

Bail Slip

Mr.S.Chandrasekar, S/o.Subramani Accused No.1 in S.C.No.207 of 2009 on the file of Mahalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court) Tiruvallur was enlarged on bail in MP.1/2014 in Cr1 A.No.116/2014 by this Hon'ble High Court dated 15.04.2014.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICIATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 03.11.2020

Pronounced on : 19.11.2020

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.PONGIAPPAN

Cr1.A.No.116 of 2014

S.Chandrasekar,
S/o.Subramani

...Appellant / A1

versus

The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvallur Sub-Division,
Tiruvallur District.

...Respondent/Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to set aside the Judgment of convicting the appellant for the offence alleged under section 498-A of I.P.C And sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for the period of 2 years and pay a fine of Rs.25,000/- in default to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for the period of six months and offence relating under section 304-B of I.P.C. Sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for the period of 7 years passed in S.C.No.207/2009 dated 24.02.2014 on the file of the Learned Mahalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur and consequently thereby Allowing the Appeal in part against the Judgment and Decree this Criminal Appeal.

For Appellant : Mr.J.R.K.Bhavanantham
For Respondent : Mr.S.Karthikeyan
Additional Public Prosecutor

J U D G M E N T

The present Criminal Appeal has been filed by the appellant to set aside the judgment of conviction and sentence passed by the Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur dated 24.02.2014 in S.C.No.207 of 2009.

2. The appellant herein is the first accused in the above referred case. He stood charged for the offences under Sections 498-A, 306 or 304-B of IPC. By a judgment dated 24.02.2014, the Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur, convicted the appellant under Section 498-A of IPC and sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for two(2) years and to pay a fine of Rs.25,000/-, in default to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for six(6) months. Further, he has convicted under Section 304-B of IPC and sentenced to undergo seven(7) years Rigorous Imprisonment. The trial Court also ordered the sentences to run concurrently.

3. Challenging the said conviction and sentence, the accused is before this Court, by way of filing the present Criminal Appeal.

4. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is as follows;

4.1. P.W.1-Devagi, is the resident of Ma.Po.Si.Street, Ganesapuram, Manavalanagar, Tiruvallur, she knew both the appellant and his wife (Vendha), who came as tenants, in her house 3½ months back prior to the occurrence and they had a petty quarrel and problems. On the day of occurrence, at about 2.30p.m. to 3.00p.m., the present appellant along with one Gopi, who is arrayed as 2nd accused came to her residence and they have fight with Vendha in a noisy manner, for which, she called all three persons and questioned why they have been fighting. While the conversation was going on, the said Vendha gone into the kitchen room and within a minute, there was a flame and she came out. At that time, Vendha was alive and she has taken to the Hospital by Ambulance and thereafter, she was told that Vendha was died. Hence, P.W.1 lodged a compliant under Ex.P.1 before P.W.14.

4.2. P.W.14, the then Sub-Inspector of Police in Manavalanagar Police Station, on 21.09.2007, at about 4.30p.m., when he was at his Police Station, P.W.1 came and lodged a complaint. On receipt of the same, P.W.14 registered First Information Report against the accused and one another person in Crime No.314 of 2007 under Section 309 of IPC. A printed F.I.R. was marked as Ex.P.13. Immediately, after registration of the case, he handed over the case records to P.W.15 for investigation.

4.3. In the meantime, after the occurrence, P.W.2-Krishnaveni, who is the mother of the deceased Vendha, heard the news and proceeded to the accused house, in which, she was informed by the house owner as her daughter set ablaze by pouring kerosene. Thereafter, she was stayed in the accused house in the night and in the next day morning, she was informed

by her sister's son that Vendha was died. After hearing the same, she lodged a complaint under Ex.P.2 on 22.09.2007 at Manavalanagar Police Station.

4.4. Immediately, after the occurrence, on 21.09.2007 itself, the appellant was brought by Gopi-A2 at around 4.25p.m., before P.W.10-Dr.Rajkumar, who is the Doctor attached to the Government Hospital, Tiruvallur. On enquiry, the appellant stated in the same day evening at 3.45p.m., at his house, his wife set ablaze and the appellant tried to save her and during that transaction, he sustained injuries. However, the appellant herein was treated as out-patient, for which, P.W.10 issued Accident Register Copy under Ex.P.8.

4.5. Further, on the same day, at about 4.20p.m., the deceased Vendha was brought to the Hospital by Gopi-A2. On examination, the injured Vendha told him that she herself poured kerosene on her body and set ablaze for the injuries sustained, she was taken to the Hospital. On examination, P.W.10 found that the injured Vendha sustained 85% burn injuries and therefore, first aid treatment was given to her and thereafter, she was referred to K.M.C. Hospital, Chennai, for further treatment. In this regard, P.W.10 issued Accident Register Copy, which was marked as Ex.P.9.

4.6. P.W.11-Dr.A.K.Mehajabeen, attached with K.M.C. Hospital, Chennai, on 21.09.2007, when he was on duty at about 5.45p.m., the appellant was brought by his relative, P.W.4-Velu for treatment and on enquiry, the appellant told that at his house, when his wife was in a burning condition, he tried to save her and out of that transaction, he sustained injuries. On examination, he was influenced by alcohol and new burn injuries were found on his face, right hand, right back, two legs, left hand and first aid treatment was given to him. In this regard, P.W.11 issued Accident Register copy under Ex.P.10. On the same day, at 5.50p.m., he examined the deceased Vendha, who was brought by P.W.4-Velu. On examination, the injured Vendha was brought dead and she sustained burn injuries having kerosene smell all over the body. Thereafter, the same was informed to the out-post Police Station and the dead body was sent to the mortuary. In this regard, P.W.11 issued Accident Register copy under Ex.P.11.

4.7. In continuation of investigation, on receipt of the First Information Report, P.W.15-Neelakandan, the then Inspector of Police, Manavalanagar Police Station, proceeded to the scene of occurrence and recorded the statement from P.W.1. In the presence of P.W.11-Ramu and P.W.12-Devaraj, he prepared the observation mahazar, under Ex.P.14. He drawn rough sketch under Ex.P.15. In the presence of same witnesses, he seized the

case properties of a plastic cane with 1.5 litres kerosene oil with lid, a burnt condition match box and burnt condition rose-cum-blue colour nylon saree, under seizure mahazar. He examined the witnesses, who are all present there and recorded their statements.

4.8. After recording the statements from the witnesses, he proceeded to the Hospital and recorded the statement from P.W.10-Dr.Rajkumar. On receipt of the death intimation, in the next day morning i.e. on 22.09.2007, at about 9.00a.m., he received a complaint from P.W.2-Krishnaveni and thereafter, he altered the Section of Law from Section 309 to Section 306 of IPC and in respect to the same, he prepared alteration report, under Ex.P.16. After completing those formalities, he handed over the case records to P.W.17 for further investigation.

4.9. P.W.17-Balakrishnan, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, took up the case for further investigation. He examined P.W.1 to P.W.5 and recorded their statements. He sent a requisition to R.D.O. concerned for conducting inquest. Further, he issued a requisition for conducting postmortem through Head Constable Raja, who was examined as P.W.13.

4.10. On receipt of the requisition given by P.W.17, P.W.12-Ranganathan, the then R.D.O., conducted inquest over the dead body of Vendha at K.M.C.Hospital, Chennai and the inquest report was marked as Ex.P.12. After enquiring the witnesses, he came to the conclusion that the present appellant has demanded dowry from the deceased, further on the ground of domestic violence, the deceased committed the suicide.

4.11. Similarly, on receipt of the requisition given by P.W.17, P.W.19-Dr.Kuppusamy, Police Surgeon and Professor of the Medical Legal Department of K.M.C. Hospital, conducted autopsy on the dead body of the deceased Vendha and found the following injuries;

"A moderately nourished female dead body with burns injuries exposing the reddish area over the face front and back of neck chest upper abdomen front and back of both upper limbs and both lower limbs except the gluteal region.

On discussion of Internal Organs : Hyoid bone intact. Trachea and larynx food particles present. Stomach empty. Heart, lungs, liver, kidneys and spleen normal. C/s congested. Intestines bladder and uterus - empty. Pelvis and spinal cord in tact. Scalp skull and membrane - In tact. Brain normal and c/s congested."

He has given a final opinion as the deceased could have been died of Hypovolumic shock due to burns (95%) and issued postmortem

certificate under Ex.P.19.

4.12. After completion of the postmortem, P.W.17 proceeded the investigation, on 24.09.2007 at about 6.00a.m., at Periyakuppam Manavalanagar Athupalam, arrested both the accused and recorded the confession statement from the appellant. The said confession statement given by the appellant was attested by P.W.9-Kumaran along with one Sampath.

4.13. Thereafter, on 01.10.2007, P.W.15 received the case records from the Deputy Superintendent of Police, and made arrangements for sending the seized materials for chemical examination. In respect to the same, P.W.20-Visalakshi, Officer from Forensic Science Laboratory conducted chemical analysis of M.O.1 to M.O.3 and gave a report under Ex.P.20 stating that M.O.1 is a sealed plastic cane with plastic screw and possessed 1½ litres of kerosene and on measurement, it was 1600ml of blue oily liquid and the result found to be a kerosene. M.O.2 is the match box with burn sticks and on their chemical test detected kerosene in the washings of the above items. In M.O.3, burnt rose with blue colour nylon saree piece detected kerosene.

4.14. After making arrangement for sending material objects for chemical examination, on 30.10.2007, P.W.15 collected the marriage invitation from P.W.2 and the same has been marked before the trial Court as Ex.P.18. Thereafter, since he was retired from service, P.W.18-Murugesan, the then Deputy Superintendent of Police, Tiruvallur, took up the case for further investigation. He received the case records and after obtaining the report from R.D.O., on 11.02.2008, he laid a final report against the accused under Sections 306, 304-B and 498-A of IPC.

5. Based on the above materials, the trial Court framed charges under Sections 498-A, 306 or 304-B of IPC and the accused denied the same. In order to prove their case, on the side of the prosecution, as many as 20 witnesses were examined as P.W.1 to P.W.20 and 20 documents were exhibited as Exs.P.1 to P.20. Besides, 3 Material Objects, which were marked as M.O.1 to M.O.3.

6. Out of the said witnesses, P.W.1-Devagi is the house owner, wherein the deceased and the appellant are resided, she had stated before the trial Court as on the day of occurrence, at about 2.30p.m. to 3.00p.m., both the accused came to the residence of the appellant and they have fight with Vendha in a noisy manner, for which, she called all the accused persons and questioned why they have been fighting. While the conversation was going on, the deceased Vendha gone into the kitchen room and within a minute, there was a flame and she came out, at that

time Vendha was alive and Vendha was taken to the Hospital through the Ambulance.

7. P.W.2-Krishnaveni, who is the mother of the deceased, deposed as three months prior to the occurrence, the deceased married the appellant at Tiruvallur Veera Raghavar Temple and during the time of marriage, 8 sovereigns of gold jewels and Rs.10,000/- cash and household articles were given as Sreedhana. After the marriage, the appellant regularly came to his house in a drunken mood, tortured the deceased and demanded to bring money from her house. Further, the appellant has also pledged the deceased 'Thali' and spent the amount and that information was passed by the deceased to her. After the occurrence, she was informed that her daughter set ablaze by pouring kerosene and thereafter, she rushed to the place of occurrence and stayed at the accused house and in the next day morning, she was informed by her sister's son that Vendha was died. Thereafter, they have received the dead body of Vendha after two days with heavy hectic pain and buried the same. In this regard, she had lodged a complaint before the Police.

8. P.W.3-Chinnapaiyan, who is the father of the deceased, deposed in the same manner as deposed by P.W.2.

9. P.W.4-Velu is P.W.2 sister's son, he has stated as after the marriage, both the deceased and the appellant are resided one month at P.W.2's house and thereafter, he arranged a rented house to the appellant and deceased at Manavalanagar. On that occasion, he was residing nearby to the house of the accused. On the fateful day, P.W.1 informed that the deceased set ablaze by pouring kerosene and thereafter, he proceeded to the incident area and found that the deceased was lying back without any dress and he covered the same with a bed sheet. After some time, police came to the occurrence place and thereafter, the injured was taken to the Hospital by Ambulance.

10. P.W.5-Shankar, who is the relative of P.W.2 to P.W.4, deposed as stated by P.W.2.

11. P.W.6-Ramu, is the resident of same locality has stated that the signature found in the observation mahazar and seizure mahazar are belong to him.

12. P.W.7-Viswanathan, is the husband of P.W.1, heard the message from P.W.1 and he has stated as the deceased and appellant had frequently quarrelled with each other.

13. P.W.8-Devaraj, is also a witness to the observation mahazar.

14. P.W.9-Kumaran, is the witness attested in the confession statement given by the appellant. Though the case of the prosecution is that the confession statement given by the appellant was recorded in the presence of P.W.9, he did not say anything about the recording of confession and hence, he treated as a hostile witness.

15. P.W.10-Dr.Rajkumar, attached with the Government Hospital, Tiruvallur, has stated about the treatment given to the appellant and also about the first aid treatment given to the deceased.

16. P.W.11-Dr.A.K.Mehajabeen, attached with K.M.C. Hospital, Chennai, has deposed before the trial Court about the treatment given to the appellant. Further, she has stated that the deceased Vendha was brought to the Hospital as dead person.

17. P.W.12-Ranganathan, is the Revenue Divisional Officer has stated about the preparation of inquest report and about the examination of witness. According to him, before the occurrence, the appellant has demanded dowry and also committed domestic violence towards the deceased.

18. P.W.13-C.Raja, is the Head Constable attached with Manavalanagar Police Station, has stated about the details in respect to the handing over of the dead body to her relatives.

19. P.W.14 to P.W.18 are the Police Officers, who have stated about the receipt of the complaints received from P.W.1 as well as from P.W.2 and also about the examination of witnesses, arrest of accused and filing of Final Report.

20. P.W.19-Dr.Kuppusamy, is the Doctor attached with K.M.C. Hospital, Chennai, has stated in his evidence about the nature of injuries sustained by the deceased during the time of postmortem.

21. P.W.20-Visalakshmi, is an Officer from Forensic Department, has stated about the examination of the material objects, which are collected by the Investigating Officer during the time of investigation.

22. 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 witness nor did he mark any documents on his side.

23. The Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur, after perusing all the above materials and

on considering the arguments advanced by either side, convicted and sentenced the appellant as stated supra. Aggrieved over the said conviction and sentence, the appellant is before this Court with this appeal.

24. I have heard Mr.J.R.K.Bhavanantham, learned counsel appearing for the appellant and Mr.S.Karthikeyan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State. I have also perused the records carefully.

25. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant would contend that before commencement of trial when at the time of framing charges, the trial Court committed a mistake saying that the appellant herein committed an offence under Section 306 or 304-B of IPC. The various precedents of our Hon'ble Apex Court and this Court had categorically held that the charge must be specific, without any specific charge, the accused has not enter into a position to defend his case and therefore, the conviction and sentence awarded to the appellant is against the principle of law settled by this Court. He would further contend that the evidence given by the prosecution witnesses is not in the form that prior to the occurrence, the appellant herein made a demand to bring additional dowry from the deceased Vendha. More than that, there was no evidence in respect to the wilful act committed by the appellant, which driven the deceased to the level of committing suicide. The evidence given by the prosecution witnesses are having lot of contradictions and therefore, he prayed to allow this appeal and for setting aside the conviction rendered by the trial Court.

26. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would contend that the evidence given by P.W.1 to P.W.4 are clearly established the case of prosecution as well as about the cruelty committed by the appellant towards the deceased. He would further contend that the contradiction available in the evidence of prosecution witnesses are all minor in nature and the same did not affect the root of prosecution case. Therefore, interference of this Court is not necessary with the conviction and sentence passed by the trial Court.

27. I have considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the records carefully.

28. First of all, in respect to the framing of charge, the Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur, during the time of framing charges, framed the charge against the appellant as he has committed an offence under Section 306 or 304(B) of IPC. In fact, in that aspect, Section 221 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides the power

to frame an alternative charge. In this regard, Section 221(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, reads as follows;

"221(1) If a single act or series of acts is of such a nature that it is doubtful which of several offences the facts which can be proved will constitute, the accused may be charged with having committed all or any of such offences, and any number of such charges may be tried at once; or he may be charged in the alternative with having committed some one of the said offences. "

29. Even assuming to the framing of charge itself is having an error that alone is not sufficient to set aside the entire conviction and sentence. In this regard, Section 465 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, reads as follows;

"465. Finding or sentence when reversible by reason of error, omission or irregularity. - (1) Subject to the provisions hereinbefore contained, no finding, sentence or order passed by a Court of competent jurisdiction shall be reversed or altered by a Court of appeal, confirmation or revision on account of any error, omission or irregularity in the complaint, summons, warrant, proclamation, order, judgment or other proceedings before or during trial or in any inquiry or other proceedings under this Code, or any error, or irregularity in any sanction for the prosecution, unless in the opinion of that Court, a failure of justice has in fact been occasioned thereby.

(2) In determining whether any error, omission or irregularity in any proceeding under this Code, or any error, or irregularity in any sanction for the prosecution has occasioned a failure of justice, the Court shall have regard to the fact whether the objection could and should have been raised at an earlier stage in the proceedings."

30. In the said circumstances, it is plain and clear from what is stated in Section 215 of the Code that when there is a charge and there is either error or omission in the charge itself or both, and whatever the character of the error or omission, whether it is serious or trivial, it is not to be regarded as important unless two conditions are fulfilled both of which are in the realm of facts. (1) The accused has 'in fact' been misled by it and (2) the omission or error or both have occasioned a failure of justice.

31. The object of framing a charge is not to introduce a mandate in the statute that goes to the very root of the jurisdiction like the requirement of previous sanction under the statute for taking cognizance of certain offences, but is only to enable the accused to have a clear idea of what he is being tried for and of the essential facts that he has to meet.

32. But here it is a case at no point of time the defence counsel argued in the Sessions Court that there was an error in the charge which had occasioned a failure of justice and therefore, the prosecution case should be thrown out on that ground alone and it was only for the first time that in the appeal such a grievance was being made.

33. Secondly, now on going through the close reading of the judgment rendered by the Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur, the appellant was convicted for an offence under Section 304-B of IPC. In this regard, to find out the validity of the sentence arrived at by the trial Court, it is necessary to see the judgment in the case of MAYA DEVI vs. STATE OF HARYANA reported in (2018) 1 SCC (Cri) 768 wherein our Hon'ble Apex Court has held as follows;

"In order to convict an accused for the offence punishable under Section 304-B IPC, the following essentials must be satisfied:

(i) the death of a woman must have been caused by burns or bodily injury or otherwise than under normal circumstances;

(ii) such death must have occurred within seven years of her marriage;

(iii) soon before her death, the woman must have been subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or any relatives of her husband;

(iv) such cruelty or harassment must be for, or in connection with, demand for dowry.

When the above ingredients are established by reliable and acceptable evidence, such death shall be called dowry death and such husband or his relatives shall be deemed to have caused her death."

34. Applying the ratio laid down by our Hon'ble Apex Court to the case in our hand, in this case the witnesses examined on the side of the prosecution have not stated about the dowry demand made by the appellant soon before the occurrence. P.W.1, who is the eye witness to the occurrence had stated in her evidence as at the time of occurrence, both the appellant and the deceased are quarrelled with each other and at the same time, the deceased voluntarily went into the kitchen room and made self-immolation.

35. P.W.2 being the mother of the deceased also did not

say anything about the demand made in respect to the dowry. The only allegation levelled by P.W.2 against the appellant is, the appellant herein regularly consumed liquor and quarrelled with the deceased. In otherwise, the appellant pledged the deceased 'thali', further, the other witnesses examined on the side of the prosecution had also not stated about the demand made by the appellant and therefore, on that score alone, the evidence given by the witnesses are all not in consensus of decisions already referred above. Therefore, I am of the constrained opinion, convicting the appellant under Section 304-B of IPC is without a detailed discussion of the evidence on record.

36. In respect of the conviction awarded to the appellant under Section 498-A of IPC, the learned counsel appearing for the appellant would rely on the judgment of our Hon'ble Apex Court in WASIM vs. STATE (NCT OF DELHI) reported in (2019) 7 SCC 435 wherein it was held as follows;

"12. Conviction under Section 498-A IPC is for subjecting a woman to cruelty. Cruelty is explained as any wilful conduct which is likely to drive a woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health. Harassment of a woman by unlawful demand of dowry also partakes the character of "Cruelty". It is clear from a plain reading of Section 498-A that conviction for an offence under Section 498-A IPC can be for wilful conduct which is likely to drive a woman to commit suicide OR for dowry demand. Having held that there is no evidence of dowry demand, the trial court convicted the appellant under Section 498-A IPC for his wilful conduct which drove the deceased to commit suicide."

37. Now, applying the ratio laid down in the above referred judgment, it is necessary to find out before the occurrence whether the deceased was subjected to cruelty. In this regard, Section 498-A of IPC reads as follows:

"498-A. Husband or relative of husband of a woman subjecting her to cruelty -Whoever, being the husband or the relative of the husband of a woman, subjects such woman to cruelty shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years and shall also be liable to fine.
Explanation.-For the purposes of this section, "cruelty" means-

(a) any wilful conduct which is of such a nature as is likely to drive the woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether mental or physical) of the woman; or

(b) harassment of the woman where such harassment is with a view to coercing her or any person related to her

to meet any unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand."

38. Therefore, it is necessary whether the conduct attributed against the deceased was driven her to commit suicide or not. It is an admitted fact that after the marriage, the appellant being the husband of the deceased regularly quarrelled with the deceased. Further, he demanded the deceased to give money for purchasing liquor. In otherwise, P.W.1's evidence is very clear as before the occurrence the appellant along with other accused seriously quarrelled with the deceased. The said act of the appellant alone driven the deceased for committing suicide.

39. Though there was no evidence in respect to the demand of dowry, here it is a case the wilful conduct of the appellant is of such a nature driven the deceased for committing suicide. Therefore, such act is also amounts to cruelty and therefore, I am of the opinion that the findings arrived at by the trial Court in respect to Section 498-A of IPC is found correct and therefore, interference of this Court is not necessary in respect to the conviction awarded to the appellant under Section 498-A of IPC.

40. In the result, this Criminal Appeal is partly allowed. The conviction and sentence imposed upon the appellant / accused by the Magalir Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur dated 24.02.2014 in S.C.No.207 of 2009, for an offence under Section 304-B of IPC alone is set aside and on the other hand, the conviction and sentence awarded under Section 498-A IPC, is confirmed. Since the appellant / accused is on bail, the trial Court is directed to take steps to secure the presence of the accused to commit him to prison to undergo the remaining period of sentence, if any. It is ordered to run the sentences concurrently. Fine amount, if any paid is directed to be adjusted. Further, the period of sentence already undergone by the appellant / accused shall be given set off under Section 428 Cr.P.C.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Magalir Neethi Mandram,
(Fast Track Mahila Court), Tiruvallur.
2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvallur Sub-Division,
Tiruvallur District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
4. The Judicial Magistrate No.II
Tiruvallur.
5. The Cheife Judicial Magistrate,
Tiruvallur.
6. The superintendent Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

+1cc to Mr.J.R.K.Bhavanantham, Advocate, S.R.No.37109

Judgment in
Crl.A.No.116 of 2014

SS(CO)
RV(18/01/2020)



WEB COPY