



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED : 19.07.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SATHYANARAYANAN
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Criminal Appeal (MD)No.36 of 2018

Ganesan

... Appellant/ Sole Accused

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Kenikarai Police Station,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.
Crime No.156/2012

... Respondent/ Complainant

Prayer : Appeal filed under Section 374 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, against the judgment and order passed in S.C.No.77 of 2013, dated 16.06.2017, by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram.

For Appellant : Mr.R.Anand


For Respondent : Mr.S.Chandrasekar
Additional Public Prosecutor

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by M.SATHYANARAYANAN,J.)

The sole accused in S.C.No.77 of 2013 on the file of the Additional District and Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram, is the appellant. The appellant/accused stood charged and tried for the commission of the offence under Section 302 I.P.C. and vide impugned judgment dated 16.06.2017, he was found guilty for the commission of the said offence and was convicted to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only), in default, to undergo simple imprisonment for one year. The trial Court has also granted set off under Section 428 Cr.P.C. The appellant/accused aggrieved by the conviction and sentence awarded vide impugned judgment, has filed this appeal.


2. Facts leading to the filing of the present appeal, briefly narrated and necessary for the disposal of this appeal, are as follows:



2.1. The appellant/accused is the husband of P.W.2 and son-in-law of P.W.1. P.W.1 is the mother of the deceased, namely, Muthukumar. There was a matrimonial discard between the appellant/accused and his wife - P.W.2 with regard to the house gifted as *sridhana* and therefore, the appellant/accused is used to ill-treat his wife, namely, P.W.2. The appellant/accused also used to demand her 5 more sovereigns of gold jewels and since the said demand was not acceded to, used to physically abuse his wife - P.W.2. The prosecution also states that the appellant/accused, his wife - P.W.2, his mother-in-law - P.W.1 and his brother-in-law - deceased Muthukumar used to live together at Manjana Mariamman Kovil Street, Chakkarakottai, Ramanathapuram.

2.2. The appellant/accused, on 29.03.2012, at about 06.30 p.m., had a wordy altercation with his wife - P.W.2 with regard to his demand of 5 sovereigns of gold jewels. The son of P.W.1, namely, Muthukumar came to the house at 09.00 p.m., on the same day and told him that they are unable to meet his demand and in reply, the appellant/accused told him that by morning, he will finish him off and accordingly, went out of the house. P.W.1, P.W.2 and Muthukumar (deceased), after taking food slept. P.W.1, at about 06.00 a.m., on 30.03.2012, went out and when she returned, she saw the appellant/accused putting grinder stone upon the head of her son - Muthukumar and when she raised alarm, her daughter - P.W.2 came inside. The deceased Muthukumar - son of P.W.1, on account of sustainment of grievous injuries, started bleeding and upon hearing the cry and alarm, P.W.2 and neighbours came and the services of 108 Ambulance were summoned and the injured Muthukumar was initially taken to the Government Hospital, Ramanathapuram and thereafter, they were advised to take him to Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai and he was admitted therein. P.W.8, who was the Special Sub Inspector of Police, in-charge of Kenikarai Police Station, at about 13.00 hours, received the intimation from the Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai and proceeded to the Hospital and since the injured Muthukumar was in unconscious state, he recorded the statement of his mother - P.W.1 and thereafter, returned to the Police Station and registered the F.I.R., in Cr.No.156 of 2012 at about 05.00 a.m., on 31.03.2012 for the commission of the offence under Section 307 I.P.C. The printed F.I.R., was marked as Ex.P.5. P.W.8 despatched the original of Ex.P.1 - complaint and Ex.P.5 - F.I.R to the jurisdictional Magistrate Court and also sent the copies to the official superiors.

2.3. P.W.16 - Inspector of Police, on receipt of the F.I.R., commenced the investigation and at about 05.30 a.m., on 31.03.2012 went to the scene of crime and in the presence of P.W.7 - and one Thiagarajan prepared the Observation Mahazar - Ex.P.3 and Rough Sketch - Ex.P.12. P.W.16 recovered M.O.3 - blood stained cement slab pieces and M.O.4 - cement slab pieces under a cover of mahazar marked as Ex.P.13. P.W.16 received an intimation at about 08.15 a.m., on 31.03.2012 that the injured without responding to the treatment died and upon receipt of the death intimation from the Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai, altered the case from Section 307 I.P.C., to Section 302 I.P.C and through P.W.10, sent the



alteration report to the Court of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram. P.W.16 had examined one Sarasu, P.W.3 - Sathiya, P.W.4 - Shanmugavalli and four other witnesses separately and recorded their statements under Section 161(3) Cr.P.C. and on the same day, at Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai, recorded the statements of P.W.1, P.W.2 and two other witnesses. P.W.16, in the presence of Panchayatdars had conducted inquest at 16.00 hours at the mortuary of the said Hospital and the inquest report was marked as Ex.P.14.

2.4. P.W.16 sent a requisition to P.W.9 to conduct the post-mortem on the body of the deceased and accordingly, his body was taken to Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai. P.W.13 was the Tutor in Forensic Medicine, Madurai Medical College, Madurai and commenced the post-mortem at about 10.45 a.m., at 01.04.2012 and noted the following features:

"Appearances found at the postmortem:

Moderately nourished body of a male aged about 26 years. Finger and toe nails blue.

The following ante mortem injuries are noted on the body:

1. Bleeding through both ears are noted.
2. Abrasion of size 3 cm X 2 cm noted on the right temporal region of scalp.

On dissection of scalp, skull and dura:


A linear fracture of size 10 cm x 1 cm noted in left temporal region. A curvilinear fracture of size 8 cm x 1 cm noted in the right temporal region of skull. A linear fracture of size 7 cm x 1 cm noted in the left middle cranial fossa. Diffused subdural hemorrhage & subarachnoid hemorrhage noted over both the cerebral hemispheres. Laceration of size 6 cm x 2 cm x 1 cm is noted in right temporal area of brain.

OTHER FINDINGS:

Peritoneal cavity - empty; Pleural cavities - empty; Pericardium - contains 15 ml of straw colour fluid; Heart - right side fluid blood, left side empty; coronaries - patent; Lungs - cut section congested; Larynx & trachea - normal; Hyoid bone - intact; Stomach - contains 100 ml of brown colour fluid, nil specific smell, mucosa - normal; Liver, Spleen & kidneys - cut section congested; Small intestine - contains 20 ml of bile stained fluid, nil specific smell, mucosa - normal; Bladder - empty; Brain - described;" [extracted as such]

2.5. P.W.13, after concluding the post-mortem, has opined, "The deceased would appear to have died of cranio cerebral injuries." and accordingly, issued the post-mortem certificate marked as Ex.P.9.

2.6. P.W.16 effected the arrest of the appellant/accused at 05.30 a.m., on 01.04.2012 and at about 06.00 a.m., the appellant/accused voluntarily gave a confession statement in the presence of the Village Administrative Officer - P.W.6 and one Mahalingam and as per the admissible portion of the confession statement, marked as Ex.P.2, M.O.2 - lungi worn by the appellant/accused was recovered and it was sent to the jurisdictional Magistrate Court under Form 95 and thereafter, sent



requisition for conducting biological and serological examination and the biological report and serology report were marked as Exs.P.10 and P.11 respectively. P.W.16 examined P.W.11 to P.W.13 on 25.06.2012 and recorded their statements and also examined P.W.14 in connection with Exs.P.10 and P.11 and also examined P.W.15 - Head Clerk attached to the Court of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram. P.W.16, upon completion of investigation and after obtaining the opinion from the learned Public Prosecutor, has filed the final report/charge sheet before the Court of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram, charging the appellant/accused for the offence under Section 302 I.P.C., and it was filed on 29.07.2012. The Court of Judicial Magistrate No.II, took it on file in P.R.C.No.3 of 2013.

2.7. The Committal Court, upon filing of the final report, issued summons to the appellant/accused and on his appearance, furnished to him the documents under Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The Committal Court having found that the case is exclusively triable by the Court of Session, committed the case to the Principal District and Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram, which in turn, made over the case to the file of the Additional District and Sessions Court, Ramanathapuram, which has taken it on file in S.C.No.77 of 2013 and on appearance of the accused, framed the charge under Section 302 I.P.C., and questioned him. The appellant/accused pleaded not guilty to the charge framed against him and prayed for trial of the case.

2.8. The prosecution in order to sustain their case, examined P.W.1 to P.W.16, marked Exs.P.1 to P.14 and also marked M.O.1 to M.O.4.


2.9. The appellant/accused was questioned under Section 313 (1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, with regard to the incriminating circumstances made out against him in the evidence tendered by the prosecution and he denied it as false.

2.10. On behalf of the accused, neither oral nor documentary evidence was let in.

2.11. The trial Court on consideration of the oral and documentary evidence and other materials, found him guilty under Section 302 I.P.C., and convicted and sentenced the appellant/accused as stated above and challenging the legality of the conviction and sentence awarded vide impugned judgment, the appellant/accused has preferred this Criminal Appeal.

3. Mr.R.Anand, learned Counsel for the appellant/accused made the following submissions:

Though the occurrence took place on 30.03.2012 at about 06.30 a.m., the statement of P.W.1 was recorded on the next day, i.e., on 31.03.2012 and the delay in registering the F.I.R has not been explained. Though P.W.1 after witnessing the occurrence raised an alarm and neighbours gathered, they have not been examined except P.W.3 and P.W.4 and they did not support the case of the prosecution and the eyewitnesses are, admittedly, close relatives of the deceased and as such, it is not safe to rely upon the said



testimonies to record conviction and sentence. Admittedly, prior to the date and time of the occurrence, on the earlier day, i.e., 29.03.2012 at about 06.30 p.m., there was a wordy altercation between the appellant/accused and P.W.2, that was witnessed by P.W.1 and even it is also the case of the prosecution that on account of matrimonial discard, P.W.2 started living separately in the house of P.W.1 and in the absence of any corroborating materials, the evidence of P.W.1 cannot be believed at all. The injured was taken to Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai, from Government Hospital, Ramanathapuram, through one Panchu and he was not examined and despite his statement was recorded, his statement is totally contradictory and since the earliest version with regard to the alleged commission of the offence has been totally and deliberately suppressed, the entire edifice of prosecution had fallen and the testimony of P.W.12 - Casualty Medical Officer attached to the Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai, would also sustain the fact that the injured was accompanied by one Panchu, who was not examined by P.W.16 - Investigating Officer. There was a delay on the part of P.W.16 to record the statement of P.W.1 and the arrest and recovery are also doubtful. P.W.6 - Village Administrative Officer had spoken about the alleged recovery. The evidence of P.W.6 cannot be believed at all for the reason that he is an official of the Government and he always supports the prosecution case and in sum and substance, it is the submission of the learned Counsel for the appellant/accused that since the case of the prosecution bristles with very many inconsistencies and improbabilities, the trial Court ought to have awarded the benefit of doubt and acquitted him and therefore, prays for allowing this appeal.

4. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State has drawn the attention of this Court to the testimonies of witnesses and would submit that the appellant/accused is also equally close relative of P.W.1, namely, mother-in-law and P.W.2 - his wife and especially, P.W.2 had no axe to grind against the appellant/accused and despite there is a matrimonial discard, relationship continues to exist and there is no compulsion or necessity for them to implicate the appellant/accused. The testimony of P.W.1 is in tune with Ex.P.1 - complaint given by her and it is amply corroborated through the evidence of P.W.2 - wife of the appellant/accused supported by scientific evidence and the trial Court, on proper appreciation and consideration of entire materials available on record, has rightly reached the conclusion to convict and sentence the appellant/accused in commensurate with the gravity of the offence and prays for the dismissal of this appeal.

5. This Court has paid it's best attention and anxious consideration to the rival submissions and also perused the materials available on record.

6. The questions that arise for consideration, are:

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>
 (1) Whether the prosecution through oral and documentary evidence and other materials, had sustained its case? and



(ii) Whether the reasons assigned in the impugned judgment are sustainable?

7. P.W.1 is the mother-in-law of the appellant/accused and mother of P.W.2. She would depose about the matrimonial discard between her daughter - P.W.2 and the appellant/accused and physical abuse inflicted upon her daughter - P.W.2 on account of demand of 5 sovereigns of gold jewels. She would also depose that one day prior to the occurrence, i.e., on 29.03.2012, at about 06.30 p.m., the appellant/accused once again demanded 5 sovereigns of gold jewels and when there was a wordy altercation between him and P.W.2 - his wife, her son - Muthukumar came to the house at the relevant point of time and also castigated him and refused to his demand and enraged by the same, the appellant/accused threatened to finish him.


8. It is the categorical testimony of P.W.1 that on 30.03.2012 at about 06.00 a.m., when she went outside and returned, she saw the appellant/accused putting grinder stone upon the head of her son - Muthukumar and when she raised alarm, her daughter - P.W.2 came inside the house and so also, the neighbours and P.W.4 and others and the services of 108 Ambulance were summoned and initially, he was taken to Government Hospital, Ramanathapuram and he was treated by P.W.11 who found that he was unconscious and considering the physical condition, asked the persons who brought him, to get him immediately admitted in Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai and also issued Ex.P.7 - Accident Register.

9. The primordial submission made by the learned Counsel for the petitioner is that the statement of the person who accommodated the injured has not been recorded by P.W.11. It is to be noted at this juncture that the duty of the Casualty Medical Officer is to note down the injuries in the Accident Register and he is not concerned whether the person admitted in the hospital was attacked by known or unknown persons and even assuming that the names of such persons are recorded, still it cannot be used either by the prosecution or by the witnesses. It is also relevant to refer to the decision of Division Bench of this Court in **Annamalai v. State** reported in **(2007) 1 MLJ (Cr1) 319**, wherein it is held as follows:

"The Madras Medical Code (Vol.I) Section 10 paragraph-622 gives guidelines or instructions to the doctor as to how the columns in wound certificate are to be filled up. Para-622 (vi) reads:

"Medical officer should ascertain and incorporate in the certificate only the alleged cause as to the manner in which the injuries were inflicted, the weapon used and the time."

The Medical Officer should ascertain the cause of the injury, weapon used, time, etc. thereby showing no power is vested upon the Medical Officer, to ascertain from the injured or the person accompanied the injured, who is the cause for the assault, whether it is known or unknown even. The doctor is concerned, to ascertain and incorporate in the certificate, how the injuries were inflicted and what is the weapon used, including the time, so as to find out, at later point of time, whether the injury would have been caused by



the weapon produced on behalf of the prosecution said to have been used by the assailants on the basis of the recovery, if any. In this view, if the doctor had incorporated about the statement made by the person who brought the deceased, that can be ignored, which appears to be the dictum of the Apex Court also in *Basheer v. State* 1993 Cr1.L.J. 2173."


10. When P.W.1 was in the Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai, on receipt of the intimation, P.W.8 - Special Sub Inspector of Police attached to Kenikarai Police Station went to the said hospital and recorded the statement of P.W.1 under Ex.P.1 and initially, registered the case under Section 307 I.P.C. The original of Ex.P.1 - complaint and Ex.P.5 - F.I.R., had been despatched to the jurisdictional Magistrate Court without any loss of time. P.W.16 - Investigating Officer, upon receipt of the death intimation, altered the case from Section 307 I.P.C., to Section 302 I.P.C.

11. It is also the submission of the learned Counsel for the appellant/accused that P.W.2 cannot be cited as an eyewitness for the reason that she did not see the actual overt act on the part of the appellant/accused and as per her testimony, she saw her husband standing with grinding stone outside the house.

12. It is also pointed out by the learned Counsel for the appellant/accused that as per Exs.P.4 and P.13 - recovery mahazars with regard to the recovery in the scene of crime, P.W.16 - Investigating Officer, in the cross-examination, would admit that P.W.2 in the course of examination during investigation, did not state that she came out and saw her husband having grinding stone and as such, her statement cannot be believed.

13. Admittedly, the grinding stone was recovered from the scene of crime inside the house and though P.W.2 would state that upon hearing the alarm raised by her mother, she rushed and saw her husband in possession of grinding stone, she did not say the same in her statement during the course of investigation. P.W.16 would further state in the cross-examination that P.W.1 during the course of examination did not state about raising alarm and in response to the same, her daughter - P.W.2 came. The said portion of the testimony of P.W.2 is a clear improvement from that of her statement recorded during investigation and it is a material contradiction and in the opinion of this Court, P.W.2 would not have witnessed the actual commission of the crime.

14. Now, coming to the testimony of P.W.1, her testimony appears to be natural and in consonance with her complaint, marked as Ex.P.1. Though it is the vehement submission of the learned Counsel for the appellant/accused that since she is an interested witness, in the absence of supporting evidence, the same cannot be believed, this Court is of the opinion that it is the quality of the matter alone and not quantity and it is also to be noted at this juncture that P.W.1 is equally close to the appellant/accused being



her son-in-law. She knew pretty well about the consequences by sending him behind the bars and in future, her daughter would also be affected. Despite that, she had spoken about the overt act on the part of the appellant/accused cogently. Though P.W.3 and P.W.4 - neighbours, turned hostile, the testimony of P.W.13, who conducted the autopsy, coupled with Ex.P.9 - post-mortem certificate, would reveal that the deceased died on account of homicidal violence pursuant to the overt act on the part of the appellant/accused.


15. It is also to be noted at this juncture that the occurrence took place on 30.03.2012 and P.W.1 was examined on 03.07.2014 and her evidence was closed and on petition filed on behalf of the appellant/accused, she was recalled and cross-examination was done after four months on 25.11.2014. On account of passage of time, there is bound to be some discrepancy, but the said discrepancy is trivial and minor in nature and did not affect the core of the prosecution.

16. It is also the submission of the learned Counsel for the appellant/accused that since there are very many inconsistencies and improbabilities in the prosecution case projected, the trial Court ought to have awarded the benefit of doubt. However, the said submission is liable to be rejected for the reason that the evidence should be judged and analysed on the basis of quality and it is also relevant to extract hereunder paragraph 23 of the decision in **State of Punjab v. Jagir Singh** reported in **(1974) 3 Supreme Court Cases 277**:

"23. A criminal trial is not like a fairy tale wherein one is free to give flight to one's imagination and phantasy. It concerns itself with the question as to whether the accused arraigned at the trial is guilty of the crime with which he is charged. Crime is an event in real life and is the product of interplay of different human emotions. In arriving at the conclusion about the guilt of the accused charged with the commission of a crime, the court has to judge the evidence by the yardstick of probabilities, its intrinsic worth and the animus of witnesses. Every case in the final analysis would have to depend upon its own facts. Although the benefit of every reasonable doubt should be given to the accused, the courts should not at the same time reject evidence which is ex facie trustworthy on grounds which are fanciful or in the nature of conjectures."

17. In **State of H.P. v. Lekh Raj and another** reported in **(2000) 1 Supreme Court Cases 247**, in paragraph 10, it is observed as follows:

"The criminal trial cannot be equated with a mock scene from a stunt film. The legal trial is conducted to ascertain the guilt or innocence of the accused arraigned. In arriving at a conclusion about the truth, the courts are required to adopt a rational approach and judge the evidence by its intrinsic worth and the animus of the witnesses. The hypertechnicalities or figment of imagination should not be allowed to divest the court of its



responsibility of sifting and weighing the evidence to arrive at the conclusion regarding the existence or otherwise of a particular circumstance keeping in view the peculiar facts of each case, the social position of the victim and the accused, the larger interests of the society particularly the law and order problem and degrading values of life inherent in the prevalent system. The realities of life have to be kept in mind while appreciating the evidence for arriving at the truth. The courts are not obliged to make efforts either to give latitude to the prosecution or loosely construe the law in favour of the accused. The traditional dogmatic hypertechnical approach has to be replaced by a rational, realistic and genuine approach for administering justice in a criminal trial. Criminal jurisprudence cannot be considered to be a utopian thought but have to be considered as part and parcel of the human civilization and the realities of life. The courts cannot ignore the erosion in values of life which are a common feature of the present system. Such erosions cannot be given a bonus in favour of those who are guilty of polluting society and mankind."

18. P.W.1 is a rural woman and a rustic witness. She is not under any compulsion to implicate her son-in-law, namely, the appellant/accused falsely and her testimony is amply corroborated by the materials through the other evidence and it is also believable and trustworthy.

19. This Court has also come across very many cases where after deferment of cross-examination or after closure of chief examination, applications under Section 309 Cr.P.C., were filed belatedly and so, those applications were entertained as a matter of course and in the interregnum, especially, the eyewitnesses were won over who turned hostile and did not stick on to the version in the chief examination.

20. In **Doongar Singh v. State of Rajasthan** reported in **2017 (13) SCALE 752**, the Honourable Supreme Court had considered the scope of Section 309 Cr.P.C., and after referring to the decisions in **Mohd. Khalid v. State of W.B** reported in **(2002) 7 Supreme Court Cases 334**; **Vinod Kumar v. State of Punjab** reported in **(2015) 3 Supreme Court Cases 220**; and **State of U.P. v. Shambhu Nath Singh and others** reported in **(2001) 4 Supreme Court Cases 667**, in paragraph 13, concluded as follows:


"13. To conclude:

(i) The trial Courts must carry out the mandate of Section 309 of the Cr.P.C., as reiterated in judgments of this Court, *inter alia*, in *State of U.P., versus Shambhu Nath Singh and others* [(2001) 4 SCC 667], *Mohd. Khalid versus State of W.B.*, [(2002) 7 SCC 334] and *Vinod Kumar versus State of Punjab* [(2015) 3 SCC 220].

(ii) The eye-witnesses must be examined by the prosecution as soon as possible.

(iii) Statements of eye-witnesses should invariably be recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., as per procedure prescribed thereunder."

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



In the very same decision, in paragraphs 14 and 15, it was observed, "The High Courts may issue appropriate directions to the trial courts for compliance of the above and a copy of this order be sent by the Secretary General to the Registrars of all the High Courts for being forwarded to all the presiding officers in their respective jurisdiction."

21. Therefore, the Registry in compliance of the above cited decision of the Honourable Supreme Court, shall place a Note before the Honourable the Chief Justice for appropriate orders for issuance of guidelines/circulars to all the Presiding Officers who are exercising criminal jurisdiction.

22. As already pointed out, the investigation has commenced without any loss of time and Ex.P.1 - complaint and Ex.P.5 - F.I.R had also been despatched to the jurisdictional Magistrate Court without any loss of time and there is no possibility of interpolation in the said documents for the reason that the person implicated is the appellant/accused who is none other than the son-in-law of P.W.1 and husband of P.W.2. The motive for the commission of the offence had been spoken to by P.W.1 and P.W.2 with regard to the demand of dowry and the said aspect has also been spoken to by P.W.5 - elder sister of P.W.2.

23. It is also settled position of law that conviction can also be recorded based on the sole testimony of eyewitness provided, that inspires confidence and trustworthy. In the case on hand, this Court is of the view that P.W.1 had spoken the truth and it is also amply corroborated through the other evidence and the trial Court was right in reaching the conclusion to convict and sentence the appellant/accused accordingly. The trial Court had properly considered the materials and appreciated the oral and documentary evidence in proper perspective and as such, the impugned judgment is to be confirmed.

24. In the result, this Criminal Appeal is dismissed, confirming the conviction and sentence awarded vide judgment made in S.C.No.77 of 2013, dated 16.06.2017, by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (Records)

/TRUE COPY/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Court of Additional District and Sessions Judge,
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>
Ramanathapuram.



2.The Inspector of Police,
Kenikarai Police Station,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

4.The Registrar General,
High Court, Madras.

5.The Registrar (Judicial),
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

COPY TO:

THE SECTION OFFICER,
CRIMINAL RECORDS SECTION,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
(2 COPIES)

Criminal Appeal (MD)No.36 of 2018
19.07.2019

RSB

JM/08.08.2019/11P-8C