

BAIL SLIP

The Appellant/Accused namely Dhanapal, S/o.Rangasamy Gounder was ordered to be released on bail vide Court order dated 20/08/2019 made in CRL.MP.No.6676 of 2019 in CRL.A.280 of 2019 passed by this Hon'ble High Court.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.03.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

Crl.A.No.280 of 2019

Dhanapal

... Appellant

-Vs-

State rep by,
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Rasipuram,
Namakkal District.
(Crime No.74/2013).

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, to set aside the judgment made in S.C.No.88 of 2014 dated 20.08.2018 on the file of Principal Sessions Judge, Namakkal.

For Appellant : Mr.S.N.Arunkumar

For Respondent : Ms.T.P.Savitha,
Government Advocate [Crl. Side]

JUDGMENT

This Criminal Appeal has been filed against the conviction and sentence imposed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Namakkal in S.C.No.88 of 2014, dated 20.08.2018.

2.The respondent Police have registered a case in Crime No.74 of 2013, for offence under Sections 376(i), 376-C(a) IPC (Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013), 417 IPC r/w 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, 1998 against the appellant on the complaint (Ex.P1) given by the victim (PW1). During investigation, the respondent Police altered Sections into 376(i), 376-C(a) IPC (Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013), 417 IPC r/w 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, 1998 and Section 3(i)(xii) and 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled

Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and laid a charge sheet before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Rasipuram and the same was taken on file in P.R.C.No.22 of 2013. After the completing the formalities, since the offences are especially triable by the Court of Session, the learned Judicial Magistrate, Rasipuram committed the case to the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Namakkal and the same was taken on file in S.C.No.88 of 2014.

3.After completing the formalities under Section 207 Cr.P.C., since there was a prima facie material to frame charge against the appellant, the learned Principal Sessions Judge, framed charges under Sections 376(i), 376 C(a) IPC as Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013, 417 IPC and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act 44/1998 amended as per TN Act 39/2002 and Sections 3(1)(xii) and 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

4.After completing the trial and hearing the arguments advanced on either side and also considering the oral and documentary evidence, the learned trial Judge found the appellant not guilty under Section 376(c)(a) of IPC as Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013 and Sections 3(1)(xii) and 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and found guilty and convicted and sentenced as follows:-

- For offence under Section 376(i) IPC, the appellant to undergo seven years Rigorous Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/-, in default to undergo six months Rigorous Imprisonment.
- For offence under Section 417 IPC, the appellant to undergo one year Rigorous Imprisonment.
- For offence under Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act 44/1998 amended as per TN Act 39/2002, the appellant to undergo two years Rigorous Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/-, in default to undergo three months Rigorous Imprisonment.

5.Challenging the above said Judgment of conviction and sentence, the appellant has filed the present appeal before this Court.

6.The learned counsel for the appellant would submit that none of the ingredients of the offence under Sections 376(i) IPC, 417 IPC and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act 44/1998 amended as per TN Act 39/2002 would made out against the appellant. He would further submit

that on 21.04.2013, when the victim (PW1) demanded mutton to prepare food, the appellant refused to purchase the same, but the victim (PW1) insisted him to purchase mutton. Hence, the appellant made a complaint to PW9, who was running the Smart Home Care Service, Coimbatore to take back the victim (PW1) and PW9 informed she would arrange for substitution. In order to wreak vengeance due to personal grudge over the same, she lodged a false complaint (Ex.P1) against the appellant. The victim (PW1) deposed that she was raped on 09.07.2012 by the appellant on promise that he would marry her and do needful for her children. But she preferred to leave the appellant on her own on 21.04.2013 at about 10.30 a.m., for not purchasing mutton for her. Hence, it is an unnatural conduct of woman. The learned counsel would further submit that there are material contradictions with regard to the alleged injuries sustained by the victim (Ex.P1). In the complaint (Ex.P1), she stated that she sustained injury in the left leg and backside of chest, but while giving deposition, she stated that she sustained lacerated injuries on her hands and legs.

7.The learned counsel for the appellant would further submit that the evidence of the victim (PW1) is not reliable and trustworthy. In the complaint (Ex.P1), she stated that the appellant pushed her out and locked the door. In the deposition, she made improvement and deposed that the appellant smashed her head by pulling her hair, kicked her on her chest and hip. In the Accident Register (Ex.P7) issued by the Doctor (PW11) there is no mention about the alleged assault on 21.04.2013 and the Wound Certificate (Ex.P8) is for the injuries sustained by the victim (PW1) jumped on the well on 22.04.2013. None of the prosecution witnesses deposed that the victim (PW1) was assaulted by the appellant physically and verbally on 21.04.2013 at about 10.30 a.m. Further, the victim (PW1) did not make any complaint to the Smart Home Care Service, Coimbatore or to the Police or to her mother (PW2) about the alleged assault on 21.04.2013. Hence, the evidence of the victim (PW1) and also her complaint (Ex.P1) are not trustworthy and the charge against the appellant under Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act 44/1998 amended as per TN Act 39/2002 is false.

8.The learned counsel would further submit that the Doctor (PW11) did not give evidence for the alleged assault of the appellant on the victim on 21.04.2013 at about 10.30 a.m. The Doctor (PW11) has stated that the victim (PW1) informed her that she fell in the well on her own and drowned in water on 22.04.2013 at about 11.00 a.m. Hence, the Doctor (PW11) gave treatment and issued the Accident Register (Ex.P7). Therefore, the alleged injuries sustained by her on 21.04.2013 are self inflicted. Further, the occurrence alleged to have taken place

on 21.04.2013 at about 10.45 a.m., but the victim (PW1) did not give complaint against him to anyone till 07.00 p.m., on 22.04.2013. Hence, there was a delay in lodging the complaint and no explanation for the same given by her.

9.The learned counsel for the appellant would further submit that in the complaint (Ex.P1) and the statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C., (Ex.P17), there is no whisper about that the appellant made a promise to marry the victim (PW1). Hence, the promise for marriage is an afterthought and the charge under Section 417 IPC is false. Further, the learned trial Judge failed to consider the contradictions in the evidence and materials produced by the prosecution and the improvements and exaggerations between the complaint (Ex.P1) and the evidence of the victim(PW1). The evidence of PW4, who is the neighbour to the appellant is false and due to previous enmity, he gave false evidence against the appellant which has been admitted by him in his cross examination.

10.The learned counsel would further submit that during trial, on the side of the defence, in order to prove the case of the appellant, documents were produced with necessary stamps. But the learned trial Judge did not take any action either to accept or reject the documents and no endorsement was made for admission or for rejection. Therefore, the conviction and sentence passed against the appellant are liable to be set aside and prayed for allowing the appeal.

11.In order to substantiate his arguments, the learned counsel for the appellant relied upon the following citations:-

- Yedla Srinivasa Rao Versus State of A.P in Appeal (Crl.) No.1369 of 2004.
- K.P.Thimmappa Gowda Versus State of Karnataka in Criminal Appeal No.1499 of 2004.
- Kaini Rajan Versus State of Kerala in Criminal Appeal No.1467 of 2013.
- Maheshwar Tigga Versus The State of Jharkhand in Criminal Appeal No.635 of 2020.
- The State of Himachal Pradesh Versus Trilok Chand & Anr. in Criminal Appeal No(s).2133-2134 of 2011.
- Gouresh Mehra Versus The State Rep. By in Crl.O.P.No.13501 of 2010.
- Deepak Gulati Versus State of Haryana in Criminal Appeal

No.2322 of 2010.

- Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar Versus The State of Maharashtra in Criminal appeal No.1443 of 2018.
- Pramod Suryabhan Pawar Versus The State of Maharashtra & Anr. in Criminal Appeal No.1165 of 2019.
- Prakash Chand Versus State of Himachal Pradesh in Criminal Appeal No.2393 of 2010.
- G.V.Rao Versus L.H.V.Prasad & Ors.
- Manjoj Bajpai Versus State of Delhi in W.P(CRL)No.771 of 2014.
- N.Ravi Versus State through the Inspector of Police, Taluk Police Station, Tirunelveli District in Crl.A(MD).No.122 of 2015.
- Abhoy Pradhan Versus State of West Bengal.

12.Ms.T.P.Savitha, learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing on behalf of the respondent Police would submit that PW9 was running an organization in the name of Smart Home Care Service in Coimbatore. The appellant went to the said home on 05.07.2012 and approached PW9 that he needed house maid to take care of his mother and his house. Based on the request, PW9 sent the victim (PW1) to the house of the appellant for salary of Rs.8,500/- per month for about one year contract. The appellant also agreed with the terms and conditions of the contract and he also made his sign in the same. The details were informed to both the appellant and the victim (PW1) and thereafter, PW9 sent the victim (PW1) to the house of the appellant at Mottiyagoundan Kadu, Vennandhur, Rasipuram, Namakkal District. Till 10 months, there was no problem and after that, PW9 received call from the appellant that the victim (PW1) demanding all her needs from him. Therefore, the appellant asked PW9 to take back the victim (PW1) to the home and arrange another woman.

13.When the victim (PW1) was working in the house of the appellant, he had forcible sexual intercourse with her and promised to marry her and also take care of her children. For ten months, the appellant and the victim(PW1) were living as husband and wife and the appellant was taking care of all her needs. All of a sudden, the appellant make a phone call to the organization where the victim (PW1) was working and asked PW9 to take back her and also pulled her tuft and also kicked on her hip and chest by uttering her caste name. On the next day

morning, she jumped into the well belonging to the appellant in order to commit suicide. The neighbours of the appellant came there and informed to Fire Station and Fire Officer (PW8) came there and rescued her from the well with the help of rope. Thereafter, she got admitted in the Government Hospital, Salem where the Police attached to the respondent Police Station came and received the complaint (Ex.P1) of the victim (PW1) and the police investigated the matter and laid a charge sheet before the trial Court.

14.The learned Government Advocate would further submit that during trial, the victim was examined as PW1 and she has narrated the entire events happened in the house of the appellant. The person who sent the victim (PW1) to the house of the appellant was examined as PW9. The mother of the victim was examined PW2 and she has spoken about her daughter (PW1) was working in the house of the appellant. The neighbour of the appellant was examined as PW4. He has deposed about the appellant and the victim (PW1) were living together as husband and wife in the house of the appellant. The Village Administrative Officer and the Tahsildar were examined as PW7 and PW15 respectively and they have spoken about the community of the appellant and the victim (PW1) and issued community certificates (Exs.P9 & P15). The Fire Service officer from the Fire Station, Rasipuram was examined as PW8. The Doctors who gave treatment to the victim (PW1) and the appellant were examined as PW10, PW11 and PW13. The learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Namakkal who recorded the statement of the victim under Section 164 Cr.P.C., (Ex.P17) was examined as PW16. Therefore, the prosecution by producing the above materials and evidence proved the charges framed against the appellant and the trial Court also rightly convicted and sentenced the appellant, which need not be interfered with.

15.Heard the learned counsel appearing for the appellants and the learned Government Advocate [Crl. Side] appearing for the respondent Police and also perused the materials available on record.

16.The case of the prosecution is that the victim (PW1) belongs to the Scheduled Caste community and the appellant belongs to Nattu Gounder Caste. Before 15 years from the occurrence, the victim got married with one Thangavel from Erode and they have two children and due to difference of opinion, she separated from her husband and living with her mother (PW2) and children. Before 4 years from the occurrence, she joined and worked in Smart Home Services, Coimbatore, which was running by PW9. On 09.07.2012, the appellant approached the organization for want of house maid for cooking and to take care of his mother. The victim (PW1) was appointed by the organization to

the house of the appellant for salary of Rs.8,500/- and the appellant knows that community of the victim (PW1). Then the appellant told the victim (PW1) that he would give Rs.6,500/- for cooking and Rs.2,000/- for sharing her bed with him and she refused. Thereafter, the appellant had forcible sexual intercourse with her without her consent and promised her that he would marry her and also take care of her children. For about ten months, they were lived as husband and wife and thereafter, the appellant started that he would call for another house maid for work. Since the victim lost her life, she intended to be in the house of the appellant only.

17. On 21.04.2013, she requested the appellant to buy mutton, for which the appellant refused and informed to the organization where the victim (PW1) was working and requested to change her, since she demanded each and every thing to him. Hence, the organization contacted the victim (PW1) and instructed her to return back. Thereafter, the appellant pulled her tuft and also kicked on her hip and chest by uttering her caste name and also driven out her from his house and locked the door and gone away. Hence, she laid outside of the appellant's house throughout night and on the next day morning, she jumped into the well belonging to the appellant in order to commit suicide. Since no water is exist in the well, she came up from the well by holding the pipes, due to which she got lacerated injuries on her hand and legs. The neighbours of the appellant came there and informed to Fire Station and Firemen came there and rescued her from the well with the help of rope. Thereafter, she got admitted in the Government Hospital, Salem where the Police attached to the respondent Police Station came and received the complaint (Ex.P1) of the defacto complainant.

18. Based on the complaint (Ex.P1) given by the victim (PW1), an FIR in Crime No.74 of 2013 was registered for offence under Section 376(i), 376-C(a) IPC (Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013), 417 IPC r/w 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, 1998 against the appellant on the complaint (Ex.P1) given by the victim (PW1). During investigation, the respondent Police altered Sections into 376(i), 376-C(a) IPC (Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013), 417 IPC r/w 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, 1998 and Section 3(i)(xii) and 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. After the completing the formalities, since the offences are especially triable by the Court of Session, the learned Judicial Magistrate, Rasipuram committed the case to the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Namakkal and the same was taken on file in S.C.No.88 of 2014.

19. During the trial, on the side of the prosecution, as many as 18 witnesses were examined as PW1 to PW18 and 20 documents

were marked as Exs.P1 to P20 and no material object was exhibited. After completing the evidence of prosecution witnesses, when incriminating circumstances were culled out from the prosecution witnesses put before the appellant by questioning under Section 313 Cr.P.C., he denied as false and pleaded not guilty. On the side of the defence, no oral and documentary evidence was produced.

20.After considering the evidence on record and hearing the arguments advanced on either side, the learned Principal Sessions Judge, by judgment dated 20.08.2018 in S.C.No.88 of 2014, convicted and sentenced the appellant as stated above.

21.This Court, being an Appellate Court, is a final Court of fact finding Court, which has to necessarily re-appreciate the entire evidence and give an independent finding. Accordingly, this Court appreciated the entire evidence and materials available on record to give independent finding.

22.In order to prove the charges framed against the appellant, on the side of the prosecution, the victim was examined as PW1. Immediately after the occurrence, the victim (PW1) was produced before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Namakkal (PW16) for recording the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C., and the same was recorded (Ex.P17). Though the statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., is not a substantive piece of evidence, however it is a previous statement made by the witness which can be used for corroboration or contradiction.

23.The victim (PW1) has deposed that she belongs to the Scheduled Caste community and the appellant belongs to Nattu Gounder Caste. The victim (PW1) got married with one Thangavel from Erode and they have two children and due to difference of opinion, she separated from her husband and joined and living with her mother (PW2) and children. The victim (PW1) joined and worked in Smart Home Services, Coimbatore, which was running by PW9. On 09.07.2012, she was appointed by the organization to the house of the appellant as house maid for salary of Rs.8,500/-. The appellant told her that he would give Rs.6,500/- for cooking and Rs.2,000/- for sharing her bed with him and she refused. Thereafter, appellant had forcible sexual intercourse without her consent and promised her that he would marry and would take care of her children. For ten months, they were lived as husband and wife and thereafter, the appellant started that he would call for another lady to do the work. On 21.04.2013, the appellant contacted PW9 and instructed PW9 to take back the defacto complainant. Thereafter, the appellant pulled her tuft and also kicked on her hip and chest by uttering her caste name and also driven out her from his house and locked

the door and gone away. On the next day morning, she jumped into the well belonging to the appellant in order to commit suicide. The neighbours of the appellant came there and informed to Fire Station and Fire Officer (PW8) came there and rescued her from the well with the help of rope. Thereafter, she got admitted in the Government Hospital, Salem where the Police came and received the complaint (Ex.P1) of the defacto complainant.

24.PW4 is the neighbour of the appellant and he has stated that he saw the victim (PW1) in the house of the appellant and both were living together as husband and wife. PW9, who was running the organization in the name of Smart Home Care Service, Coimbatore has stated that she appointed the victim (PW1) as house maid to the house of the appellant on the contract basis. The mother of the victim (PW2) has spoken about the fact that her daughter was working in the house of the appellant as house maid. Thus, from the evidence of the victim (PW1), her mother (PW2), the neighbour (PW4) and PW9, it is proved that the victim (PW1) was working in the house of the appellant during the relevant point of time.

25.The main case of the prosecution is that while the victim (PW1) was working in the house of the appellant as house maid, the appellant forcibly raped her and subsequently, he promised to marry her and take care of her children. In order to prove the same, the prosecution examined the victim (PW1), who has spoken about the entire incident happened in the house of the appellant, the mother of the victim (PW2), the neighbour (PW4), and the Doctors who gave treatment to the victim (PW11 & PW13).

26.When the appellant informed the victim (PW1) on the first day itself she should share her bed with him, if at all she is not interested she should have immediately left the place and should have informed the same to her mother (PW2) or informed PW9, who sent her to the house of the appellant as house maid. But, she neither resisted not to work as a house maid in the house of the appellant, nor informed the same to PW9 that she would not work in the house of the appellant and engage her to some other place. Hence, from the evidence of the victim (PW1) and the statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., (Ex.P17), it is very clear that when the appellant made a promise to marry her and also take care of her children, the victim (PW1) allowed him to share the bed. In this case, the facts remains that prior to the occurrence both the appellant and the victim are married persons and not divorced and are living separately.

27.On the request made by the appellant to PW9, the victim (PW1) was sent to the house of the appellant as house maid only to take care of his mother and his house. When the appellant

expressed his desire to have sexual intercourse, the victim(PW1) should have avoided for sexual intercourse and should have left the house of the appellant. On the contrary, she continued her work in the house of the appellant and during that time, the appellant had sexual intercourse with her consent. Therefore, it is a consented sexual relationship between the appellant and the defacto complainant. Even the neighbour (PW4) deposed that he saw the victim (PW1) in the house of the appellant and both were living as husband and wife. Therefore, it may not be possible that the appellant had forcible sexual intercourse with the victim (PW1) by making false promise. Therefore, the offence under Section 376(i) IPC is not made out against the appellant.

28.A reading of the entire evidence of the victim (PW1) and also the statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., (Ex.P17), this Court finds that there was a consented sexual relationship during the time when the victim was working in the house of the appellant. Though in her evidence she has stated that the appellant forcibly had a sexual intercourse and subsequently made a false promise that he would marry her, in the statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., (Ex.P17) she clearly stated that on the first day itself when she entered into the house, the appellant informed that out of Rs.8,500/-, Rs.6,500/- for her work and Rs.2,000/- for sharing her bed with him, for which she has not refused and has not left away the place. Thereafter, the appellant had sexual intercourse with her consent.

29.The evidence of the mother of the victim (PW2) and PW9 clearly show that at no point of time, the victim (PW1) has not informed anything about the forcible sexual assault of the appellant. The victim (PW1) has stated in the statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., that (Ex.P17) that the appellant informed her she should share her bed with him, for which she stated that she would think about it and sought time for one month to inform the same. Before expiry of one month, the appellant had sexual intercourse with her and subsequently, made a false promise that he would marry her and take care of her children, which is not acceptable. Thus, the evidence of the victim (PW1) is not reliable and trustworthy and therefore, this Court comes to the conclusion that the victim (PW1) had given consent for the sexual intercourse with the appellant. With the consent of the victim (PW1), the appellant had sexual intercourse with her and there is no material to show that without consent of the victim (PW1), the appellant had sexual intercourse either by force or threaten by making false promise. The learned trial Judge failed to appreciate the evidence of the victim (PW1) and wrongly convicted and sentenced the appellant under Section 376(i) of IPC and the same are liable to be set

aside and are set aside.

30. Since both the appellant and the victim (PW1) are married and not divorced, the promise made by the appellant is not believable, acceptable and legally, it is not valid. Hence, the conviction and sentence for offence under Section 417 of IPC are liable to be set aside and are set aside.

31. A careful reading of the evidence of the victim (PW1), the neighbour (PW4) and PW9, the appellant knew about the caste of the victim (PW1) at the time of joining as house maid. But in this case, there is no evidence to show that in the public view, she was humiliated by the appellant using the caste name. Therefore, the learned trial Judge has rightly acquitted the appellant for offence under Sections 3(1)(xii) and 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

32. The Doctor (PW11) has stated that on 22.04.2013, she gave treatment to the victim (PW1) and examined by X-Ray and concluded that there is no fracture in her body and issued the Accident Register (Ex.P7) and issued the Wound Certificate (Ex.P8) that the wounds are simple in nature. Subsequently during investigation, again the victim was produced before the Doctor (PW13) for medical examination. The Doctor (PW13) examined her and found that there was no external injury and collected the vaginal smear for Forensic Science Lab, Salem. On 22.05.2013, the Doctor (PW13) received the report (Ex.P12) that the spermatozoa not present and hence, she gave the opinion (Ex.P13) that the victim would have had sexual intercourse and issued the Medical Certificate (Ex.P11). Thus, from the evidence of the Doctors (PW11 & PW13), it could be seen that the victim (PW1) was subjected to harassment by physical as well as sexually.

33. From the evidence of the victim (PW1), her mother (PW2), the neighbour of the appellant (PW4), PW9, who was running the Smart Home Care Service in Coimbatore and the Doctors (PW11 & PW13) who gave treatment to the victim (PW1), this Court finds the victim (PW1) was subjected to harassment by the appellant and therefore, the appellant has committed the offence under Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act 44/1998 amended as per TN Act 39/2002. The learned trial Judge has rightly convicted and sentenced the appellant for offence under Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act 44/1998 amended as per TN Act 39/2002 and the same are confirmed. However, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the sentence of two years imposed by the learned trial Judge for offence under Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act 44/1998 amended as per TN Act 39/2002 is

modified to one year. The appellant is directed to pay compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- to the victim (PW1).

34. Every criminal case has to be decided on the basis of facts and evidence available and not on precedence. The citations referred to by the learned counsel for the appellants are not applicable to the present case on hand.

35. With the above modification, this Criminal Appeal is Partly Allowed. The trial Court is directed to secure the appellant for sufferance of the remaining sentence if he is outside.

1
Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vv2

To

1. The Principal Sessions Court,
Namakkal.
2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Rasipuram,
Namakkal District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
5. The Judicial Magistrate,
Rasipuram.
6. The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Namakkal. (For Information)

Crl.A.No.280 of 2019

CP(CO)
RGA(14/07/2021)