BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 13.03.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

Crl. A.(MD)No.277 of 2013

The Inspector of Police
Vigilance and Anti Corruption Wing
Nagapattinam
Crime No.1 of 2008 .. Appellant/Complainant

Vs.

M.Selvam .. Respondent/Accused

Prayer : This Criminal Appeal is filed under Section 378 of Cr.P.C., to set aside the judgment of acquittal of the respondent/accused passed in Special Case No.108 of 2011, dated 28.02.2013 by the Special Court for trial cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, Tiruchirapalli and convict the respondent/accused for offence under Sections 7,13(2) r/w.13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

For Appellant :Mr.K.K.Ramakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

For Respondent : Mr.S.Sivakumar
Legal Aid Counsel

J U D G M E N T

This Criminal Appeal is preferred by the State against the judgement of acquittal of the respondent herein/ accused dated 28.02.2013 in Special Case No.108 of 2011 on the file of the learned Special Judge for Prevention of Corruption Act, Tirchirapalli.

2.For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per the rank mentioned in the trial Court. The gist of the charge framed on the accused is as follows:

Charge	***Gist of Charge***
Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.	Public Servant taking gratification other than legal remuneration in respect of an official act.

Charge	Gist of Charge
Section and 13 (1) (a) & (d) read with 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.	Accused receiving a sum of Rs.250/- as bribe for giving certificate for getting Government Aid for the death of his father.

3. The brief facts, which are leading to this case are as follows:

(i) PW2 Moorthy is the resident of Kariyapattinam village and doing agricultural business. PW 4 is the mother of PW 2 and wife of Somasundaram, who died on 30.11.2007. PW2 received an application from PW5/ Vedachalam, Chettipulam, Village Administrative Officer for getting Government Aid under Government of Tamil Agricultural Labourers Farmers(Social Security and Welfare) Act, 2006 (herein after called as Farmers's Act). The complainant got his mother's sign in it and gave it with annexure to the Tahsildhar office, Vedaranyam on 06.12.2007. He was told that the application will be sent back to the Village Administrative Officer for enquiry. Then he went for treatment at Chennai and returned home after pongal. One Rajalingam, the younger brother of his father told that the application which was given by him to the Tahsildhar office has been received at Village Administrative Office, Chettipulam for enquiry. The complainant met the Village Administrative Officer, Chettipulam on 30.01.2008. The Village Administrative Officer, Chettipulam has issued certificate to get the aid and gave the application with certificate and copies of application for registering as an agriculturalist to the complainant and instructed to meet the Revenue Inspector, Kariyapattinam to get his certificate and to hand over it to the Tahsildhar officer, Vedaranyam.

(ii) On 01.02.2008 at about 11.30 hrs, the complainant met the accused officer in his office at Kariyapattinam with his two friends viz., V.Subahar/P.W.7 and R.Thiyagarajan and requested him to issue the required certificate. The accused officer enquired the witnesses and got their signature in the application filled by him. Then the accused officer asked the witnesses to wait outside of the office and demanded Rs.250/- from the complainant for issuing certificate to him and told that, only if he fills up the form and sign it, he can get the aid and return the application and its annexure to the complainant. The complainant told that he did not have any amount, as he is in distress condition and he cannot give the amount and requested to give the certificate, for which, the accused officer told that, only when the complainant comes with the demanded amount, he will receive the application, sign it and send it to Tahsildhar office.

(iii) Since the defacto complainant/PW2 is not willing to pay the bribe amount to the accused, on 06.02.2008 he went to the office of the Vigilance and Anti Corruption, Nagapattinam and lodged a written complaint to the Inspector of Police/PW 15 and after observing all the formalities, P.W.15 registered a case in Crime No.1 of 2008 for the offences under Sections 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1998 against the accused.

(iv) On 07.02.2008 PW 15 arranged two official witnesses for trap. One K.Rajasekaran, Junior Assistant, O/o.Deputy Director of Health Service and T.Jayaraj, Junior Assistant, O/o. District Educaional Oficer, Nagapattinam and they both came to the office of the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption and they were introduced to PW 2 and they were asked to come next day at 08.00 am. As per the instructions the above two witness were present on 07.02.2008 at 08.00 am and they were introduced to PW2 and perused the complaint/Ex.P.26. The phenolphthalein test demonstration was conducted. Thereafter the trap team left Nagapattinam on 07.02.2008 at about 10.00 hrs and alighted near the Government Higher Secondary School. PW15 instructed PW2 along with shadow witnesses to go and meet the accused by reminding the earlier instructions. When PW2 went to the office he found the accused office locked and they were waiting there as per the instructions of PW.15. When the accused officer came to his office at 13.00 hrs, PW2 and PW3 met the accused officer and handed over the application along with annexure for sign at 14.00 hrs and the accused officer received the same and while filling and signing the application, the accused officer received the bribe amount of Rs. 250 /- from his right hand from PW2 in the presence of official witness PW3 and transferred the amount to the left hand and kept in the left table drawer. Thereafter PW2 ,PW3 came out from the accused office and showed the pre arranged signal.

(v) Immediately after the receipt of pre arranged signal from PW2 and PW3, PW 15/Trap Laying Officer with other official witnesses including PW 2 went inside the accused office and introduced him and enquired about the happenings to the accused officer. Thereafter he directed PW2 to wait outside the office and conducted phenolphthalein test by dipping the accused officer right and left hands, which proved positive. The tainted money/M.O.1 was recovered intact on production by the accused officer from the left table drawer of the accused. A mahazar was prepared between 14.30 hrs and 16.30 hrs and signed by the official witnesses. The relevant documents, resultant solutions/M.O.2 and M.O.3, tainted money etc were seized and rough sketch was drawn and observation mahazar was also prepared between 16.45 hrs and 17.15 hrs. Thereafter PW.15/ Inspector of Police arrested the accused on 07.02.008 and after giving prior intimation to the Court under section 165 of Cr.P.C. The residents of the accused was searched and search list was prepared and thereafter the accused officer was released on bail. Thereafter PW 15 handed over the investigation to PW 16. PW 16 took up the investigation and examined the remaining witnesses and filed final report before the Special Court in Crime No.1 of 2008 under Sections 7,13(2)r/w.13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

4. In order to substantiate charges against the accused in the trial Court, prosecution examined 19 witnesses as PW1 to PW19 and marked 29 Exhibits as Ex.P.1-Ex.P.29 and also material objects M.O.1 to 3 were produced. When the accused was questioned under incriminating circumstance under section 313 Cr.P.C. he denied the prosecution case by stating that PW2 and PW 5 are close relatives and PW2 has enmity with the accused person and from the day one when they entered into Revenue service and before his last day of retirement, he decided to implicate the accused in the present case and accordingly he approached PW 2 in order to implicate the accused in the above said offence and as per the direction of PW 5 , PW2 lodged a complaint before the Trap laying Officer and without his knowledge, the phenolphthalein coated money was put in his drawer and thereafter trap laying officer threatened him to take the bribe money from his drawer and conducted phenolphthalein test. This entire case was foisted by the trap laying officer at the instigation of PW2 and PW.5. PW2 and PW3 also known to each other and PW 3 also gave false evidence before the Court in order to implicate the accused. For his defence he has marked one document namely Ex,D.1

5. Upon consideration of evidence, the learned Special Judge found that PW 2 admitted that since the accused has not signed in the report and sent the same, he wanted trap the accused in the bribery case. Further PW 5 and the accused were working in the same revenue department and the accused got promotion of Revenue Inspector and hence, the Accused Officer has not responded to PW 5 and due to previous enmity implicated the Accused Officer in this case. The trial court has come to the conclusion that PW 5 with collusion of PW2 has foisted a case against the accused persons. Further the delay in lodging the complaint vitiate the entire prosecution case and on the above said grounds the trial court held that failure to record the statement immediately after trap under section 161 Cr.P.C will vitiate the entire prosecution case. Hence the trial court acquitted the accused.

6. Aggrieved against the same, the State has preferred this Criminal Appeal.

7. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on records carefully.

8. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would submit that admittedly PW2 has presented the application for getting death benefit under the Farmers Act before the Tahsildhar and again the Tahsildhar forwarded the same to Special Tahsildhar and thereafter the said Special Tahsildhar forwarded the application to the Field Level Officer/PW5 and the accused. Thereafter PW2/defacto complainant met the accused officer on 01.02.2008 and on that day, the accused officer demanded bribe amount of Rs. 250/- for issuing the certificate for getting benefit under the Farmers Scheme and the said application is marked as

Ex.P.4 Series and thereafter since PW2 not inclined to pay the bribe amount to the accused officer, he lodged a complaint /Ex.P.2 before PW15/Trap Laying Officer. PW.15 after completing the pre trap proceedings, went to the accused office along with witnesses and they waited there till his arrival. On seeing PW2 the accused reiterated the earlier demand and filled the applications and put his signature and thereafter PW2 paid the amount in the presence of PW3 to the accused officer and he received the bribe amount in his right hand and transferred to his left hand and put it in his table drawer and hence, demand and acceptance is well established before the trial court through PW2 and PW 3 and phenolphthalein test also proved positive and though there were discrepancies with regard to the phenolphthalein test conducted by the trap laying officer, that discrepancies will not vitiate the entire prosecution case.

9.He would further submit that the trial court considered the irrelevant materials which were not supported either by documents or evidence. The acquittal of the accused by the trial Court is perverse and non-est in law. Though the the trial court assigned the reason for acquitting the accused that there was enmity in between PW5/Village Administrative Officer and the accused officer, that enmity has not been proved before the trial court and mere suggestion is not sufficient to disprove the prosecution case. Further there is no discrepancies with regard to the trap proceedings conducted on 07.02.2008 and clearly corroborate each other. In the present case prosecution has clearly proved the case beyond reasonable doubts and accordingly he prayed for allowing the appeal.

10. In support of his contention, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor relied upon the following decisions:

(i) ***Motiram Padu Joshi and others -vs- State of Maharastra*** reported in ***(2018)9 Supreme Court Cases 429***. The relevant para is extracted hereunder:

> "24. In Kallu alias Masih and others v. State of M.P., (2006) 10 SCC 313, this Court held as under:-
>
> "8. While deciding an appeal against acquittal, the power of the appellate court is no less than the power exercised while hearing appeals against conviction. In both types of appeals, the power exists to review the entire evidence. However, one significant difference is that an order of acquittal will not be interfered with, by an appellate court, where the judgment of the trial court is based on evidence and the view taken is reasonable and plausible. It will not reverse the decision of the trial court merely because a different view is possible. The appellate court will also bear in mind that there is a presumption of innocence in favour of the accused and the accused is entitled to get the benefit of any doubt. Further, if it decides to interfere, it should assign reasons for differing

with the decision of the trial court."

25. In the present case, as held by the High Court, the trial court has not properly appreciated the evidence and its findings are perverse. When the approach of the trial court is perverse, in an appeal against the order of acquittal, a duty is cast upon the High Court to reappreciate the evidence".

(ii) ***Billa Nagul Sharief -Vs- State of Andhra Pradesh*** reported in ***(2011) 1 Supreme Court Cases (Cr.) 214.*** The relevant para is extracted hereunder:

"17.We do not find any substance in the submission of Mr Ranga Ramanujam. The de facto complainant in his evidence has clearly stated that it was he who had filed the application for grant of composite licence. In his cross-examination he had denied the suggestion that anybody else presented the application in the office of the District Supply Officer. In any view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the gravamen of the charge against the appellant being of taking bribe for giving the composite licence, who presented the application for grant of composite licence is not of much consequence. It is to be borne in mind that discrepancy in regard to that part of the story itself does not go to the root of the case but discrepancy in regard to the material facts only has bearing to test the veracity of the prosecution case. Here in the present case, there is ample evidence on record that for the purpose of grant of composite licence the appellant demanded bribe, which was paid to him and recovered from his possession".

11.Repudiating the above submissions, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/accused would submit that in the appeal against the acquittal, the power of appellate Court is very very limited and need not be interfered in the mechanical manner, where the judgement of the trial court is based on evidence and the view that is taken is reasonable or plausible, the appellate court did not reverse the decision of the trial court merely different views are possible. The appellate court also bear in mind the presumption of innocence in favour of the accused and accused is entitled to get benefit of any doubt.

12. He would further submit that in the present case, there were contradictions in between PW2 and PW 3. When they reached the accused office at 1.00 p.m, the accused office was found locked and they waited outside upto 03.00 p.m and the necessity for the PW2 and PW3 waiting till 2.00 p.m may not arise. Taking advantage of the accused left to bath room, PW 2 placed the tainted money in his

drawer and further PW2 and PW 5/VAO are close relatives and in fact PW5/VAO and the accused officer are colleagues in the very same department and that they are known to each other and there was existing enmity in between PW2 and PW 5. The accused got promotion well before PW 5's retirement and before this retirement, he designed the present case and executed through PW2. In this case, VAO and PW3 also joined the hands of PW2 and PW5 for the purpose of implicating this accused. Though all those issues were considered by the trial court, the trial court acquitted the accused. Therefore, the well considered order need not be interfered in a routine and mechanical manner.

13.Heard the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/accused and perused the materials available on records.

14.Since this appeal is against acquittal, this Court, as the appellate Court, has to consider the general principles regarding powers of the appellate court while dealing with an appeal against an order of acquittal. The Apex Court has observed certain principles in the decision reported in (2007) 4 Supreme Court Cases 415 - Chandrappa V. State of Karnataka. The relevant paragraph No.42 is extracted herein:

> **42.** From the above decisions, in our considered view, the following general principles regarding powers of the appellate court while dealing with an appeal against an order of acquittal emerge:
>
> (*1*) An appellate court has full power to review, reappreciate and reconsider the evidence upon which the order of acquittal is founded.
>
> (*2*) The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 puts no limitation, restriction or condition on exercise of such power and an appellate court on the evidence before it may reach its own conclusion, both on questions of fact and of law.
>
> (*3*) Various expressions, such as, “substantial and compelling reasons”, “good and sufficient grounds”, “very strong circumstances”, “distorted conclusions”, “glaring mistakes”, etc. are not intended to curtail extensive powers of an appellate court in an appeal against acquittal. Such phraseologies are more in the nature of “flourishes of language” to emphasise the reluctance of an appellate court to interfere with acquittal than to curtail the power of the court to review the evidence and to come to its own conclusion.
>
> (*4*) An appellate court, however, must bear in mind that in case of acquittal, there is double presumption in favour of the accused. *Firstly*, the

presumption of innocence is available to him under the fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence that every person shall be presumed to be innocent unless he is proved guilty by a competent court of law. *Secondly*, the accused having secured his acquittal, the presumption of his innocence is further reinforced, reaffirmed and strengthened by the trial court.

(*5*) If two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of the evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal recorded by the trial court.

15.Keeping in mind the above said principles and also upon careful re-assessment of the evidence and the judgment of the Trial Court and other materials on record and submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, the following points arise for consideration in this Criminal Appeal:

(i) Whether the appellate court can interfere with the order of the acquittal by re-appreciating evidence ?

(ii) Whether the trial court was right in finding the appellant/accused not guilty under Sections 7,13(2) r/w.13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988?

16. In the present case, PW2's father was a Farmer. PW4 is his mother. PW2's father died on 30.11.2007 and he was a member of Tamil Nadu Agricultural Labour Farmer and Social Security Scheme. As per the scheme, the petitioner's family is entitled to receive the benefit from the revenue department. For the purpose of getting the benefit, PW2 presented the application/Ex.P.4 before the Tahsildhar and the Tahsildhar forwarded the application to the special Tahsildhar for disbursement of the benefits under the scheme. Accordingly PW8 again forwarded the application to the field level officer for appropriate enquiry for getting the benefit. In an earlier occasion, PW2 met PW5 /VAO Vedachalam and he filled up the application and handed over to him for getting the benefit. PW2 met the accused officer on 01.02.2008 for processing his application and at that time he demanded bribe amount of Rs.250/- from PW 2 and thereafter PW 2 discussed the said demand with PW4. For the purpose of getting the benefit, his mother assured to borrow loan. However the defacto complainant is not willing to pay bribe amount to the accused and he decided to lodge a DVAC complaint before the PW15 and accordingly he lodged a complaint on 06.02.2008.

17. Immediately thereafter PW 15 arranged official witnesses on the same day and they were directed to come on 07.02.2008 at 08.30 am. Accordingly, the official witnesses assembled in the DVAC office on 07.02.2008 and after completing the pre trap proceedings, the official witnesses went to the accused office. Near the Government Higher Secondary School PW2 and PW3 de-boarded from the Government vehicle and they were instructed to complete the trap

proceedings. Accordingly they went to the accused officer however they found the said office was locked and the same was informed to PW 15 again PW 15 directed to wait them before the office. While they were waiting, the accused officer reached the office at 01.30 p.m and PW2 and PW3 went inside the accused office and handed over the application/Ex.P.4. Again on perusal of the evidence, PW2 deposed that immediately after his entering the office, the accused officer reiterated the earlier demand, for that PW2 also replied "yes" and thereafter he handed over forms and he filled the entire form and put his signatures and thereafter he demanded money from PW2 and PW2 in presence of PW 3 handed over to the accused and the accused received the tainted phenolphthalein coated money from his right hand and transferred to his left hand and put it in his drawer.

18. After collecting the Ex.P.4 /application, PW2 and PW 3 came out of the office and gave pre arranged signals to the trap laying officer and immediately PW15 and PW2 went inside the office and PW 2 identified the accused officer to PW 15 thereafter two hands of the accused officer were subjected to phenolphthalein test and recovered the tainted money and the tainted money and sodium carbonate solution was marked as M.O.1 to M.O.3 and sent it for expert opinion. PW14/Expert certified that the phenolphthalein test are positive and the said certificate is marked as Ex.P.25 and he has clearly deposed that the phenolphthalein test is positive. Though the trial court arrived at a conclusion that though prosecution is able to establish initial proof of acceptance and obtainment through the evidence of PW2 and PW3, disbelieved the evidence of PW2 and arrived at a conclusion that due to previous enmity between PW5 and the accused officer, acquitted the accused and further suspecting the delay in filing the complaint also made the prosecution case more suspicious.

19. From the finding available in para 28 and 29 of the trial court, this Court is unable to subscribe the view for acquitting the accused on the reasons that the said views neither supported by any materials nor by any evidence either in the prosecution evidence or in the defence evidence. The first reason for acquittal is that there was enmity in between PW 5 and the accused officer and PW2 and PW4 are close associates for which there is evidence available before the trial court and in what circumstances, the trial court arrived at conclusion is questionable. This Court is unable to find out any material in this aspect.

20.Though the learned counsel appearing for the respondent would submit that the non compliance of Para 47 is vitiated the entire prosecution, in the decision of this Court reported in ***K.Selvaraj V. State - 2004 Cri.L.J.3754***, this Court has held that the administrative guidelines issued by the Vigilance Manual is only directory and not mandatory and it is to be noted that the expression used in Para 47 is only .... preferably ....." and hence, the contention urged on the non-compliance of Para 47 does not in anyway undermine the reliability of the witness particularly when it is not shown in what respect he has obliged the Vigilance officials or that any prejudice being caused to the accused and any omission on the part of investigating officers to strictly comply with those administrative guidelines would not in anyway vitiate the trap. The relevant portion of the said said decision is extracted as under:

> "44.Laying emphasis upon Rule 41, it is contended that in the instant case, Rule 41 is not complied with and the non-compliance of Rule 41 vitiates the trap. Evidence of P.W.2 is assailed on the ground that being a Junior Assistant, lower in tank, and he is only an obliging witness to the Vigilance Officials. Taking the assistance of a public servant, who is lesser in rank than the officer to be trapped, might be non-compliance of Rule 41; but in my view, it does not in any way vitiate the trap. The administrative guidelines issued by the Vigilance Manual is only directory and non mandator. It is also to be noted that the expression unused in Rule 41 is only ..... preferably....." The contention urged on the non-compliance of Rule 41 does not in any way undermine the reliability of P.W.2 particularly when it is not shown in what respect he has obliged the Vigilance officials or that any prejudice being caused to the 1st accused.
>
> 45.The guidelines given as per the Vigilance Manual are only directory and administrative directions. Any omission on the part of investigating officers to strictly comply with those administrative guidelines would not in anyway vitiate the trap. In 2002(1) Mad.LW (Crl.) 136 : (2001 Cri L J 4139), Justice M.Karpagavinayagam while dismissing the Criminal Original Petition filed for quashing the proceedings, has also observed that Rules under Vigilance Manual are only administrative and on non-observance of the same there is no mandatory violation, which would affect the validity of the prosecution."

21.The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***State of M.P. V. Ram Singh reported in (2000) 5 Supreme Court Cases 88***, has held that procedural delays and technicalities of law should not be permitted to defeat the object sought to be achieved by the Act. The overall public interest and the social object is required to be kept in mind while interpreting various provisions of the Act and deciding cases under it.

22.Even on a perusal of the decision in ***K.V.Joseph V. State of Gujarat reported in 1997 CRI.L.J. 2896***, the Gujarat High Court makes it clear that if a non violation of the DVAC manual, the State Government have departmental proceedings for dereliction of duty and it will not vitiate the entire prosecution case. The above decision was followed by the decision of this Court in ***A.Selvaraj Vs. State*** in Crl.A.No.605 of 2016 dated 19.06.2018. Further, in the above said case, this Court has held that the non-recording of the statement from the accused after the trap proceeding is not fatal to the case of the prosecution and only the disciplinary proceeding alone can be taken against the officer concerned. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the the ground of non-recording of the statement of the accused is not vitiated the case of prosecution. Hence, on that score acquitting the accused is unsustainable and the same is perverse.

23. In the present case, PW2/defacto complainant, trap witness and PW3/Shadow witness line by line corroborated each other and this Court unable to find out a small discrepancy in the evidence of PW2 and PW 3 and the trial court has not discussed about the phenolphthalein test conducted by Trap laying officer. The most important evidence is that PW15/Trap Laying Officer who arranged for trap had no interest in favour of PW2 and there is no enmity towards accused and no animosity against the delinquent officer. Even the evidence of PW2/Defacto complainant, and PW3,/ official Shadow witness coupled with PW 14 the expert is sufficient to decide the trap.

24. In the present case, the prosecution has clearly established that the accused officer demanded money on 01.02.2008 and again reiterated the earlier demand on 07.02.2008 in the presence of PW3 and received the bribe amount from PW2 in his right hand and transferred to his left hand and put in his table drawer which was recovered by the trap laying officer is well established and the reason assigned for acquittal is not supported by any material or any evidence and this Court has no hesitation to arrive at a different conclusion and the order of the trial court is perverse.

25. This Court has found that though there are some discrepancies in the evidence, the same does not affect the prosecution case. In the present case, there was ample evidence to show that the respondent had demanded bribe which was paid to him and recovered from his possession for the purpose of issuing certificate to enable PW2 to get benefit under the scheme.

26. In view of the above, I have no other option except for accepting the prosecution case. In such circumstances, I found the accused guilty for the offence under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(i)(d) of the Act and I am inclined to convict the accused for the above reasons.

27. Accordingly, the accused is convicted for the offences under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(i)(d) of the Act and sentenced to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment and imposed to pay a fine of Rs.5000/- in default to undergo one month rigorous imprisonment for the offence under Section 7 of the Act and sentenced to undergo one

year rigorous imprisonment and imposed to pay a fine of Rs.5000/- in default to undergo one month rigorous imprisonment for the offence under Section 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of the Act. The above sentences shall run concurrently.

28.Accordingly, this Criminal Appeal is allowed to the extent as indicated above. However, liberty is granted to the accused to surrender before the trial Court, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

To

1.The Special Judge,
The Special Court for trial cases under
Prevention of Corruption Act,
Tiruchirapalli.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption wing,
Nagapattinam.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption wing,
Nagapattinam.

4.The District Collector,
Tiruchirapalli.

5.The Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai.

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

Copy to: The Section Officer,
Criminal Records Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.(2 COPIES)
+1cc to Mr.S.SIVAKUMAR, Advocate, SR.No. 54062

AAV
RK/SAR/08.05.2019/ 12P- 10C