Bail Slip

M.Noordheen, male aged 66/14 Accused No.1, was released on bail vide this Court order dated 30.07.2014 made in MP(MD)No.1/2014 in CRL A(MD).226 of 2014.

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF THE MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.12.2020

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

CRL A (MD) No.226 of 2014

M.Noordheen ...1st Appellant / Accused No.1

K.Durairaj (deceased) ... 2nd Appellant / Accused No.2

D.Govindammal W/o.late Durairaj

(D.Govindammal W/o.late Durairaj impleaded as per order of this Court dated 14.10.2019 in Crl MP(MD) No.8821 of 2019 in Crl A(MD)No.226 of 2014)

Vs.

The State, rep.by
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption,
Madurai.
(in Crime No.7 of 2003) ... Respondent / Complainant

Prayer : This Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the judgment dated 04.07.2014 made in Special Case No.60 of 2011 on the file of the Special Court for Prevention of Corruption Act cases, Madurai and set aside the conviction and sentence imposed against the appellants/accused and allow the appeal by acquitting the appellants/accused.

For Appellants : Mr.V.Gopinath, Senior Counsel
for Mr.UM.Ravichandran for A1

Mr.R.John Sathiyan for Mr.L.Mahendran for A2

For Respondent : Mr.A.Robinson,
Government Advocate (crl.side)

JUDGMENT

This criminal appeal is directed against the judgment dated 04.07.2014 made in S.C No.60 of 2011 on the file of the learned Special Judge for Trial of Prevention of Corruption Act Cases, Madurai. By the impugned judgment, the appellants (A1 and A2) were found guilty, convicted and sentenced as follows :

Rank	Offence	Punishment
A1 & A2	Under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988	Six months rigorous imprisonment and fine of Rs.1,000/-, in default of payment of fine, to undergo two simple imprisonment.
	Under Section 13(1)(d) r/w.13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988	One year rigorous imprisonment and fine of Rs.5,000/-, in default of payment of fine, to undergo three months simple imprisonment.

During the pendency of the appeal, the second appellant K.Durairaj passed away and his legal heirs have come on record to prosecute the appeal along the with the first appellant.

2.Heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the first appellant, the learned counsel for the legal heirs of the second appellant and the learned Government Advocate (crl.side) for the prosecution.

3.The learned Senior Counsel reiterated all the contentions set out in the memorandum of grounds and in the written arguments. The learned Senior Counsel submitted that the case projected by the prosecution is inherently improbable and wanted this Court to set aside the impugned judgment and allow this appeal and thus acquit the accused. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate submitted that the impugned judgment does not call for any interference.

4.The defacto complainant in this case is Thiru.A.K.Nagarajan (PW.3). He was working as Station Fire Officer, Kallikudi Fire Station during the year 2003. The case of the prosecution is that the first appellant Thiru.M.Noordheen was then functioning as Deputy Director of Fire and Rescue Services, Southern Region, Madurai. He demanded payment of illegal gratification to the tune of Rs.5,000/- from PW.3 so as to refrain from taking disciplinary action against him. The second accused K.Durairaj was a Writer of Fire Station in Sivakasi and he also repeated the said demand on behalf of the first accused. This was on various dates in the month of September, 2003. Since the defacto complainant was not willing to pay any illegal gratification, he lodged Ex.P5 complaint before the respondent herein. It was on 29.09.2003. Ex.P10 FIR was registered on the basis of the said complaint in Crime No.7 of 2003 for the offence under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 at 02.30 P.M. The trap turned out to be successful. Investigation was conducted and final report came to be filed. Cognizance of the offences was taken and summons were issued to the accused. Copies were served on the accused under Section 207 of Cr.Pc. Two charges were framed and on being questioned, the accused denied their guilt and claimed to be tried. The prosecution examined PW.1 to PW.15 and marked Exs.P1 to P24. MO.1 to MO.6 were also marked. On the side of the accused no one was examined. Exs.D1 and D2 were marked on the side of the accused. The learned Trial Judge by the impugned judgement after appreciating the entire evidence on record, found the accused guilty and sentenced them as mentioned above.

5.The learned Senior Counsel submitted that the prosecution has failed to prove that there was demand of payment for illegal gratification by the accused. He would contend that it has been elicited from the cross examination of PW.3 that he was a controversial character and that therefore, reliance cannot be placed on his testimony. He would also contend that admittedly there was no complaint pending against PW.3 and therefore, his claim that the accused was trying to grab money from him could not be believed. Though the defacto complainant would claim that the accused demanded money on 11.09.2003, 12.09.2003, 13.09.2003, 15.09.2003, 16.09.2003 and again on 29.09.2003, in Ex.P5, there is a reference only to the demand said to have made on 11.09.2003 and 29.09.2003. Ex.P5 is conspicuously silent as regards the other happenings.

6.The learned Senior Counsel would point out that mere recovery of the tainted money is not sufficient and that the prosecution is obliged to prove the demand. He also would point out that the testimony of the defacto complainant cannot be taken as gospel truth. Relying case laws, he contended that there must be corroboration for the testimony of the complainant.

7.The learned Senior Counsel for the appellant also submitted that the trap proceedings cannot be believed. PW.3 was instructed by the trap laying officer that he must go to Virudhunagar along with PW.4 and when he sees A2, he must tell him that he would pay the amount directly to A1 and if A2 receives the money, PW.3 was to give the pre-arranged signal. According to PW.3, the trap laying party left the Vigilance Office at Madurai at 05.00 P.M and reached Virudhunagar at 06.30 P.M. A1 was staying at Star Lodge and PW.3 reached the lodge at around 07.10 P.M. At about 07.30 PM, PW.3 gave the money to A2 Durairaj. Durairaj said to have counted the same and put it in his pant pocket. The pre-arranged signal was not at all given. PW.3 gave the pre-arranged signal only at 09.30 P.M.

Immediately, the trap laying party arrived. PW.3 identified A2. A2 was taken to room No.107 and subjected to phenolphthalein test and the test turned out to be positive.

8.The contention of the learned Senior Counsel is that this story is unbelievable in view of the testimony of PW.2. According to PW.2, he came along with A1 to the hotel after inspection and was in the reception hall while A1 went to his room. At about 08.00 or 08.30 P.M, seven or eight persons entered the lodge and enquired as to where A1 was staying. They went in search of A1 and returned after half an hour. Thereafter, the trap laying party directed everyone present not to leave the place. A1 was taken to room No.107. The learned Senior Counsel would strongly contend that the prosecution case was that the pre-arranged signal was given only at 09.30 P.M. But then, this is clearly contrary to the testimony of PW.2 who would state that the police party arrived between 08.00 and 08.30 itself. According to the learned Senior Counsel, the testimony of PW.5 also seriously weakens the prosecution case. If the tainted money was given at 07.30 pm itself, there was no reason for giving the pre-arranged signal at 09.30 pm. There is no reason as to why PW.3 should wait for two hours to do so. According to the learned Senior Counsel, the prosecution has not come out with a consistent timeline or sequence of events and that therefore, the entire trap and recovery of money, preparation of mahazar are clouded by suspicion and that therefore they are to be rejected.

9.The learned Senior Counsel would also draw my attention to the testimony of PW.3 who admitted that when he met A1, he was enquired about the complaint given by one Venkatraman against a fire station staff by name Ayyanar. PW.3 would claim that he had a copy of the complaint and gave it to A1. The contention of the learned Senior Counsel is that it was PW.3 who had created a justification for meeting A1 and used the occasion to falsely implicate him. It is also pointed out that PW.2 was given a tape recorder to record the incriminating conversation that was to take place. But the said tape recorder was not recovered at all and the contents of it were also not noted. In fact, the investigation is completely silent as regards the tape recorder. The learned Senior Counsel would argue when it has been established convincingly that at the time of demonstrating the trap formalities and after registering the FIR, the tape recorder was also given. But since nothing incriminating was there in the conversation, it was completely suppressed. The learned Senior Counsel would state that the best evidence to establish the culpability was by playing tape recorder to show the conversation between PW.3 and A2 and PW.3 and A1. Since this best evidence is not forthcoming, the court should draw adverse inference against the prosecution. It is also admitted that one Velpriyadharsan, a journalist accompanied A1 and was staying with him. But the said journalist was not at all examined.

10.The learned counsel who represented the legal heirs of the second appellant/Durairaj adopted the submissions of the learned Senior Counsel and contended that Durairaj had been falsely implicated.

11.I am not persuaded by the submissions advanced on behalf of the appellants. PW.3 A.K.Nagarajan is the prime witness. He is the defacto complainant in this case. He was working as Station Fire Officer at Kallikudi from 01.04.2002 to 31.05.2005. During September 2003, A1 Noordheen was the Deputy Director, Fire and Rescue Services during the relevant time. According to PW.3, based on his report on 10.09.2003 one Rajendran, Fireman, Kallikudi was placed under suspension. On 11.09.2003, the Assistant Divisional Fire Officer, Madurai came to Kallikudi Fire Station to conduct his routine inspection at about 05.15 PM. He told PW.3 to contact A1 over phone at 05.15 P.M in the evening. When PW.3 contacted him, A1 asked PW.3 to meet him in his residence. After inspection was over, PW.3 took Elangovan in his two wheeler and dropped him enroute. He obtained the house address of A1 from the said Elango. He met A1 in his house at about 08.00 P.M on 11.09.2003. A1, after enquiring about the suspended employee Rajendran, told PW.3 that a complaint has been received by him and that to avoid disciplinary action against him, PW.3 should pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- to him in the evening at Kallikudi office at 10.00 A.M on 12.09.2003. Since PW.3 had already taken casual leave for the next day, he told A1 that he would meet him on 13.09.2003. When PW.3 was attending a marriage function in Kattanur Village, he received information from a local person to contact his Fire Station. Accordingly, at 03.00 P.M, when PW.3 contacted the station officer by name Jeevanantham, the said Jeevanantham told him that PW.3 must contact A1. When on the next day at about 07.55 A.M on 13.09.2003, PW.3 came to Kallikudi Fire Station, one Machapandi who was on duty told him that A1 called the Fire Station and wanted PW.3 to contact him. At about 10.30 A.M on 13.09.2003, PW.3 contacted A1. A1 is said to have expressed his dissatisfaction as to why the amount demanded by him was not paid and asked him to contact Selvendhiran, Fire Officer of Sivakasi and Durairaj, Station Writer of Sivakasi. When PW.3 contacted Selvendhiran on the next day, Selvendhiran had advised him not to antagonize A1. A2 had also spoken to him on the same lines. Thereafter, PW.3 contacted Elango Assistant Divisional Officer, Madurai and asked if there is any complaint pending against him. Though Thiru.Elango had told PW.3 that there is no complaint pending against him, he had also advised him not to antagonize A1. PW.3 went to the house of Thiru.V.Ramachandran, Divisional Fire Officer, Madurai on 13th evening and told him what happened. Thiru.V.Ramachandran while confirming that there is no complaint against PW.3 added that he had nothing further to advise.

12.PW.3 went on leave on 14.09.2003 and when he reported for duty on 15.09.2003 at about 07.00 A.M, Machapandi a fellow staff told him that A1 had earlier contacted the station and enquired as to whether PW.3 had joined duty. When Machapandi answered in the negative, he was asked to enter the same in the General Diary. Thereafter, at about 08.40 P.M, PW.3 contacted A1, he is said to have reiterated his demand. Since PW.3 did not make the payment on 16.09.2003 at about 10.30 A.M, A1 contacted Kallikudi Fire Station on the land line and demanded that PW.3 should make the payment by the evening. PW.3 tried to raise funds. At around 08.30 P.M, when he contacted A1 on his mobile phone and asked him where he could meet him. A1 told him to meet him at 09.30 P.M at Madurai Railway Junction. A1 and others came to the railway junction at about 09.45 P.M. When A1 asked for the money, PW.3 told him that after getting monthly salary, he would pay. A1 told him that the behavior of PW.3 was not proper and that after his return from Chennai, he would suspend him. He also scolded him. From 17.09.2003 till 28.09.2003, there was no contact between A1 and PW.3. On 29.09.2003, at about 08.15 A.M, A2 Durairaj called Kallikudi Station and told PW.3 to contact A1. When PW.3 contacted A1, A1 told him that he will come for inspection to Virudhunagar in the evening and that since it was salary day, he could make the payment. PW.3 agreed and to draw the salary, he came to Madurai along with Station Writer Balasubramanian. When PW.3 was leaving Kallikudi Fire Station, A2 Durairaj contacted him and told him that A1 was coming to Virudhunagar Fire Station for inspection in the evening and asked PW.3 to come.

13.PW.3 went to the Vigilance and Anti Corruption Office at Madurai at around 01.00 P.M. He wrote down a complaint against A1. He went to the office of the respondent at about 02.00 P.M and met Shri.Srinivasan, Deputy Superintendent of Police and gave the complaint Ex.P5. At around 02.45 P.M, Ex.P10 FIR was registered as Crime No.7 of 2003 against A1 Noordheen and A2 Durairaj under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The trap laying officer arranged two shadow witnesses, namely, PW.4 Annamalai and one Mr.Stalin, Executive Engineer, PWD. The two shadow witnesses came to the office of the respondent. The trap laying officer arranged pre-trap formalities and gave the necessary instructions to PW.3 and PW.4 shadow witness Thiru.Annamalai.

14.The trap laying party left Madurai in a tempo van at around 05.20 P.M and reached Virdhunagar at around 06.30 PM. PW.3 defacto complainant and PW.4 shadow witness proceeded to Virudhunagar Fire Station. PW.3 went in a two wheeler and he was followed by PW.4. PW.3 met A2 in a tea stall. A2 asked PW.3 as to whether he had brought the money. When PW.3 answered in the affirmative, A2 told him to hand over the amount. When PW.3 stated that he wanted to meet A1 in person, A2 contacted A1 from an STD booth and told him that PW.3 has brought the money and wanted to meet A1. A1 was conducting inspection of Virudhunagar Fire Station. Thereafter, A2 told PW.3 that A1 wanted them to come to the lodge where A1 was staying. After the inspection was over, A1 left the fire station and went to the lodge by name, Star Lodge. PW.3 and A2 followed by PW.4 Annamalai went to the said spot and parked their two wheelers. A2 reiterated his demand and thereupon, PW.3 took the tainted currency notes (Rs.5,000/-) from his shirt pocket and gave it to the second accused. A2 accepted the same, counted them and kept them in his left side pant pocket. A2 then left the place, went to A1's room and returned after a while and told PW.3 to meet A1 in his room no.1. PW.3 met A1 in his Room and told him that he already given the amount to A2. A1 by answering in the affirmative confirmed the receipt of money. Thereupon, PW.3 was asked to leave. When PW.3 returned, he saw A2 Durairaj standing under a Neem tree. Thereafter, PW.3 gave the pre-arranged signal and police personnel immediately arrived. PW.4 Annamalai identified Durairaj to DSP, V&AC. Immediately, the police party took Durairaj inside the lodge. The tainted money was recovered from Durairaj and it was marked as MO.1. It was duly identified by PW.3.

15.The core argument of the learned Senior Counsel is that there is absolutely no corroboration for the testimony of PW.3 and that the tainted money was recovered from A2 and nothing was recovered from A1. In my view, the case laws relied on by the learned Government Counsel reported in ***(1995) 3 SCC 351 (M.O.Shamsudhin vs. State of Kerala)*** and ***(2015) 12 SCC 348 (D.Velayutham vs. State),*** answer the contentions of the learned Senior Counsel for the accused. In M.O.Shamsudhin, the Hon'ble Supreme Court made a distinction between a person offers a bribe to achieve his own purpose and where one is forced to offer bribe under a threat of loss or harm that is to say under coercion. The former can be treated as an accomplice while the latter should be treated as an interested witness.

16.Coming to the nature of corroborating evidence that is required, it was held that it can be even by way of circumstantial evidence. In paragraph No.23 of ***M.O.Shamsudhin***, it was held as follows :

> "23.Now coming to the nature of corroborating evidence that is required, it is well settled that the corroborating evidence can be even by way of circumstantial evidence. No general rule can be laid down with respect to quantum of evidence corroborating the testimony of a trap witness which again would depend upon its own facts and circumstances like the nature of the crime, the character of trap witness etc. and other general requirements necessary to sustain the conviction in that case. The court should weigh the evidence and

> then see whether corroboration is necessary. Therefore as a rule of law it cannot be laid down that the evidence of every complainant in a bribery case should be corroborated in all material particulars and otherwise it cannot be acted upon. Whether corroboration is necessary and if so to what extent and what should be its nature de- pends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. In a case of bribe, the person who pays the bribe and those who act as intermediaries are the only persons who can ordinarily be expected to give evidence about the bribe and it is not possible to get absolutely independent evidence about the bribe. However, it is cautioned that the evidence of a bribe-giver has to be scrutinised very carefully and it is for the court to consider and appreciate the evidence in a proper manner and decide the question whether a conviction can be based upon or not in those given circumstances. ”

M.O.Shamsudhin was followed in ***D.Velayutham vs. State (2015) 12 SCC 348*** which was held as follows :

> “15.Though this Court has stressed the need and significance of phenolphthalein as a trap device in corruption cases, so as to allay doubts about the actual receiving of bribes by accused persons, there may be cases where there are multiple demanders in a common or conjoint bribe demand, and for whatsoever reason, only one receives the sum on their behalf, and is entrapped in consequence. Depending on strength of the remainder of evidence, in these cases, constructive receipt by co-accused persons is open to establishment by the prosecution, in order that those who intermediately obtain bribes be latched with equal culpability as their co- accused and entrapped receivers. This will, of course, discount those cases where the trap is successful only against one and not the other official, the latter having refused to accept the bribe tendered. In this case, the trap would have clearly failed against such an official, and there could be no question of the application of constructive receipt. If the receipt and handling of bribe money by Accused 2 so convincingly and inexorably points towards his custodianship of part of the same bribe amount on behalf of his superior officer, namely Accused 1, then Accused 1 cannot rely on mere non-handling/ non-receipt of the bribe money, as his path to exculpation. This Court's construal of anti-corruption cases is sensitive even to these byzantine methods of bribe-taking, and where an evader escapes a trap, constructive receipt has to be an alternate means of fastening criminal culpability.”

17.It has been established beyond reasonable doubt that the tainted money was accepted by A2 and recovered from him. The question that arises for consideration is whether on this ground, the culpability of the first accused has been established. The sequence of events clearly a point to the culpability of A1. PW.3 had clearly deposed that right from 11.09.2003, PW.3 was repeatedly demanding payment of illegal gratification to the tune of Rs.5,000/-. Ex.P5 complaint clearly mentions that A1 made the demand on 11.09.2003 at about 05.00 PM and 29.09.2003 at about 08.15 AM. It also mentions that A1 told him to contact A2 in this regard. A2 told PW.3 to come to Virudhunagar Fire Station in that very evening with the amount. Ex.P10 FIR reached the court on the same day well before the trap. Merely because Ex.P5 complaint does not speak about the other demands made by A1 on 12.09.2003 to 16.09.2003, the prosecution case does not get weakened. It has been convincingly established and to some extent accepted by the defence also that no complaint was pending against PW.3 during the relevant time. The defence has tried to paint PW.3 in a negative light. But incidents referred by the defence are subsequent in point of time. As on 29.09.2003, PW.3 had absolutely no motive whatsoever to lodge any false complaint against A1.

18.PW.4 is a shadow witness and is also a higher rank officer. He had closely followed PW.3 and corroborated his testimony as to what happened between him and A2 Durairaj. A2 Durairaj repeated the demand when they met in the tea stall near Virudhunagar Fire Station. PW.3 was working in Kallikudi Fire Station and unless he had been specifically told he could not know that A1 would come to inspection in the evening of 29.09.2003.

19.From a reading of the contents of Ex.P6 entrustment mahazar, one can note that the trap laying party was fully aware that A1 was not in the habit of receiving the money directly and that he would receive illegal gratification only through others. It is also mentioned in Ex.P6 that A2 Durairaj was one such conduit. The trap laying officer had advised PW.3 to give the pre-arranged signal after Durairaj passed on the tainted money to A1 Noordheen. It is true that the tainted money was handed over by PW.3 to A2 at 07.30 P.M outside the lodge. But then, as advised by the trap laying officer, PW.3 waited till A2 met A1. It is for this reason that the pre-arranged signal was not given immediately after the money was given to A2. It is quite possible that PW.3 could not meet A1 immediately but only after a while. After A2 confirmed to PW.3 that he had already handed over money to A1, PW3 gave the signal. Actually the money was very much with A2. But then, believing A2's statement that it had reached the hands of A1, the pre-arranged signal was given. Therefore, I do not disbelieve the prosecution version merely because the pre-arranged signal was not given at 07.30 P.M itself. In fact, the delay in giving the pre-arranged signal strengthens the prosecution version. PW.3 had been asked to pay the illegal gratification only to A1. PW.3 did not have any grievance against A2. PW.3 wanted to be fully sure that the money had passed hands from A2 to A1. Only thereafter he would be in a position to call upon the trap laying party to enter the scene. The conduct of PW.3 is natural and commands the confidence of this court. PW.4 Annamalai who is a high ranking officer has no motive against the accused. He had witnessed what happened between PW.3 and A2. The recovery of money from A2 has been established beyond reasonable doubt by the prosecution by marking Exs.P3 and Ex.P4 Mahazar. Unfortunately the trap laying officer Thiru.Srinivasan, Deputy Superintendent of Police had passed away. He could not be examined.

20.Applying the ratio laid down in ***D.Velayutham vs. State***, receipt of the bribe amount by A2 and constructive receipt by A1 have been established. I am not persuaded by the submissions of the learned Senior Counsel that the testimony of PW.2 and PW.5 shake the prosecution case. Though the occurrence has taken place in the year 2003, the witnesses were examined in October 2013. It is true that PW.2 had stated that he saw the arrival of the police party between 08.00 and 08.30 P.M. He however confirmed that the police party brought Durairaj from outside and took him to room No.107. He also confirmed the recovery of the amount of Rs.5,000/- from Durairaj. PW.2 confirmed that he was signatory to Ex.P2 Mahazar. I, therefore, hold that the discrepancy between the testimonies of PW.2 and PW.3 is rather trivial and does not go to the root of the matter. The testimony of PW.5 who is signatory in Ex.P4 Mahazar also broadly corroborative and does not weaken the prosecution case.

21.Considerable emphasis was laid on the the non recovery of the tape recorder given to PW.3 at the time of preparing the FIR. I am of the view that this would not constitute serious lacunae in the prosecution case. PW.15 Thiru.Kulothungapandian filed the final report on 25.09.2008 and when a question was put to him, he stated that since PW.3 failed to switch on the tape recorder, he did not record anything and that is why, it was not sent to the court. As rightly pointed out by the learned Senior Counsel, PW.15 was not competent to speak about the same because he merely filed the final report. I am of the view that this question should have been directly posed by the accused to PW.3. PW.3 would have probably given the same answer as that of PW.15. Having failed to confront PW.3 in this regard, it is not open to the accused to labour much on this aspect. No serious contention was advanced as regards the validity of the sanction order. Ex.P1 is the sanction order and that it was marked through PW.1 who was the Home Secretary during the relevant time.

22.The learned Trial Judge after carefully considering entire evidence on record rightly came to the conclusion that the prosecution had established its case beyond reasonable doubt. On a careful re-appreciation of the entire evidence on record and after considering the contentions of the learned Senior counsel for the first accused/1st appellant and the learned Government Counsel, I am not able to take a different view. I concur with the reasons given by the learned Trial Judge. I find no merit in this appeal. This appeal stands dismissed. The conviction and fine imposed on the appellants for both the charges stands confirmed. The sentence of imprisonment imposed on the first accused shall run concurrently. The sentence already undergone by the first accused if any shall be set off under Section 428 of Cr.PC. The learned Special Judge shall take steps to enforce this judgment. The bail bond executed by the first appellant shall stand cancelled.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(AS)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Skm

Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To

1.The Special Judge for Prevention of Corruption Act Cases, Madurai.

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

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

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

+2 CC to Mr.L.MAHENDRAN, Advocate SR.No.25077

CRL A (MD) No.226 of 2014
09.12.2020

tp(CO)
TR(09.03.2021) 11P 8C