BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
RESERVED ON : 15.03.2019
PRONOUNCED ON : 22.03.2019
CORAM:
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI
CRL.A.(MD)No.351 of 2013

The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption Wing,
Thiruchirapalli.
(Crime No.8 of 2007) ... Appellant / Complainant

-Vs-

1.V.Sekar
2.M.Kathirvel ... Respondents / Accused

Prayer: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 378 of the Criminal Procedure Code, praying to set aside the judgment of acquittal of the respondents / accused (A-1 & A-2) passed in Special Case No.122/2011, dated 08.10.2012 by the Special Court for trial of cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, Tiruchirapalli and convict both the respondents / accused (A-1 & A-2) 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 R1 : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar
For R2 : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar for Mr.P.Rajkumar

JUDGMENT

This appeal is directed against the judgment in Special Case No.122 of 2011 on the file of the learned Special Judge for trial of cases under Prevention of Corruption Act, Tiruchirapalli, dated 08.10.2012, wherein the accused persons were acquitted for the offences under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2.For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per the rank in the trial Court.

3.The brief facts of the prosecution case are as follows:

(i)The defacto complainant P.W.3 by name B.Vanitha applied to Thanthoni Municipality on 29.05.2007 for getting water connection to her house. The second accused by name Kathirvel being the Executive Officer (Grade-I) Thanthoni Municipality, Karur District, received that application and handed over the same to the first accused, by name Sekar, who was working as Water Supply Helper, (Grade III) at the same office. After receipt of the same, the first accused instructed to P.W.3 / defacto complainant to pay fee of Rs.3/- for application for water connection and Rs.561/- for house tax. Hence, P.W.3 paid the same and got receipt on that day itself. Further, P.W.3 handed over her application along with the receipts and requested to make arrangement for water connection, for which, the first accused told her that he will calculate the amount and instructed her to come after ten days. Then on 08.06.2007, P.W.3 went to the office of the accused, met the first accused and when she asked him, he told her that she has to pay a sum of Rs.2,000/- in Bank for the Tamil Nadu Water and Drainage Board; to pay a sum of Rs.1000/- as donation for the defense; to pay a sum of Rs.5000/- for office deposit and to pay a sum of Rs.1000/- as plumbing charges, totalling to Rs.9,000/- along with Rs.1,500/- as extra amount and totally Rs.10,500/-. P.W.3 asked him why should she has to give an amount of Rs.1,500/- as extra and for that the first accused told her that if her request is to be fulfilled, she has to give a sum of Rs.1,500/-. Further, the first accused told her that the above said amount is also for the second accused and as per the direction of the second accused, he asked her to give the same. On that day at 7.00 p.m., when the second accused arrived, P.W.3 complained him that the first accused asked Rs.1,500/-. For that the second accused also told her to pay the above said sum of Rs.1,500/- to the first accused as demanded by him, otherwise the work would not be done. Further, the second accused told her that on Monday, he is out of station and instructed her to come on Tuesday with the above said money. When the complainant requested the second accused to provide water connection without money, the second accused refused to do so.

(ii)Since P.W.3 is not willing to give the bribe amount, she lodged a written complaint under Ex.P.4 along with the due amount of Rs.9,000/- with the bribe amount of Rs.1,500/- before the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anticorruption, Trichy, namely, Prasanna Venkatesh. After receiving the complaint of P.W.3, P.W.11 Inspector of Police registered First Information Report under Ex.P.18 and got signature of P.W.3 in it. The signature of P.W.3 is marked as Ex.P.5.

(iii)As per the instruction of P.W.11, P.W.3 came to the Vigilance Office on 12.06.2007 at about 7.30 a.m., the official witnesses, namely, Mahalakshmi, who was examined as P.W.8 and Poonkodi, who was examined as P.W.4, came to the Vigilance Office and P.W.11 introduced them to P.W.3 and P.W.3 was also introduced with them. Thereafter, they were perused the complaint of P.W.3 and First Information Report and on enquiry P.W.3 admitted that it was true. As per the instruction of P.W.11, P.W.3 gave Rs.9,000/- and he instructed P.W.3 to keep it in a yellow color bag separately. Then, he asked about the bribe amount of Rs.1,500/-. P.W.3 handed over two 500 rupees currency notes and five 100 rupee currency notes to P.W.11 and P.W.11 called a Police Constable, namely, Srinivasa Balaji and instructed him to prepare the sodium carbonate liquid, coated Phenolphthalein powder on the currency notes and demonstrated the phenolphthalein test to the witnesses and explained its significance. The said proceeding was reduced under Ex.P.6 entrustment mahazar and the numbers of the currency notes were entered therein.

(iv)Then P.W.11 instructed P.W.3 to go and meet the accused persons and if they received the above said tainted amount, she was instructed that when she went out from the office, give pre-arranged signal. Further P.W.8 was instructed to accompany with P.W.3 and watch over the occurrence. Then at about 09.30 hrs., P.W.3, official witnesses, Inspector along with raiding party went in a two Government vehicles to Thanthonimalai. On reaching near Thanthoni Mini Bus Stop, P.W.3 and P.W.8 alighted from the vehicle and at about 11.45 hrs., they went into the office of the accused. At that time the accused were found talking inside the office. On seeing them, the second accused called P.W.3 and she went along with P.W.8. P.W.3 asked the second accused, when water connection can be given to her. For that the second accused told her whether P.W.3 brought the fees for water connection with Rs.1,500/- as demanded earlier. P.W.3 told that she brought the above amount and the second accused told that if the amount is paid only the work will be completed. For that P.W.3 told that she brought Rs.9,000/- for payment of water connection and Rs.1,500/- as extra to give them as demanded. Then the second accused brought them to the first accused and gave a bit of paper, mentioning by writing the amount for payment of water connection with instruction to pay the same in the counter. Further, the second accused instructed to give the bribe amount of Rs.1,500/- to the first accused as demanded for himself and to the first accused. Further the second accused told P.W.3 that out of the said sum, only Rs.1000/- is for himself and he will receive the same from the first accused. Then, the first accused brought P.W.3 and P.W.8 to his room from upstairs. After that he took the application of P.W.3 and wrote the details of payment to be paid for water connection in a bit of paper under Ex.P.7 and gave it to P.W.3 to pay the same in the cash counter. Then P.W.3 went to counter and gave the amount. The person was in counter collected Rs.5,325/- and returned Rs.175/- as balance to P.W.3 and he gave a receipt therefor. He instructed to pay a sum of Rs.2,000/- in Bank and gave a receipt under Ex.P.8 for payment of Rs.5,325/- to P.W.3. Then P.W.3 met the first accused and produced the receipt along with her application. He received the same and asked P.W.3 about the amount of Rs.1,500/- as demanded. After that P.W.3 gave the tainted amount of Rs.1,500/-, which was kept by her separately, to the first accused. The first accused received the same through his right hand and kept it on his table and told that out of that Rs.500/- is for himself and the remaining amount of Rs.1,000/- is for the second accused. After that he told to P.W.3 that he will give water connection as required within two days.

(v)After coming out of the office, P.W.3 gave pre-arranged signal. After that P.W.11 enquired with P.W.3 and P.W.8 and they explained the happenings. Then, they were identified the second accused to P.W.11 and he directed two police constables to stand near the second accused and further, P.W.3 and P.W.8 went upstairs and identified the first accused in his room. Then P.W.3 went out. The official witness was in his room. The amount of Rs.1500/- consisting of two 500 rupee currency notes and five 100 rupee notes are M.O.1 series. The agreement for water connection written to Municipality is marked as Ex.P.9. The Xerox copy of the tax receipt is marked as Ex.P.10. P.W.11 asked the first accused about the bribe amount and instructed to prepare sodium carbonate liquid in two separate glasses of water. As per his instructions, the first accused dipped his right and left hand fingers separately in it and subsequently, the liquids in both glasses turned into pink colour. Then P.W.11 seized the above said liquids for further proceedings. The bottle containing washers of right hand of the first accused marked as M.O.2 and the washers of left hand was marked as M.O.3 respectively. On enquiry, the first accused indicated the bribe amount on his table. As per the instructions of P.W.11, the official witness has taken the money from the table, after counting the same, told that it was Rs.1,500/-. When the numbers are verified with the entrustment mahazar, it was found tallied. P.W.11 seized the stamp pad and subjected to phenolphthalein test. The bottle containing washer of stamp pad is marked as M.O.4 and stamp pad is marked as M.O.5. Then, P.W.11 asked the first accused regarding the documents pertaining to the water connection application of P.W.3, he handed over 7 documents relating to that and were marked as Exs.P.3, P.7 to P.10, P.16 and P.17. After that P.W.11 came down and enquired the second accused. Then P.W.11 arrested both the accused persons.

(vi)For the above said proceedings, a mahazar was prepared under Ex.P.11, observation mahazar is marked under Ex.P.13, rough sketch is marked under Ex.P.19. After that P.W.11 went to the house of the accused persons and searched. But no documents were seized. The search list were prepared under Ex.P.12 for the first accused and Ex.P.14 for the second accused. Then P.W.11 seized the Attendance Register (Ex.P.20), water connection application register (Ex.P.21). The entries in Sl.No.45 are Ex.P.22, Sl.No.1 to149 from the date i.e., 16.03.2007 to 11.06.2007 in another water connection application register is marked as Ex.P.23. P.W.11 handed over the case records to P.W.12, another Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anticorruption for further investigation.

(vii)P.W.12 has taken up the investigation and filed a final report before the trial Court against the accused persons for the offences under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

4.After receipt of the final report, the trial Court framed the charges against the accused persons, which are as follows:-

The accused persons being public servants demanded and accepted a sum of Rs.1,500/- from P.W.3 as illegal gratification. Therefore, they are committed offences under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. Since the accused denied their charges and pleaded not guilty, they were tried for the offences as stated supra.

5.In order to buttress the prosecution case, the prosecution examined P.W.1 to P.W.12 and marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.27 and also M.O.1 to M.O.6. In order to disprove the case of the prosecution, the accused examined D.W.1 and marked Ex.D.1 and Ex.D.2.

6.On consideration of both oral and documentary evidence, the trial Court has acquitted the accused for the offences as stated supra. Assailing the same, the present appeal came to be filed by the State.

7.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would submit that in the present case, P.W.3 is the defacto complainant and P.W.8 is the shadow witness. Their evidence was clearly corroborated each other. Initially, the first accused demanded a sum of Rs.9,000/- for water connection and Rs.1,500/- as illegal gratification and the same was reported to the second accused Executive Officer. However, the second accused also reiterated the same and stated that without making payment, no work will be done in the Government office. Thereafter, she filed a complaint before P.W.11, trap laying officer. After completing pre-trap proceeding, trap was conducted on 12.06.2007. P.W.3 narrated the entire events happened in the accused's office and the evidence of P.W.8 also line by line corroborated with P.W.3 and there is no enmity in between the accused persons and P.W.8. However, the trial Court has acquitted the accused on the ground that if at all the money was received as illegal gratification by the first accused, he would definitely keep the amount in his pocket or on his table drawer, but the same was placed on the table.

8.He would further submit that P.W.11 in his cross-examination stated that he recorded the confession statement of the accused at the time of trap proceeding. P.W.8 has also corroborated the same. However, the same was not produced before the trial Court. Further, in the application under Ex.P.4, there is a word that P.W.3 was instructed to pay Rs.1000/- as flag day donation. But, the trial Court has given a benefit of doubt in favour of the accused and acquitted them, which is unsustainable one. Though the accused persons have right to collect the legal amount for water connection and for flag day donation, they have no right to demand a particular amount except the legal amount. Even a bare perusal of the order of the trial Court reveals that the same is perverse and liable to be rejected. Therefore, he prayed for allowing this appeal by convicting the accused persons.

9.In support of his contention, he relied upon the decisions rendered in the cases of ***Pon Sakthivel / Natarajan Vs. State by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance and Anticorruption, Trichy*** reported in ***2000-1-L.W. (Crl.) 169*** and ***State of Tamil Nadu Vs. S.Krishnamurthy*** reported in ***2003 SCC (Crl.) 1236***.

10.Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondents /

accused would submit that the law with regard to the power of the Appellate Court to interfere with the order of acquittal is well settled. Once the case is ended in acquittal, two views are possible. One is the Appellate Court should not interfere with the acquittal by the Lower Court and another one is only where the material on record leads to a sole and inescapable conclusion of guilt of the accused, the judgment of acquittal will call for interference by the Appellate Court. In the present case, admittedly, the defacto complainant P.W.3 was instructed to pay Rs.9,000/- for getting water connection from the Town Panchayat. Therefore, he came to the Town Panchayat and he paid only a sum of Rs.5,535/- with receipt, without paying a sum of Rs.2,000/- he approached the first accused for water connection. In Ex.P.4, the first accused clearly mentioned that a sum of Rs.1,500/- is for military donation cum flag day donation. Innocently, the first accused collected the flag day donation from the defacto complainant. The said amount is seized by the Law Enforcing Agency and the defacto complainant is a problematic person and she intentionally, implicated the accused persons in the present case. In fact, the defacto complainant's husband was in military service and since the defacto complainant is belonged to military family, the first accused received the said amount as flag day donation. However, cunningly, the trap laying officer and the defacto complainant handed over the phenolphthalein coated notes to the accused persons. P.W.7 in his cross-examination clearly stated that except P.W.3, no official witness was present at the time of paying cash and without paying Rs.2000/- bank deposit she got water connection and further except Rs.1,500/- no amount was recovered from the office of the accused persons and no amount was recorded in the recovery mahazar.

11.He would further submit that considering all those aspects, it is seen that there is no corroboration in between P.W.3 and P.W.8, shadow witness, thereby, benefit of doubt has been given in favour of the accused persons. Accordingly, the trial Court acquitted the accused persons and the well considered and well merited judgment passed by the trial Court need not be interfered with in mechanical manner.

12.In respect of his contention, he placed reliance on the decisions rendered in the cases of ***Nayankumar Shivappa Waghmare Vs. State of Maharashtra*** reported in ***(2015) 11 SCC 213, T.Subramanian Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*** reported in ***(2006) 1 SCC (Crl.) 401, State of Rajasthan Vs. Mohan Lal*** reported in ***(2009) 12 SCC 515*** and ***V.Sejappa Vs. The State, by Police Inspector, Lokayukta, Chitradurga*** reported in ***2016 (1) T.N.L.R. 321 (SC).***

13.Heard both sides and perused the records carefully.

14.In the light of the above submissions, now it has to be analyzed that:-

(i)Whether the respondents are entitled to the benefit of reasonable doubt, when this Court deals with the merit of the appeal against acquittal;

(ii)Whether the prosecution has established that the accused persons have demanded and obtained a sum of Rs.1,500/- other than legal remuneration through the evidence of P.W.3 and P.W.8.

15.This Court is of the considered view that the law with regard to the power of the Appellate Court to interfere with the order of acquittal is well settled. Once the case is ended in acquittal, there are two views possible. One is the Appellate Court should not interfere with the acquittal by the Lower Court and another one is only where the material on record leads to a sole and inescapable conclusion of guilt of the accused, the judgment of acquittal will call for interference by the Appellate Court. The aforesaid views are clearly elaborated in the decisions reported in (2006) 1 SCC (Crl) 401 as stated supra.

16.It is relevant to refer the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in 2016 (1) T.N.L.R. 321 (SC) as stated supra, wherein it has been extracted that in dealing with appeals against acquittal, the Appellate Court must bear in mind that there is presumption of innocence in favour of an accused person and such presumption is strengthened by the order of acquittal passed in his favour by the trial Court and the accused person is entitled to the benefit of reasonable doubt, when it deals with the merit of the appeal against acquittal.

17.The evidence of P.W.3 defacto complainant and P.W.8 shadow witness was elaborately discussed in the earlier paragraphs. The initial demand made by the first accused is 08.06.2007. However, P.W.3 in her evidence stated that the initial demand is 29.05.2007. The second accused received the application and instructed to hand over the said application to the first accused. After receipt of the same, the first accused directed P.W.3 to pay a sum of Rs.3/- for application for water connection and Rs.561/- for house tax. The defacto complainant paid the said amount and got receipt on the same day itself and handed over the application along with receipts and requested to make arrangement for water connection. For which, the first accused instructed the defacto complainant to come after 10 days. Again he met the first accused on 08.06.2007 at about 04.00 p.m., at that time, he instructed the defacto complainant to pay a sum of Rs.9,000/- for water connection and Rs.1,500/- as bribe amount for himself and for the second accused. On the same day, it was reported to the second accused. The second accused also reiterated and confirmed the bribe amount demanded by the first accused for himself and the first accused. Immediately, thereafter, the same was informed to P.W.11 and P.W.11 arranged official witnesses and conducted pre-trap proceedings. On the date of trap proceedings, the second accused again demanded the very same amount from the defacto complainant. P.W.8 shadow witness accompanied with P.W.3 and went to the first accused's room, thereafter, the first accused prepared chit for payment for water connection and directed P.W.3 to pay the same in the cash counter.

The person was in counter taken Rs.5,325/- and returned Rs.175/- as balance to P.W.3 and he gave a receipt therefore. He instructed to pay a sum of Rs.2,000/- in Bank and gave a receipt under Ex.P.8 for payment of Rs.5,325/- to P.W.3. Thereafter, P.W.3 and P.W.8 met the first accused and gave the aforesaid receipts and other documents. The first accused demanded the bribe amount of Rs.1,500/- thereafter, the said phenolphthalein coated currency notes were handed over to the first accused. The first accused received the said amount in his hand and put it on the table. The evidence of P.W.3 and P.W.8 clearly corroborated each other.

18.Now, this Court could not able to find any discrepancy from the evidence of P.W.3 and P.W.8. Further, P.W.11 trap laying officer clearly narrated the entire events happened at the time of trap proceedings with regard to the phenolphthalein test conducted by him.

19.On perusal of the above, this Court unable to understand the view taken by the trial Court and the view taken by the trial Court is contrary to the decision reported in ***1977 Crl.L.J 626 (Sumanlal Vs. State of Gujarat***), wherein it has been held as follows:-

> *"If a public servant insists upon a particular payment, which does not amount to a legal remuneration as consideration for the discharge of his duties, he does commit an act, which amounts to an offence under Section 161 IPC."*

20.In the present case, the accused did not establish that whether the amount received by them is military fund or flag day donation. A perusal of Ex.P.4 reveals that it is only for military fund. If it is military fund, the stand taken by the accused as flag day donation is unsustainable one and military fund and flag day donation is not one and the same. They must maintain separate register for collecting the military fund from the general public. However, no register was adduced before the trial Court in order to establish that the amount received by the accused persons as military fund or flag day donation.

21.The learned counsel appearing for the respondents in his argument submitted that P.W.3 de-facto complainant brought a sum of Rs.9,000/- and Rs.1,500/- tainted currency. However, he paid only a sum of Rs.5,325/-. The balance amount was not recovered by the trap laying officer. Non-recovery of balance amount creates suspicion with regard to trap conducted by the trap laying officer. The trap laying officer arranged pre-trap proceedings and handed over Rs.1,500/- tainted currency notes to P.W.2 and instructed the shadow witness to accompany with her in order to identify the demand and acceptance of bribe amount. Non-recovery of other amount, which is not related to the trap proceedings, will not vitiate the entire prosecution case. Further, the prosecution has clearly established the demand and acceptance of bribe amount through the evidence of P.W.2 and P.W.8.

22.Now, with regard to donation, it is relevant to refer the decision of this Court in ***Pon Sakthivel/Natarajan Vs. State by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance and Anticorruption, Trichi***, reported in ***2000 (1) LW (Cri.) 169***, wherein at Paragraph 34, it has been held as follows:-

"34.Learned Government Advocate contended that even assuming that the first accused received amount for the flag day collection, it would amount to illegal gratification. In support of the same, he relies upon a decision reported in Sumanlal V. State of Gujarat (1997 Crl.L.J. 626). In the above decision, it is held thus:-

"If a public servant insists upon a particular payment, which does not amount to a legal remuneration as consideration for the discharge of his duties, he does commit an act which amounts to an offence under Section 161 IPC, even though it is found that he received that amount, not for his personal purpose, but for a charitable purpose or for the purpose of his employer. Even the employer is not entitled to refuse to discharge his duties, which are of public nature and make it a condition precedent upon any payment for any cause, however, laudable the aid cause may be"

In a decision of this Court reported in Periyasamy V. Inspector, Vigilance and Anticorruption, Tiruchirappalli (1999 Crl.L.J.2944), the above judgment of Gujarat High Court has been referred to. In the above decision, it is held thus:-

"The public servant also would some times take the advantage of the circular to take up the defence plea in these corruption cases, though the demand of the amount was towards bribe. Therefore, it is, in this context, appropriate to direct the State Government to take a policy decision not to ask the public servants to make any collection for any purpose, which would be a great service to both the public and the public servants".

But in the instant case, it is not established that P.W.3 paid Rs. 300/- as donation for the flag day collection to first accused."

23.A perusal of the above said decision, it is seen that the public servant had prohibited from collecting any donation from the general public. In the present case, no circular was placed before this Court either by the respondents or by the Executive Office that they are authorized to collect either military donation or Flag Day donation. In the absence of any circular or authorization by the State Government or by the Central Government, even demanding such donation is illegal one. Hence, the decisions relied upon by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor are squarely applicable to the present case. In this case, it is not established that P.W.2 paid a sum of Rs.1,500/- as donation for the flag day collection to the first accused.

24.Once the initial burden with regard to demand and acceptance are established / discharged by the prosecution, as per Section 20 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, it is for the accused to rebut the presumption and disprove the prosecution case. Unless the contrary is proved, it is presumed that the accused accepted or obtained or agreed to accept or attempted to obtain that gratification or that valuable thing, as the case may be, as a motive or reward. In the present case on hand, in order to disprove the case of the prosecution, the accused examined D.W.1-Jagannathan, who deposed that he is the relative of the second accused and marked Ex.D.1-Marriage Invitation of his son. This Court is unable to arrive at any conclusion that the accused person rebutted the presumption through D.W.1. Further, the prosecution has established that the second accused received the bribe amount and the amount was recovered by P.W.11 and therefore, it shall be presumed that the second accused received a sum of Rs.1,500/- as illegal gratification for himself and for the first accused and the presumption under Section 20 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, has not been rebutted by the accused persons, by acceptable evidence in all probabilities.

25.On a careful scrutiny of the records, I am of the considered opinion that not only the reasonings given by the trial Court are wrong, but also the entire approach adopted by the trial Court in appreciation of the materials available on record would reflect utter perversity. In other words, it can be stated that none of the reasonings given by the trial Court for concluding that the prosecution case is not reliable is not based upon any evidence available in this case, but the entire finding of the trial Court is thoroughly based upon misreading of the evidence. Hence, I hold that the findings of the trial Court, acquitting the accused persons without any acceptable reason, is perverse.

26.Accordingly, the accused persons are convicted for the offences under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(i)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and sentenced to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment and imposed to pay a fine of Rs.2,500/- in default to undergo one month rigorous imprisonment for the offence under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act and sentenced to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment and imposed to pay a fine of Rs.2,500/- in default to undergo one month rigorous imprisonment for the offence under Section 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act. The above sentences shall run concurrently. Therefore, the trial Court is directed to take immediate steps for securing the accused persons to commit them for serving the period of sentence.

27.In the result, this Criminal Appeal is allowed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CO)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar

Myr
To
1.The Special Judge,
Vigilance and Anticorruption Court,
Trichirappalli.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Vigilance and Anticorruption Wing, Tiruchirappalli.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anticorruption Wing, Tiruchirappalli.

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

Copy To:

The Section Officer,
Criminal Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.**(2 copies**)

1 CC to M/s.T.SENTHIL KUMAR, Advocate (SR-55840[F])dated 22/03/2019)

Judgement made in
CRL.A.(MD)No.351 of 2013

DS/ /SAR- (01.04.2019) 11P 8C