**BAIL SLIP**

Revision Petitioner/Accused, namely Ayyanar S/O. Rajamani, Was directed to be released on bail in and by the order of this court dated 12.01.2011 made in M.P. 1 of 2011 in CrI R.C. (MD) No. 22 of 2011.

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.06.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

CrI.R.C (MD) No.22 of 2011

Ayyanar

... Petitioner

Vs

State through,
The Inspector of Police,
Watrap Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
In Crime No.102 of 2005


... Respondent

PRAYER: Petition filed under Section 397 r/w 401 of Criminal Procedure Code, against the Judgment and Conviction passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Srivilliputhur in C.C.No.36 of 2005, dated 24.01.2006 for the offence under Section 435 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo one year R.I., and to pay a fine of Rs.5,000 in default to undergo three months rigorous imprisonment and in the fine amount of Rs.5,000/- Rs.3,000/- to be treated as fine and the remaining Rs.2000/- has to be given to P.W.1 for the loss incurred by him and the compensation amount of Rs.2,000/- is ordered to be handed over to P.W.1 after the appeal time and for the alleged offence under Section 506(ii) of IPC to undergo one year rigorous imprisonment and the sentence should run concurrently and the same was confirmed by the Principal Sessions Court, Virudhunagar District at Srivilliputhoor in C.A.No.22 of 2006, dated 12.11.2010.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Kalamurugappan

For Respondent : Mr.A.Robinson
Government Advocate (CrI.side)**ORDER**

The petitioner was found guilty of the offences under Sections 435 and 506(II) of IPC. He was sentenced to one year rigorous imprisonment and also directed to pay a fine amount of Rs.5,000/- in respect of the offence under Section 435 of IPC. As regards offence under Section 506(ii) IPC, he was sentenced to



undergo one year rigorous imprisonment. The sentences were to run concurrently.

2. The petitioner had already remitted the fine amount. The petitioner appears to have spent quite some time in prison. The occurrence had taken place way back in the year 2005. The petitioner's counsel therefore, submitted that he would not question the finding of guilt and that he would be satisfied, if the sentence is modified.

3. I find the said request to be reasonable. Therefore, even while confirming the finding of conviction pronounced by the Courts below, the sentence is reduced and modified to the period already undergone. The criminal revision petition is partly allowed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CRL SIDE)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

rmi

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Srivilliputhur.

2. TO THRO'

The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Virudhunagar at Srivilliputhur.

3. The Principal Sessions Court, Virudhunagar
District at Srivilliputhoor.

4. The Inspector of Police,
Watrap Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.

5. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Madurai

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

+1CC TO M/S.M.KALAMURUGAPPAN, ADVOCATE, SR.NO.70532

Crl.R.C (MD) No.22 of 2011
21.06.2019