above, as per Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act, the Judge is the competent person to decide as to the admissibility of evidence. The Trial Court, after carefully analysing the relevant provisions of law and the CBI Manual, has rightly dismissed the Petition filed under Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act, by the Petitioner/A1, by a detailed and reasoned order, which warrants no interference by this Court.

29.In the result, this Criminal Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected MP is closed.

Srcm

Crl.RC.No.357 of 2019

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

1.Today, after pronouncement of the order, the learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI would make a submission, stating that the case before the Trial Court is of the year 2014 and that out of 46 witnesses, 42 witnesses have been examined and that a direction may be issued to the Trial Court to complete the trial, within a specified period.

2.The learned senior counsel for the Petitioner/A1 would further submit that at no point of time, the Petitioner had been the cause for delaying the case and he has cross examined all the witnesses on the same day of their examination in chief and that if a specified time is fixed, generally, the lower courts insist that the case has to be completed with a particular time frame and there is a chance that the Petitioner may not be given sufficient opportunity to examine the witnesses on his side.

3. In view of the above, this Court passes the following directions:-

   i. The Petitioner shall file an affidavit before the Trial Court to the effect he will cooperate for the completion of the trial.

   ii. The Trial Court shall conclude the trial, as expeditiously as possible, giving sufficient opportunity to the Petitioner, by allowing him to examine the defence witnesses on his side, if sought for.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy//
Sub Assistant Registrar

srcm

To:

1. The Inspector of Police, CBI,
   Anti Corruption Branch, Chennai-6

2. The Public Prosecutor,
   High Court, Madras

3. The XII Additional Special Judge
   for CBI Cases, Chennai.

4. The Section Officer,
   Criminal Section,
   High Court, Madras-104.

+2cc to Mr.C.Arunkumar, Advocate SR.74212

Crl.RC.No.357 of 2019

VBA(CO)
CB(17/10/2019)