

BAIL SLIP

The Appellant in Crl A.No.208 of 2018 viz., Elumalai S/O Mottaiyan, aged 39 years was directed to be released on Bail as per the order of this court dated 03-10-2018 made in Crl MP.NO.4963 of 2018 in Crl A.No.208 of 2018.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICIATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 29.01.2020

Pronounced on: 21.02.2020

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.PONGIAPPAN

Criminal Appeal No.208 of 2018

Elumalai
S/o.Mottaiyan

...

Appellant / 1st Accused

versus

The State represented
By the Inspector of Police,
Vanapuram Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai.
(Crime No.161 of 2008)

..

Respondent / Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, against the conviction and sentence passed by the learned Sessions Judge [Fast Track Mahila Court], Tiruvannamalai in S.C.No.136 of 2009 dated 09.12.2017.

For Appellant : Dr.G.Krishnamurthy

For Respondent : Mrs.M.Prabhavathi
Additional Public Prosecutor

J U D G M E N T

[Judgment of this Court was made by R.PONGIAPPAN, J.]

The present Appeal has been filed by the appellant/first accused against the judgment passed in S.C.No.136 of 2009 dated 09.12.2017 on the file of the learned Sessions Judge [Fast Track Mahila Court], Tiruvannamalai.

2. The appellant is the first accused in the above said case. Along with the other accused, the appellant stood charged for the offences under Sections 324 and 302 of IPC. The appellant denied all the charges and opted for trial. Therefore, he was put on trial on the charges. After full-fledged trial, the learned Sessions Judge [Fast Track Mahila Court], Tiruvannamalai, found the appellant guilty of an offence under Section 302 of IPC. Accordingly, the appellant was convicted and sentenced to undergo Life Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/-, in default to undergo 3 years Rigorous Imprisonment. Challenging the conviction and sentence, the appellant is before this Court by way of filing the present Criminal Appeal.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is as follows:-

P.W.1 [Jegannathan] is the resident of Kottaiyur Colony. The second accused/Amuthavalli [now acquitted] is the sister of the present appellant [Elumalai]. The third accused/Kasiammal [now acquitted] is the mother of the accused 1 and 2. All of them are residing in the same house. All the accused in the alleged occurrence had cultivated the land measuring an extent of 1 acre belongs to P.W.1 and they have not paid any lease amount till date. For the past 15 years, both P.W.1 and the accused are having the land dispute. In this regard, the suit filed by the mother of P.W.1 was ended in favour of P.W.1. Due to the land dispute, all the accused having an enmity with P.W.1.

4. While so, on 12.09.2008, at about 6.30a.m., when P.W.1 was in his house, his daughter Esther put a cow dung water in front of his house, during that time, the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal] came there. Unfortunately, cow dung water was put on the said Unnamalai Ammal, for which, the deceased abused the daughter of P.W.1 and assaulted on her right leg. Due to the said incident, wordy altercation had happened between P.W.1 and the deceased. In consequent to the same, the appellant [Elumalai] assaulted P.W.1 on his left hand. Further, he pulled down the mother of P.W.1, due to which, she went to the stage of unconscious.

5. In continuation of the same transaction, the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal] catch hold the hands of P.W.1's mother. Immediately, the appellant/first accused assaulted the deceased on her chest and abdomen. Due to the attack made by the first accused, the mother of P.W.1 sustained injury and went to the stage of unconscious. Thereafter, she was died in the occurrence place itself. The said occurrence was seen by nearly 30 persons, who are residing in the same Village. On the same day, at about 8.00a.m., P.W.1 lodged a complaint before Vanapuram Police Station under Ex.P.1. P.W.1 was also taken treatment in Tiruvannamalai Government Hospital for the injury sustained by him.

6. On receipt of the complaint given by P.W.1, P.W.12 [Hemamalini], the then Sub Inspector of Police, registered a case in Crime No.161 of 2008 under Sections 294(b), 324 and 302 of IPC. Ex.P.7 is the printed First Information Report. After registration of the case, for investigation the same was handed over to P.W.15 [Ravichandran], who is the then Inspector of Police, Vanapuram. On receipt of copy of First Information Report, P.W.15 rushed to the scene of occurrence and he prepared an Observation Mahazar under Ex.P.2 in the presence of P.W.6 [Samuvel] and one Sathya. He conducted enquiry in the presence of panchayatars and witnesses and prepared Inquest Report under Ex.P.11. On 12.09.2008, at about 2.45p.m. near Vanapuram Bus Stand, he arrested all the accused and recorded the confession statement given by the appellant herein in the presence of P.W.7 [Karthikeyan], who is the Village Administrative Officer. In the confession statement, the appellant admitted the offence and willing to produce the cement concrete stone, which was used for the commission of offence, now hidden in his thatched shed.

7. Based on the said confession, the appellant brought the police to his house and identified the cement concrete stone and subsequently, the same was recovered by P.W.15 under the cover of Mahazar. The admitted portion of the confession statement given by the appellant was marked as Ex.P.13. The Mazahar dated 12.09.2008 was marked as Ex.P.4.

8. In continuation of the investigation, P.W.15 entrusted the dead body of Unnamalai Ammal to P.W.11 [Annamalai], who is the then Head Constable of Vanapuram Police Station, with a direction to hand over the dead body for post-mortem and in-turn, P.W.11 identified the dead body of Unnamalai Ammal to P.W.14 [Dr.Arulanandham].

9. On 12.09.2008, P.W.14 [Dr.Arulanandham] attached to the Tiruvannamalai Government Hospital received a requisition letter given by P.W.15 and conducted post-mortem over the dead body of the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal]. During the time of post-

mortem, he found the following external and internal injuries:-

"External injuries:-

- 1) Contusion Lt. side of face near left eye 3 cm x 2 cm size brown in colour,
- 2) Contusion Lt. side of face near nose 0.5 cm x 0.5 cm size brown in colour,
- 3) Abrasion Lt. side of face linear 1 cm length brown in colour,
- 4) Abrasion alanasai of Lt. side of nose 1 cm length brown in colour,
- 5) Abrasion over the left shoulder linear 2.5 cm length brown in colour,
- 6) Contusion Lt. side of chest inframammary region 5 cm x 5 cm size brown in colour,
- 7) Mud gravels sticking over the postero medial aspect both Rt & Lt arms, Elbows, forearms, on cleaning multiple punctuate abrasions seen 0.5 cm x 0.5 cm size brown in colour.

Internal injuries:-

Thorax : Ribs cartilages intact, left plural cavity containing about 100 ml. of blood stained fluid. Lungs : contusion left lower lobe 4 cm x 3 cm size seen. Heart intact contains dark coloured blood about 80 ml abdomen, peritoneal cavity empty, liver intact c/s congested, stomach contains 50 ml. of liquid white colour, spleen intact c/s congested. Both kidneys intact c/s congested, small intestine empty. Uterus intact, empty. Bladder empty, spine and long bones intact."

10. P.W.14 preserved viscera for chemical examination. On examination, it was found that there is no poisonous substance found in the viscera. After receiving the Viscera Report, P.W.14 gave an opinion that the deceased would appear to have died due to Asphyxia possibly due to smothering. Simultaneously, on the same day, at about 7.45a.m., he treated the appellant [Elumalai] and found the following injuries:-

- 1) Laceration over the occipital scalp 2.5 cm x 0.5 cm x 0.5 cm size, red in colour, edges irregular, small abrasion around the laceration 3 in numbers, contusion around the laceration 3 cm x 1 cm size,
- 2) Contusion & Abrasion over to back of the chest portion 12 cm x 2 cm red in colour, Abrasion locus dark red in colour.

According to him, injury nos.1 and 2 stated above, are simple in nature. In this regard, he issued Accident Register copy under Ex.P.9.

11. Further, he treated the daughter [Esther] of P.W.1 and found the following injuries:-

- "1) Bruise over the right thigh 2 cm x 2 cm size back in colour,
- 2) Linear abrasion over the right thigh 4 cm length back in colour."

In this occasion, the injury sustained by the said Esther is also simple in nature, for which, he issued Accident Register copy under Ex.P.10.

12. After completion of post-mortem along with Special Report, P.W.11 handed over M.O.4 [Green and Blue Colour Saree], M.O.5 [Green Colour Inskirt] and M.O.6 [Green Colour Blouse] to the Investigating Officer, which were removed from the dead body of the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal] and in-turn, the same were recovered by P.W.15 and thereafter, the same were forwarded to the learned Judicial Magistrate for further investigation. Before that, P.W.15 made arrangements for taking photographs and C.D. in the occurrence place under M.O.2 and M.O.3.

13. Subsequent to the completion of the above formalities, P.W.15 transferred from the said post and thereafter, P.W.16 [Sekar] took up the case for further investigation. He perused the records and examined the Doctor, who conducted post-mortem. After completing the investigation, he came to the positive conclusion that all the accused committed an offence of homicidal death and filed a final report under Sections 341, 294(b), 324, 342 and 302 r/w 34 of IPC, as against all the accused.

14. Based on the above materials, the trial Court framed the charges under Sections 324 and 302 of IPC against the appellant. He denied the same and opted for trial. Hence, in order to prove the case of prosecution, 16 witnesses have been examined as P.W.1 to P.W.16 and 14 documents were exhibited as P.1 to P.14 besides 6 Material Objects.

15. Out of the said witnesses, P.W.1 [Jegannathan] is the husband of the deceased Unnamalai Ammal. He has spoken about the previous enmity having between his family members with the accused. He has stated before the trial Court that during the time of occurrence, the first accused [Elumlalai] kicked the deceased on her chest, abdomen and on her face, also he stated about the lodging of complaint before the Police.

16. P.W.2 [Sakthivel] and P.W.3 [Balakrishnan] are the residents of Kottaiyur Village, wherein the deceased and the accused were residing. Though they were cited as eye witnesses

to the alleged occurrence before the trial Court, they have not supported the case of prosecution.

17. P.W.4 [Jhansirani] is the daughter of P.W.1. She has spoken about the abuse made by the second accused [Amuthavalli] and about the assault made towards her sister P.W.5 [Esther]. She has also spoken about the occurrence as stated by P.W.1.

18. P.W.5 [Esther] is also the daughter of P.W.1. She has spoken about the abuse made by the second accused [Amuthavalli] and also about the assault made by the first accused towards the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal].

19. P.W.6 [Samuvel] is the relative of P.W.1. He has spoken about the preparation of Observation Mahazar and the Rough Sketch by the Investigating Officer.

20. P.W.7 [Karthikeyan] is the Village Administrative Officer, now retired from service. According to him, on 12.09.2008, when he was standing along with his Assistant in Vanapuram Bus Stand, P.W.15 Investigating Officer examined A-2 and A-3 [now acquitted] and recorded their confession statement. As per their confession statement, they brought the Police Officers to their house and identified M.O.1 by saying that, the same was used for the commission of offence.

21. P.W.8 [Ashok Kumar] was working as an Assistant Director, Forensic Department, Vellore. He has spoken about the examination of viscera and about the issuance of the Viscera Report. According to him, there is no poisonous substance found in the viscera collected from the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal].

22. P.W.9 [Murugan] is the Photographer, who took photographs in the occurrence place in three angles.

23. P.W.10 [Elumalai], the then Sub Inspector of Police, Tandarampattu Police Station. He has spoken about the handing over of copy of First Information Report to the Deputy Superintendent of Police.

24. P.W.11 [Annamalai], the then Head Constable, Vanapuram Police Station. He has spoken about the entrustment of the dead body of Unnamalai Ammal by the Investigating Officer and about the handing over of M.O.3 to M.O.6 to the Investigating Officer.

25. P.W.12 [Hemamalini], the then Sub Inspector of Police, Vanapuram Police Station. He has stated about the receipt of complaint from P.W.1 and about the registration of

the case.

26. P.W.13 [Selvam], the then Judicial Magistrate, Chengam. He has stated about the recording of 164(5) statement from the witnesses, namely, Jegannathan and Sumathi.

27. P.W.14 Dr.Arulanandham is a Doctor attached with Tiruvannamalai Government Hospital. He has spoken about the treatment given to the appellant/first accused and P.W.5 [Esther]. He has also spoken about the details of injuries sustained by the deceased and about the opinion with regard to the cause of death.

28. P.W.15 [Ravichandran] and P.W.16 [Sekar] are the Police Officers, they had spoken about the manner of investigation conducted, about the arrest of accused, recovery made through the accused and about the filing of the charge sheet.

29. When the above incriminating materials were put to the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C., he denied the same as false, however, he did not choose to examine any witnesses nor did he mark any documents on his side.

30. Having considered all the above, the learned Presiding Officer, Mahila Court, Tiruvannamalai, found the appellant/first accused guilty for the offence under Section 302 IPC. In respect to the charges framed against A-2 and A-3, the learned Judge came to the conclusion that the same has not been proved beyond reasonable doubt and ultimately, he acquitted A-2 and A-3. Accordingly, the appellant was convicted and sentenced to undergo as stated in the second paragraph of this judgment. Aggrieved over the above conviction and sentence, the appellant/first accused is before this Court with the present Criminal Appeal.

31. We have heard Dr.G.Krishnamurthy, learned counsel appearing for the appellant, Mrs.M.Prabhavathi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State and also perused the records carefully.

32. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant would contend that during the time of occurrence, many number of persons from either side assembled and made assault each other. Only in the said circumstances, the present appellant, P.W.5 [Esther] and the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal] got injury, as a result of which, the death had occurred to the said Unnamalai Ammal. Before the trial Court, the witnesses on the side of the prosecution has not elicited the overt act of the appellant. Therefore, it cannot be said that the first accused

alone assaulted the deceased and committed the offence of murder.

33. He would further contend that in respect to the recovery made through the appellant, the evidence given by the Investigating Officer is entirely different, when comparing the evidence of Village Administrative Officer, who attested in the confession statement and in the recovery Mahazar. He has strongly contended that the genesis of occurrence in this case was suppressed, particularly, in respect to the lodging of complaint before the Police Officer. In fact, in respect to the lodging of complaint before the Police Officer, P.W.1, who is the de facto complainant had stated different versions and thereby, it cannot be concluded that the prosecution proved the case beyond reasonable doubt.

34. Disputing the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, Mrs.M.Prabhavathi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would contend that, the contradiction in respect to the lodging of complaint before the Police now indicated by the first accused are all minor in nature. The evidence given by P.W.1 in respect to the lodging of complaint is not materially affect the case of prosecution. Since the eye witness examined on the side of the prosecution has clearly spoken about the attack made by the appellant and also the same was corroborated through the medical evidence, it is not necessary in interfering with the findings of the trial Court. Accordingly, she prays to dismiss the appeal.

35. On considering the rival submissions made by either side, while at the time of giving evidence as P.W.1, the de facto complainant has stated that the complaint was written by the Police. Further, he has stated that the alleged complaint was written by the Police in the occurrence place itself. On the other hand, P.W.12, who registered the First Information Report has clearly stated that P.W.1 lodged a written complaint before him and thereafter, the case has been registered.

36. Now, on comparing the evidence given by P.W.1 and P.W.12, it is true that in respect of receiving the complaint, two different versions are let in by the prosecution witnesses. In the said circumstances, we are in a position to decide whether the contradiction available in the evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.12 will materially affect the case of prosecution or not. In this occasion, it is relevant to see the further evidence given by P.W.1 in respect to the lodging of complaint. According to him, the averment found in Ex.P.1 are all according to the statement given before the Police. He has specifically stated in his cross examination as after recording the complaint, the same was read over to him and then only, he put his signature in the complaint. Therefore, the cross examination of P.W.1 is very

clear that the case has been registered only as per his version.

37. In fact, the First Information Report is not a substantial piece of evidence inasmuch as it is the earliest version that can be compared with, what is later told during the trial. All versions and omissions can be considered in judging the truth. It being the first version of the case and it is the strongest weapon in the hand of the defence to test the version of the maker with referring to the first version. The principal object of the First Information Report from the point of view of the informant is to set the criminal law in motion and from the point of view of the investigating authorities is to obtain information about the alleged crime. It is not a specific piece of evidence and it may be used only for the purpose of either corroborating its maker under Section 157 of the Indian Evidence Act or contradicting him under Section 145 of the Indian Evidence Act.

38. In the said circumstances, though in respect to the lodging of complaint, there was two different versions available in the prosecution case, in respect to the occurrence P.W.1 has narrated the entire thing before the Court as stated in the complaint. In otherwise, he has not denied the lodging of complaint before the Police, more than that, P.W.1 being illiterate person gave evidence before the trial Court after a long gap and hence, the said circumstances is not materially affect the case of prosecution. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the said contradiction indicated by the learned counsel for the appellant in respect to the lodging of complaint is no way affect the case of prosecution.

39. In respect to the presence of other persons in the occurrence place, as per the evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2, at the time of occurrence, all the three accused and the family members of P.W.1 are alone present. Admittedly, both of them have previous enmity due to civil dispute. More than that, both of them are residing in the neighbouring houses. In the said circumstances, though the number of persons participated in the occurrence is more than 7, it is easy for the witnesses to identify the person, who attacked the deceased. But P.W.1 and P.W.5 had stated before the trial Court as the present appellant only attacked the deceased on her chest and abdomen. Since all the persons available in the scene of occurrence are not the third party, therefore, it cannot be concluded that it is not easy for the eye witness to identify the accused at the time of occurrence.

40. So far as the criminal cases are concerned, as observed by the Honourable Supreme Court, the evidence of an ocular witness, if accepted, is sufficient to warrant conviction

though in appropriate cases the Court may as a measure of caution seek some confirming circumstances from other sources.

41. In this case, as rightly pointed out by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor that the evidence given by the Doctor, who conducted post-mortem is in support of ocular evidence. The mere fact that in a murder case, the ocular account of eye witness is not consistent with medical evidence. If the medical evidence altogether rules out, the possibility that the injuries could take place in the manner alleged by the prosecution. In this case, P.W.14 Dr.Arulanandham has clearly stated that the death had happened due to asphyxia possibly due to smothering. Therefore, we are of the opinion that in respect to the alleged offence, the ocular evidence written by the prosecution is clearly corroborated through the medical evidence.

42. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant would further contend that in this case as per the evidence given by P.W.14, the appellant herein has also sustained injury, for which, no explanation is offered on the side of the prosecution. Therefore, in a given case, the witnesses, who are present in the occurrence had also equally assaulted the appellant and so, it cannot be held that the appellant alone committed the offence under Section 302 of IPC.

43. On considering the said submission with the relevant evidence given by P.W.14, the appellant herein sustained only simple injury during the time of occurrence. Therefore, assuming that the same was due to the assault made by P.W.1 that alone cannot be taken into account for considering the case of prosecution in favour of the appellant.

44. In this case, it is necessary to consider the judgment of DASHRATH vs. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH reported in (2018) 4 SCC 428, wherein, our Honourable Apex Court has held as follows:-

"8..... It cannot be held as a matter of law or invariably a rule that whenever the accused sustained an injury in the same occurrence, the prosecution is obliged to explain the injury and on the failure of the prosecution to do so, the prosecution case should be disbelieved. Before holding that non-explanation of the injuries on the persons of the accused persons by the prosecution witnesses may affect the prosecution case, the court has to be satisfied of the existence of two conditions:

(i) that the injury on the person of the

accused was of a serious nature; and
(ii) that such injuries must have been caused at the time of the occurrence in question. (Vide Takhaji Hiraji v. Thakore Kubersing Chamansing [(2001) 6 SCC 145, SCC p.154, para 17]."

45. So, applying the said principles with the case in our hand, since for the reason that the appellant sustained only simple injury in the occurrence that alone cannot be a ground for acquitting the charges framed against him.

46. The last submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant is that, during the time of occurrence, the appellant reached the scene of occurrence not with any motive and premeditation for murdering the deceased [Unnamalai Ammal], the occurrence had happened, as a result of wordy altercation made between P.W.5 and the first accused. Further, the appellant is not having any knowledge about the attack made on the chest of the deceased would lead her death. In this regard, he relied on the judgment of MANOJ KUMAR vs. STATE OF HIMACHAL PRADESH reported in 2018 AIR (SC) 2693, in which, our Honourable Apex Court has held as follows:-

"30. The above opinion goes to show that the injury no.2 on the scalp resulted in hemorrhage which has not been duly accounted for. Moreover, the force and gravity of assault indicates that the aforesaid assault was carried out with only sufficient knowledge of likely death of the deceased in a free fight situation. Had he got intention to commit the murder of the deceased by inflicting such injury, he might have used the weapon with sufficient force and in that case, definitely it would have caused a deep injury causing fracture of skull. This court is bound to show some deference to this particular aspect while evaluating the facts and circumstances of this case at hand."

47. Applying the principles set out by our Honourable Apex Court, in this case also, at the time of occurrence, the present appellant had come to the occurrence place without any weapon, only as a result of wordy altercation, he repeatedly kicked the deceased on her chest. So, it cannot be said that the first accused is having the intention to murder the deceased.

48. In this occasion, it is necessary to consider the judgment of LAVGHANBHAI DEVJIBHAI VASAVA vs. STATE OF GUJARAT reported in (2018) 4 SCC 329, wherein our Honourable Apex Court

has held as follows:-

"The parameters, inter alia, which are to be taken into consideration while deciding the question as to whether a case falls under Section 302 IPC or Section 304 IPC, are as follows:

- (a) The circumstances in which the incident took place;
- (b) The nature of weapon used;
- (c) Whether the weapon was carried or was taken from the spot;
- (d) Whether the assault was aimed on vital part of body;
- (e) The amount of the force used;
- (f) Whether the deceased participated in the sudden fight;
- (g) Whether there was any previous enmity;
- (h) Whether there was any sudden provocation;
- (i) Whether the attack was in the heat of passion; and
- (j) Whether the person inflicting the injury took any undue advantage or acted in the cruel or unusual manner."

49. Now, on considering the ratio laid down by our Honourable Apex Court stated supra, in this case also, considering the fact that the nature of weapon and the amount of force used by the first accused are all due to sudden fight. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the first accused has committed an offence under Section 304(II) IPC and not 302 IPC.

50. Turning to the quantum of punishment, the first accused is a poor man and he has no bad antecedence, only during a wordy quarrel between the first accused and the deceased, the first accused attacked the deceased with his hand on her chest and pushed her down and while she fell down, the first accused assaulted on her chest. Taking into consideration of the mitigating as well as aggravating circumstances, we are of the considered view that reducing the sentence is very much necessary in this case.

51. In the result, the Criminal Appeal is partly allowed. The conviction and sentence imposed upon the appellant/first accused by the learned Sessions Judge [Fast Track Mahila Court], Tiruvannamalai in S.C.No.136 of 2009 dated 09.12.2017, is modified and the appellant/first accused is convicted under Sections 304(II) instead of 302 of IPC. For the offence under Section 304(II) of IPC, the appellant/first accused is hereby sentenced to undergo seven years Rigorous Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/-, in default to

undergo three months Rigorous Imprisonment. Since the appellant/first accused is on bail, the trial Court is directed to take steps to serve his custody, to undergo the remaining period of sentence, if any. It is also directed that the period of sentence already undergone by the appellant shall be given set off, as required under Section 428 Cr.P.C. Fine amount paid by him already is to be adjusted for the fine now imposed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sri

To

- 1.The Sessions Judge [Fast Track Mahila Court],
Tiruvannamalai.
- 2.The State Represented by the Inspector of Police,
Vanapuram Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai.
(Cr.No.161/2008)
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
- 4.The Fast Track Mahila Court,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 5.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,Vellore.
- 6.The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 7.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tiruvannamalai.

Criminal Appeal No.208 of 2018

PM(CO)
GS(02/06/2020)