BAIL SLIP

Rajangam, S/o. Krishnasamy, Appellant/Accused was released on Bail vide Court order dated 28.04.2014, made in MP(MD)No.1 of 2014 in Crl A(MD)No.145 of 2014.

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
RESERVED ON : 30.09.2019
PRONOUNCED ON : 20.12.2019
CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Crl.A.(MD)No.145 of 2014

Rajangam ...Appellant/ Accused

Vs.

State through
The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption,
Theni.
[Crime No.15 of 2006] ...Respondent/complainant

Prayer: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records, hear the Counsel for the appellant / accused, allow this appeal and set aside the order passed by the Special Judge for Prevention of Corruption Act, Cases, Madurai by his judgment in Spl.C.No.85 of 2011, dated 10.04.2014.

For Appellant : Mr.Shanmuga Sundaram,
Senior Counsel
for Mr.S.Jayakumar

For Respondent : Mr.K.K.Ramakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

J U D G M E N T

The appeal is arising out of the conviction and sentence imposed by the Special Court for trial of cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, Madurai in S.C.No.85 of 2011. By order dated 10.04.2010, the trial Court found the appellant guilty for the offence punishable under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, convicted and sentenced him to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment with a fine of Rs.1000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo simple imprisonment for one month. The appellant was also found guilty for the offence punishable under Section 13(2) r/w 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, convicted and sentenced to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment with a fine of Rs.1000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo simple imprisonment for one month and the above said sentences are ordered to run concurrently.

2.The case of the prosecution in brief is as follows:

(i) The appellant working as an Area Supervisor at A-1191, Uthamapalayam Co-Operative Primary Agricultural and Rural Bank from 21.06.1999 to 11.06.2006. The defacto complainant [PW2], namely, Manikandan, S/O.Suruli, a resident of Anaipatty Village, Uthamapalayam Taluk obtained agricultural loan of Rs.1,71,000/- from the appellant's Bank during August 1998 by mortgaging his land in favour of the Bank through mortgage deed and repaid a sum of Rs.1,26,000/- till March 2006. On 13.05.2006, the Government of Tamil Nadu waived the agricultural loans obtained by the farmers, based on the decision of the Government,Uthamapalayam CO-Operative Primary Agricultural and Rural Bank Limited waived the agricultural loan obtained by the farmers, wherein PW2 is also one of the beneficiaries and the waiver certificate [ExP19] was handed over to PW2 by the appellant at his residence and PW2 asked the appellant to return the original documents, for which, the appellant instructed PW2 to meet him at his office on the next day.

(ii) Accordingly, PW2 met the appellant at his office on 11.09.2006 and the appellant handed over the original documents to PW2, who in turn, requested the appellant to send a letter to the Sub Registrar, Uthamapalayam for redemption of the mortgage deed executed by him, for doing so, the appellant demanded a sum of Rs.3,000/- from PW2. When PW2 had expressed his inability to pay the amount as demanded by the appellant, he reduced the demand to Rs.1,500/- and informed him that only on payment of the demanded amount, the appellant would send a letter for redemption of mortgage to the Sub Registrar. Then on 14.09.2006 at about 5.00pm, PW2 contacted the appellant over phone and the appellant informed him that only if he pays the sum of Rs.1,500/-, he would take steps for redemption of mortgage.

(iii)As defacto complainant [PW2] was not interested in paying the bribe amount, he lodged a complaint [ExP2] before the Vigilance and Anti Corruption, Madurai Wing on 15.09.2006 at about 11.00am. On receipt of the complaint, the Inspector of Police [TLO], Vigilance and Anticorruption, Madurai registered a case in Crime No.15 of 2006 against the appellant for the offence under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The printed FIR is marked as [ExP3]. He also informed his higher officials about the nature of the complaint.

(iv)The TLO requested for some staff from the Taluk Office, Madurai and Office of the Executive Engineer, PWD, Madurai for organising a Trap and accordingly, one Laksmikanthan [PW3], Revenue Inspector and one Sirumanidoss, Assistant were present before him and the TLO gave a copy of the FIR [ExP3] for knowing the complaint and they also enquired the complainant about the complaint. The TLO obtained Rs.1,500/- [Rs.500 X 2 and Rs.100 X 5] from the complainant, which was meant for giving to the appellant and the serial number of the currencies were noted down in the entrustment mahazar [ExP4] and they conducted a pre-trap demonstration in the presence of the complainant [PW2], official witnesses [PW3] and other Police parties. The said Rs.1,500/- coated with phenolphthalein powder was handed over to PW2 for giving to the appellant. The TLO instructed PW2 to meet the appellant at his office and if the appellant demands money, then only he should give the money. Then they all reached Uthamapalayam.

(v)PW2 along with PW3 went to the office of the appellant around 5.30 pm on 15.09.2006, but the office was locked. When the appellant was contacted through his mobile number, he told PW2 to meet him on the next day with Rs.1,500/- as demanded. Therefore, they left the place and the TLO planned for a trap on the next day and except PW2, all others returned to the Vigilance and Anti Corruption Office, Madurai and noted down the happenings [ExP5] and the same was attested by the witnesses including the TLO.

(vi)Then on 16.09.2006, the team left for Uthamapalayam and en route, PW2 joined them around 10.10am and PW2 informed the TLO that the appellant called him in the morning over phone and demanded Rs.1,500/- and the appellant directed him to stay at a tea stall at the corner of the Uthamapalayam Bus stand and inform him. The TLO asked him to act according to the instructions of the appellant. Accordingly, PW2 along with PW3 official witness reached the said tea stall, namely, Devi tea stall and informed the appellant over phone. Around 10.25am the appellant also reached the said tea stall. PW2 complainant enquired about the cancellation of the mortgage deed, the appellant demanded the money, after his demand, PW2 handed over the phenolphthalein coated money of Rs.1,500/- to the appellant. The appellant received the same and placed it in his shirt pocket. The appellant called some body over phone and informed that PW2 would come on Monday and asked to cancel the mortgage.

(vi) After receipt of the bribe amount by the appellant, PW2 gave the pre arranged signal to the TLO. On noticing the signal, the police party reached the tea stall and caught hold of the appellant. Thereafter, the appellant was taken to his office, where the Special Officer Jeyaseelan was present [PW4] and the hands of the appellant were subjected to the phenolphthalein test separately and the solution turned into pink in colour and the said solutions were recovered in separate bottles [MOs.4 & 5] and the same was attested by the appellant, witnesses and the TLO.

(vii) On enquiry, the appellant, admitted before the TLO that he obtained Rs.1,500/- [MOs1 and 2] as bribe from PW2 and taken the money from his shirt pocket and the same tallied with the entrustment mahazar [ExP4]. The appellant's shirt pocket was also subjected to phenolphthalein test through sodium carbonate solution and the solution turned into pink in colour and the same was collected in a bottle [MO6] and from the appellant's pants pocket ExP11 [a paper containing the details of the loan was recovered, wherein the loan details of the appellant were mentioned. The Special Officer was also cited as a witness PW5. Then the TLO collected ExP12 the original waiver certificate. He also prepared recovery mahazar [ExP7] and rough sketch [ExP13] and the same was attested by the appellant, the Special Officer and the TLO. He collected the exhibits and subsequently, he sent a search intimation for searching the house of the appellant to the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Theni and on 16.09.2006 at 3.45pm to 4.45 pm and prepared a report and obtained the signatures of the appellant and submitted to the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Theni and the appellant was arrested and released on bail by the TLO.

(viii) The TLO placed all the materials collected before the Investigating Officer Rajaram and he conducted preliminary investigation and PW12 M.Muthuraj is the subsequent investigating officer in this case and after completion of the investigation, he filed a final report against the appellant on 29.11.2007 for the offence under Sections 7 and 13 (2) read with 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, before the Special Court for trial of cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, Madurai and the same was taken on file in S.C.No.74 of 2011.

3.During trial On the side of the prosecution 12 witnesses were examined, 22 documents were marked and 6 material objects were produced.

4.The available prosecution evidence are as follows:

(i) PW1 is the then Special Officer (Additional charge) at A-1191 Uthamapalayam Co-Operative Primary Agricultural and Rural Bank Limited and he has accorded sanction [ExP1] for prosecuting the appellant.

(ii) PW2 is the defacto complainant and he speaks about the demand and the acceptance of the bribe amount by the appellant for redemption of mortgage and lodging of complaint[ExP2] before the Vigilance and Anticorruption Wing, Madurai.

(iii) PW3 is the official witness, he speaks about the demand and acceptance of the money by the appellant from the PW2 at a tea stall near Uthamapalayam bus stand.

(iv) PW4 is the then Special Officer, Uthamapalayam Co-Operative Primary Agricultural and Rural Bank Limited, in whose presence the appellant admitted that he received the bribe money and the phenolphthalein test was conducted on the hands and shirt pocket of the appellant.

(v) PW5 is the Secretary of the Uthamapalayam Co-Operative Primary Agricultural and Rural Bank Limited and he speaks about the waiver of the agricultural loan and he is the authority to sign in the waiver certificates.

(vi)PW6 is a Document Writer, he speaks about the appellant contacting him over phone on 16.09.2006 and informing him to prepare cancellation deed.

(vii)PW7 is the Supplier at Devi tea stall, he speaks about the arrival of the appellant to his tea stall around 10.30 during September 2006.

(viii)PW8 is the Scientific Assistant at Forensic Science Department, Chennai and she speaks about the presence of the phenolphthalein in MOs.4 to 6 and issuance of chemical analysis report [ExP8].

(ix) PW9 is the then Head Clerk, who speaks about the request made for sending the MOs.4 to 6 for chemical analysis.

(x)PW10 is the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anticorruption, Madurai Wing [TLO] and he speaks about the complaint lodged by PW2, registration of FIR, summoning of official witness, preparation of entrustment mahazar and the trap executed by him and the preparation of observation mahazar and rough sketch and the arrest of the appellant in the presence of the official witness and Police party.

(xi)PW11 is the investigation officer in this case, who conducted preliminary enquiry in this case.

(xii)PW12 is the subsequent investigating officer in this case, who filed the final report.

5.After completion of the prosecution side evidence, the incriminating circumstances were put before the appellant and the same was denied as false. On the side of the appellant one witness was examined as DW1.

6.The trial Court, after completion of the trial and after hearing the arguments on either side, found the appellant guilty, convicted and sentenced as stated supra. As against the conviction and sentence, the appellant has preferred the present appeal.

7.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant has raised the following points.

(i) According to the defacto complainant, he met the appellant on 11.09.2006 and he returned all the original documents to PW2, who in turn, asked the appellant to cancel the mortgage deed, for which, the accused is alleged to have demanded a sum of Rs.3,000/- and reduced the same to Rs.1,500/-. But in his statement PW2, has not mentioned the date of initial demand, contrarily, he has mentioned the demand in the complaint [ExP2]. So it can be assumed that the demand was made on 11.09.2006. But, it is absolutely false. According to the prosecution, the original documents ExP20 to ExP22 were returned to PW2, wherein, the date mentioned below the signature has been stricken off. According to DW1, the Secretary of the appellant's bank, the original documents were handed over to PW2 on 14.09.2006. Therefore, the prosecution has failed to prove the initial demand.

(ii) It is stated that PW2 contacted the appellant on 14.09.2006 over phone. When, the original documents were returned to PW2 on 14.09.2006, there is no necessity for PW2, to contact the appellant on the same day. But, in this case no call details either of the appellant or PW2 complainant were collected to establish that PW2 contacted the appellant over phone on 14.09.2006, 15.09.2006 and 16.09.2006.

(iii) It is the case of the prosecution that on 16.09.2006, the appellant came to the tea stall and reiterated the demand to PW2 and it was overheard by PW3. But, PW2 and PW3 have not stated so, before the Investigating Officer [PW11] and he also admitted that PW2 and PW3 did not state about the reiterated demand and but before the Court, PW2 and PW3 admitted that they stated about the reiterated demanded on 16.0.2006. Therefore, it is the improved version of PW2 and PW3 and the prosecution has failed to prove the demand by the appellant either on 11.09.2019, 14.09.2019 or 16.09.2019.

(iv) PW3 has deposed that he came to know about the appellant only when PW2 identified the accused to the Police. Therefore, from this it is clear that PW2 did not notice what had happened between PW2 and the accused till the Police arrived and hence, the reiterated demand on 16.09.2006 has not been proved by the prosecution.

(v) PW4 and PW5 admitted in their evidence that the Secretary of the Bank alone has the power to give the letter and according to PW5, the loanee has to produce the cancellation deed before the bank and on such production, the Secretary would recommend for cancellation of the mortgage. This statement is also corroborated by PW6 document writer. Therefore, the motive or reward for receipt of the alleged bribe has not been established by the prosecution.

(vi) In any event, only on proof of voluntary acceptance of illegal gratification the presumption can be drawn under Section 20 of the PC Act. The voluntary acceptance of illegal gratification will arise only when the demand is proved. In this case the demand has not been proved.

(vii) Mere recovery of money, in the absence of demand would not attract the presumption under the Prevention of Corruption Act.

(viii) According to the appellant, the agricultural loan for a sum of Rs.1,71,000/- was sanctioned to PW2. The same would be distributed into four installment and two installments to the tune of Rs.1,21,000/- were disbursed to PW2. The Supervisor after ensuring the loan amount are utilised properly, would recommend for disbursement remaining installments. In this case, the appellant being the Supervisor did not recommend for release of remaining amount. Therefore, PW2 had animosity against the appellant. The appellant had collected a sum of Rs.20,000/-, after the issuance of Government Order for waiving the loan on 13.05.2006. The Special Officer [PW4] categorically stated that till the communication is received from the Government, the bank would recover the loan amount. PW2 had also insisted the appellant to return the money. DW1 has stated that PW2 had quarrelled with the appellant at his office. Therefore, PW2 had animosity and strong motive against the appellant. The appellant had also explained that the money was inserted by PW2 in his shirt pocket. In the given circumstances, the explanation offered by the appellant cannot be ignored.

(xi)The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant relied on the following judgments:

(i) Rakesh Kapoor Vs State of Himachal Pradesh, reported (2012) 13 SCC 552.

(ii)N.Sukanna Vs State of Andrha Pradesh, reported (2016) 1 SCC 713.

(iii) B.Jayaraj Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh, reported in (2014) 13 SCC 55.

8.Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State submitted that the prosecution has established its case through the evidence of the witnesses.

9.The demand is proved by the prosecution. PW2 defacto complainant in his complaint ExP1 stated that on 11.09.2006 at 11.30 am, he approached the accused officer for sending a letter for cancellation of mortgage deed. The accused officer demanded a sum of Rs.3,000/-, however, reduced it to Rs.1,500/-. Again on 14.09.2006 over phone, the appellant reiterated the demand. Therefore, the initial demand and the reiterated demand is proved. Non recovery of call details is no way affects the prosecution case, since the fact remains that the relevant file of the defacto complainant was dealt with by the accused officer.

10.Insofar as the motive attributed that loan waiver was announced on 13.05.2006. However, since no communication was received by the bank in that regard, the accused officer collected the loan amount of Rs.20,000/- from the defacto complainant on

12.06.2006. However, PW2 insisted to return the money to him. But, the accused officer had not returned the money, as no instructions were received by the Bank. Therefore, the PW2 defacto complainant had animosity against the accused officer. In order to take vengeance, the PW2 complainant has filed this false complaint against the accused officer.

11.In this case, the accused officer has received the amount of Rs.1,500/- as illegal gratification for processing the letter for cancellation of mortgage deed and the receipt of the money is proved by the evidence of PW2. Therefore, the motive attributed by the appellant is not acceptable.

12.Insofar as the ground that the accused officer is not competent to cancel the mortgage deed is concerned, the Hon'ble supreme Court held that it is not necessary for the Court to consider whether or not the accused public servant was capable of doing or intended to do such an act. The accused officer has accepted the illegal remuneration and he has also dealt with the file relating to the complainant. Therefore, such a ground is not acceptable.

13.The defence that the money was thrusted into the shirt pocket of the accused officer is concerned, the evidence of PW2 is clear that the accused officer demaned the money and accepted it voluntarily, which is also corroborated by PW3. Therefore, the defence theory is an afterthought and is not acceptable.

14.Therefore, the prosecution has proved the demand, acceptance of bribe money and recovery of the tainted money from the accused officer.

15.This Court has paid its anxious consideration to the rival submissions and perused the materials placed on record.

16.According to the prosecution, PW2 had obtained a sum of Rs.1,71,000/- during August 1998 and till March 2006 he repaid a sum of Rs.1,26,000/-. On 13.05.2006 the Government of Tamil Nadu waived the agricultural loans obtained by the farmers and PW2 was also covered under the Government Order. Accordingly, waiver certificate PW2 was also given to the PW2 by the appellant at his residence. To make recommendations for returning the original documents to PW2, the appellant demanded a sum of Rs.3,000/- and it was reduced to Rs.1500/- and the appellant also received the money and caught during the trap.

17.According to the appellant, since the waiver loan waiver certificate was issued by the appellant to the PW2 in his residence, there is no necessity for the appellant to demand the money form the PW2.

18.The complainant PW2 has clearly spoken about the demand made by appellant in his complaint [ExP2] and in his evidence. The defence has not shattered the complainant's evidence and therefore, the demand is proved. During the trap also, the appellant had demanded the money, which is also spoken by the complainant and PW2 and it is corroborated by the evidence of PW3 official witness. Therefore, the demand and reiteration of demand made by the appellant is proved in this case.

19.The acceptance of the money is concerned, the complainant has spoken in his evidence that the appellant had received the money and kept it in his shirt pocket. This statement is corroborated by the evidence of official witness PW3. Further, the phenolphthalein test conducted on the hands of the appellant also proved positive. This is evident from the evidence of the Scientific Assistant and it is also proved by the Chemical Analysis Report ExP8. Further, the appellant has also admitted in the presence of PW4 Special officer that he accepted the bribe from the complainant. Therefore, the acceptance of the bribe money by the appellant is also proved in this case.

20.Insofar as the recovery is concerned, according to the evidence of TLO [ExP10] the appellant admitted the acceptance of bribe money of Rs.1500/- from the defacto complainant. Further the evidence of PW2 and PW3 also clear that the money was recovered from the appellant and on comparison, the serial numbers of tainted currencies were tallied with the entrustment mahazar [ExP4]. Apart from this, in the recovery mahazar [ExP7] it was attested by the Special Officer [PW4], the TLO and the official witness including the appellant. Therefore, the recovery also has been proved in this case.

21.Insofar as the defence that since the waiver certificate was already handed over to the PW2, the alleged demand is not possible is concerned, the bribe amount was demanded as a reward and even accepting the reward is also an offence and liable to be punished under the Prevention of Corruption Act.

22.The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the decision reported in 1970 Crl.LJ (vol.76, C.No.196), held that the reward or illegal gratification accepted either before are after doing the act would be covered by Section 161 IPC. A payment of a sum to a public servant, whether paid before or after the doing the official act, would constitute bribe within Section 161, IPC.

23.It is contended by the appellant that it is the Secretary of the Bank to recommend for the redemption of mortgage deed and this appellant has no role in that process. But, it is the evidence of PW2 that after receipt of the tainted money, the appellant had called PW6 Document Writer and asked to prepare the documents for redemption of mortgage deed. Therefore, it is clear that misusing the official position, he had obtained illegal gratification and therefore, the contention of the appellant is not acceptable.

24.Insofar as the motive that since the Supervisor had not recommended for release of the subsequent installments and the appellant had collected a sum of Rs.20,000/- after the waiver announced by the Government and therefore, PW2 had animosity against the appellant and there was a quarrel between the appellant and the complainant. Therefore, he has given a false complaint against the appellant. Though it is stated that there was a quarrel between the appellant and the complainant by the DW1, who is an Employee of the appellant Bank, PW4 Special Officer and PW5 the Secretary of the appellant Bank was not at all cross examined in this connection by the defence and they failed to prove the same through the witnesses PW2 and PW5 and therefore, the motive attributed by the defence is not acceptable.

25.Bribe givers only ventilate their grievance, approach the vigilance officer after their prolonged suffering at the instance of the accused officer, which has been painfully observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of U.P.Vs.Dr.G.K.Ghosh [1984] 1 SCC 254 as follows:

> *"by and large a citizen is somewhat reluctant, rather than anxious, to complaint to the Vigilance Department and to have a trap arranged even if illegal gratification is demanded by a Government Servant. There are numerous reasons for the reluctance. In the first place, he has to make a number of visits to the office of the Vigilance Department and to wait on a number of officers. He has to provide his own currency notes for arranging a trap. He has to comply with several formalities and sign several statements. He has to accompany the officers and participants of the raiding party and avocation. He has to sacrifice his time and effort whilst doing so. Thereafter, he has to attend the court at the time of trial from day to day. He has to withstand the searching cross-examination by the defence counsel as if he himself is guilty of some fault. In the result, a citizen who has been harassed by a Government Officer, has to face all these hazards. And if the explanation offered by the accused is accepted by the Court, he has to face he humiliation of being considered as a person who tried to falsely implicate a Government Servant, not to speak of facing the wrath of the Government servants of the department concerned, in his future dealings with the department. No one would therefore be too keen or too anxious to face such an ordeal. Ordinarily, it is only when a citizen feels oppressed by a feeling of being wronged and finds the situation to be beyond endurance, that he adopts the course of approaching the Vigilance Department for laying a trap. His evidence cannot therefore be easily or lightly brushed aside. Of course, it cannot be gainsaid that*

it does not mean that the court should be oblivious of the need for caution and circumspection bearing in mind that one can conceive of cases where an honest or strict Government official may be falsely implicated by a vindictive person to whose demand, for showing favours, or for according a special treatment by giving a go-by to the rules, the official refuses to yield".

26.So citing unconnected stale motive is universal in the case of corruption by fiber thread of prolonged cross examination that too after number of years from the date of occurrence. What is required for an offence under the Prevention of Corruption Act is that the demand, acceptance and recovery. In this case, the demand and acceptance were sufficiently proved by the prosecution and the tainted money as recorded in the entrustment mahazar [ExP10] was also recovered from the accused officer. The phenolphthalein test conducted on the both hands of the appellant/accused officer has also proved positive.

27.The corruption has ruined the system. Despite implementation of the Prevention of Corruption Act, corruption has not been eradicated and it has become a common affair. Nobody is having the sense of fear to the prevailing Act. The higher officials must act as an example to their subordinates in discharge of their duties. If the higher officials themselves commit mistakes, then they loose their morale to question their subordinates. Ultimately, the system fails. The Hon'ble Apex Court in *Niranjan Hemchandra Sashittal* v. *State of Maharashtra* reported in (2013) 4 SCC 642, painfully discussed the gravity of the corruption in the following terms:

"26. It can be stated without any fear of contradiction that corruption is not to be judged by degree, for corruption mothers disorder, destroys societal will to progress, accelerates undeserved ambitions, kills the conscience, jettisons the glory of the institutions, paralyses the economic health of a country, corrodes the sense of civility and mars the marrows of governance. It is worth noting that immoral acquisition of wealth destroys the energy of the people believing in honesty, and history records with agony how they have suffered."

28.A defence was taken that the money was inserted into the appellant's pocket. But, to substantiate this defence, the appellant has not produced any evidence either through witness or documents. Therefore, defence taken by the appellant is not acceptable.

29.In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the view that the prosecution has proved the demand, acceptance of illegal gratification and recovery of the same from the appellant. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the judgment of the trial Court.

30.In the result, the appeal is dismissed, the conviction and sentence imposed by the Special Court, for Trial of Cases under the Prevention of Corruption Act, Madurai in Spl.C.No.85 of 2011, dated 10.04.2014 is hereby confirmed. The bail bonds if any shall stand cancelled. The trial Court is directed to secure the appellant and confine him to prison, to undergo the remaining period of sentence.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD II)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

dsk

To

1.The Special Court
for Trial of Cases under the Prevention of
Corruption Act, Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption,
Theni.

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

COPY TO:
The Record Keeper (2 Copies),
Criminal Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.J.AYYAMBOSE, Advocate (SR-106376[F] dated 20/12/2019)

Crl.A.(MD)No.145 of 2014
20.12.2019

KK(06.08.2020) 12P 7C