IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON 16.03.2022	PRONOUNCED ON 28.04.2022

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.CHANDRASEKHARAN

CRL.A.NO.589 OF 2014

The State of Tamil Nadu Rep. by,
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Salem – 4.
Cr.No.5/AC/97 ... Appellant/Complainant

.Vs.

1. E.Rangachari

2. S.Subramanian ... Respondents/Accused

Prayer:-

Criminal Appeal filed under Section 378 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to set aside the judgment of acquittal passed by the Special Judge for Prevention of Corruption Act cases, Salem in Spl.C.C.No.58 of 2000 dated 03.10.2013; thereby, convict and sentence the respondent/accused.

For Appellant : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor.

For Respondents : Mr.V.Gopinath
Senior Counsel
For Mr.M.Abdul Razack
(for R1)

Mr.S.Ashok Kumar
Senior Counsel
For Mr.P.Palaninathan
(for R2)

J U D G M E N T

Appellant filed final report against the respondents alleging that on 01.07.1997 at about 4.00 p.m. at the office of first respondent, first respondent received a sum of Rs.10,000/- for registration of land to an extent of 34 cents in survey Nos.35/1B and 35/3 at Ellampillai village as agricultural land for himself and on behalf of the second respondent. Therefore, both the respondents/accused committed the offences under Sections 7 and 13 (2) r/w. 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. On the basis of this final report charges under Sections 7 and 13 (2) r/w. 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 were framed against the respondents. Respondents denied the charges and demanded trial.

2. The prosecution has examined P.W.1 to P.W.24 witnesses, produced Ex.P1 to Ex.P.26, M.O.1 to M.O.8 in support of the case of the prosecution. Respondents produced Ex.D1.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, as seen from the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, is as follows:

P.W.2 purchased an extent of 34 cents and 8 cents through two sale deeds. He along with his friend Ganapathy visited Magudanchavadi Sub-Registrar office for registration of the sale deeds on 12.06.1997. First respondent gave a receipt for Rs.2,200/-. Then he informed that the second respondent would inspect the property to find out whether the property purchased is an agricultural land or otherwise and then the sale deed would be registered. On 26.06.1997, both the respondents inspected the property. Next day, P.W.2 and his friend visited Magudanchavadi Sub-Registrar office. He found second respondent sitting in the Registrar's seat and Sub-Registrar was sitting near him. He asked about the document. Second respondent told them that the property was inspected by him and the first respondent. P.W.2's samandhi paid Rs.13,500/- for registering the land. Therefore, P.W.2 has to give money. First respondent demanded Rs.15,000/-. Then first respondent said he can pay Rs.13,500/- as paid by his samandhi. P.W.2 told him that he is a weaver and is not able to pay the amount. Then, first respondent took him to a room on the eastern side of Sub-Registrar office and told that P.W.2 that if he pays money like his samandhi, the document would be registered saying the land as agricultural land, else P.W.2 would have to pay more money. P.W.2 told him that he was facing financial hardship and therefore, first respondent asked him to pay Rs.10,000/- and said that he would inform the second respondent to make arrangements for registration. P.W.2 accepted this. First respondent informed the second respondent that he demanded Rs.10,000/- and that was accepted by P.W.2. second respondent, in turn, told him that, if he brought money as demanded they would do favour to him. On 01.07.1997, P.W.2 met the first respondent again. His friend also accompanied him. First respondent demanded whether he brought the money. P.W.2 told him that he did not bring money. Then, first respondent told him that only if he brings money things would be favourable to him, else he would have to face hardship. P.W.2 did not want to give bribe to the respondents and therefore, he gave Ex.P2 complaint to the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption.

4. P.W.22, the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption on receiving the Ex.P2 complaint, registered Ex.P.25 first information report in Crime No.5/AC/97 under Section 7 and 13 (2) r/w. 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. He conducted preliminary enquiry and then arranged for trap witnesses. One Mr.N.Krishnamoorthi Senior Drafts Man, National High ways, Salem and one Balaraman, Co-operative Societies are the witnesses for assisting the trap proceedings. He introduced them to P.W.2 and gave copy of the first information report for their reading. After reading the copy of the first information report they ascertained the facts from P.W.2. Then he asked whether PW2 brought the bribe money and he produced twenty Rs.500/- notes. He explained the significance of phenolphthalein test and demonstrated the Sodium Carbonate Phenolphthalein test to P.W.2 and witnesses and prepared Ex.P11 Entrustment Mahazar. Then, he directed P.W.2 and witnesses to proceed to the Magundanchavadi Sub-Registrar office in a bus. He proceeded with his team in his office jeep. They reached Magudanchavadi Sub-Registrar office at about 3.45 p.m. P.W.2, his friend Ganapathy and witness Krishnamoorthi were asked to proceed to the office and they went inside the office at 4.00 p.m and others took positions and watching the Sub-Registrar office.

5. After entering the office, first respondent came from his seat and asked him whether P.W.2 brought the money. P.W.2 told him that there was a bit of shortage. First respondent told witness krishnamoorthi that PW2 admitted to bring and pay the money to District Registrar and now he says there is shortage in the money. District Registrar would mistake him. Only if the entire amount is brought, things would move. P.W.2 gave Ex.M.O.1 cash to the first respondent. First respondent received the money and kept in his left pant pocket. He informed that P.W.2 would get orders in one or two days. Then, they came out and P.W.2 signalled to the Inspector with pre-arranged signal.

6. P.W.3 Krishnamoorthi, had corroborated the evidence of P.W.2 with regard the Sodium Carbonate - Phenolphthalein test, demand made by the first respondent, its acceptance etc.

7. On being signalled by P.W.2, P.W.22 entered the Sub-Registrar office along with witness and his team. P.W.2 identified respondent E.Rangachari as a person who received the illegal gratification of Rs.10,000/-. Then he sent P.W.2 and P.W.4 out and he introduced himself and his team to first respondent. Sodium Carbonate solution was prepared in two glass tumblers. PW22 asked respondent E.Rangachari to dip his right and left hand fingers separately in the solutions. On dipping, both the solutions changed to light pink colour. Then, he enquired respondent E.Rangachari about money received from P.W.2. P.W.2 produced from his left pant pocket twenty Rs.500/- notes. The currency notes were compared with the notes entered in the entrustment mahazar and the numbers tallied. Respondent E.Rangachari was provided a dhothi and the left front pant pocket was subjected to Sodium Carbonate - Phenolphthalein test. It also changed to light pink colour. He seized Ex.P.6 to Ex.P.10 documents. Prepared Ex.P11 mahazar and Ex.P12 rough sketch. He made arrangements for house search of the accused. House search was conducted and a sum of Rs.26,210 was recovered from his house. Respondent S.Subramanian's house was also searched on the same date.

8. P.W.23, took up further investigation in this case, recorded the statement of witnesses, sent the material objects to the Court and requisition for sending the material objects for chemical examination. P.W.24 conducted search of the house of second respondent. He took up further investigation in this case, obtained sanction for prosecution and filed final report.

9. On considering the oral and documentary evidence, the learned trial Judge found the respondents 1 and 2 are not guilty for the offences under Section 7 and 13 (2) r/w. 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and acquitted them. Challenging the judgment, this Criminal Appeal is filed.

10. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the respondents/accused demanded a sum of Rs.10,000/- as illegal gratification from PW2 when PW2 presented the sale deed for registration, to avoid the valuation of the property as house site and for valuing the property as agricultural land so that PW2 need not have to pay higher stamp duty. The fact of the matter is that the lands purchased by PW2 are agricultural lands. The respondents, with a view to get illegal gratification, demanded bribe amount for assessing the lands as agricultural land and in pursuance of the demand, the first respondent received a sum of Rs.10,000/- towards illegal gratification on 02.07.1997 and thus, both accused committed the offences punishable under Sections under Sections 7 and 13 (2) r/w 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that PW2 had clearly

given evidence with regard to the demand of illegal gratification by both the accused. His evidence is corroborated by the evidence of his friend PW4, who accompanied him during the demand made by the respondents. PW3 also supports the evidence of PW2. The first respondent received the illegal gratification in his office on 02.07.1997 and that was recovered by PW22, trap laying officer in the presence of PW3. The Sodium Carbonate - Phenolphthalein test on the right and left hand fingers of the first respondent and his pant pocket tested positive for the presence of the Sodium Carbonate and Phenolphthalein. Though the prosecution has established the charges against the respondents beyond any reasonable doubt, the trial Court without considering the merits of the case, held the charges against the appellant as not proved and acquitted them on the basis of minor contradictions. In view of the clear and cogent evidence with regard to the demand of the bribe, its acceptance and recovery by the respondents, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the appellant prayed for the setting aside the judgment of the trial Court and convicting the respondents for the charges against them and for imposing suitable sentence.

11. Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the evidence of PWs 2, 3 and 4 is not a natural evidence, but an artificial evidence given only with a view to see that the accused are convicted. There are several material contradiction in the evidence of PWs 2, 3 and 4 with regard to the alleged demand and improbability of the demand alleged to have been made by the respondents. The truth is that PW2's land was sought to be registered as agricultural land, however, during the course of investigation, it is found that there is a house and building in and around the land purchased by PW2. Therefore, the second respondent after inspection decided that the land cannot be decided as an agricultural land but only as a house site. The documents were sent for I.G's office for assessment. When that be the case, the claim of PW2 and the prosecution that the respondents demanded illegal gratification for showing the land as an agricultural land, when in fact, the documents were already sent for I.G.'s office for assessment, could not have been true. It is claimed by PW2 that the respondents demanded him to pay bribe amount as paid by his Samandhi, who earlier purchased the portion of the land in that survey number, but, PW2's Samandhi, who was examined as PW11, stated that there was no problem when he purchased the property and he did not say anything about the payment of bribe to the respondent at the time of the registering his sale deed. PW4 is the close associate of PW2. His evidence is totally the evidence of an interested witness. Though PW3 is a Government Official, he only supports the evidence of PW2 and PW4 for the reason that he was roped in as a witness. However, the evidence of PWs 3 and

4, at the time of alleged demand of bribe amount on 02.07.1997, is doubtful in the light of the evidence given by PW2 that when he was talking with the respondents there was no one near him. It is seen from the evidence of PW2 that he had sent a petition to the head of the Registration department on 13.07.1997, wherein he had only alleged that the respondents had demanded excess stamp duty. When PW2 gave the money to the first respondent, he told him to keep the money with him and that he would inform him about the stamp duty. Leaving the money, PW2 left the office and thereafter it was recovered. The first respondent had not received the amount as illegal gratification. Though the amount was recovered from the first respondent and the Sodium Carbonate - Phenolphthalein test tested positive for the presence of Sodium Carbonate - Phenolphthalein in the first respondent's right and left hand fingers and pant pocket, mere recovery of the amount without proving the demand of illegal gratification and the receipt of the amount as illegal gratification, is not sufficient to establish the charges against the accused/respondents. Taking all these factors into account, the trial Court held that the charges against the respondents have not been proved and acquitted them. Thus, he prayed for confirming the judgment of the trial Court and for dismissal of this appeal.

12. In support of his submissions, the learned counsel for the respondents relied on the following judgments;

The judgment reported in 1996 CRI.L.J.2867 Ramesh Babulal Doshi Vs. State of Gujarat is relied for the proposition that the mere fact that a view other than the one taken by the trial Court can be legitimately arrived at by the Appellate Court on reappraisal of the evidence cannot constitute a valid and sufficient ground to interfere with an order of acquittal unless it comes to the conclusion that the entire approach of the trial Court in dealing with the evidence was patently illegal or the conclusion arrived at by it were wholly untenable. "While sitting in judgment over an acquittal the appellate Court is first required to seek answer to the question whether the findings of the trial Court are palpably wrong, manifestly erroneous or demonstrably unsustainable. If the Appellate Court answers the above question in the negative, the order of acquittal is not to be disturbed. Conversely, if the Appellate Court holds, for reasons to be recorded in view of any of the above infirmities it can then only reappraise the evidence to arrive at its own conclusions".

13. The judgment reported in (2009) 15 SCC 200 State of Maharashtra Vs. Dnyaneshwar Laxman Rao Wankhede is relied for the proposition that, even in a case where the burden is on the accused, it is well known, the prosecution must prove the

foundational facts. “It is also a well settled principle of law that where it is possible to have both the views, one in favour of the prosecution and the other in favour of the accused, the latter should prevail”.

14. The judgment reported in (2012) 10 SCC 383 Murugesan and sixteen others Vs. State through Inspector of Police is pressed into service on the powers of appellate Court, on the basis of the concise statement of law enunciated in (2007) 4 SCC 415 Chandrappa Vs. State of Karnataka. The relevant portion of the judgment is extracted as follows:

> 16. A concise statement of the law on the issue that had emerged after over half a century of evolution since Sheo Swarup (supra) is to be found in para 42 of the report in Chandrappa & Ors. v. State of Karnataka. The same may, therefore, be usefully noticed below:
>
> 42. From the above decisions, in our considered view, the following general principles regarding powers of the appellate court while dealing with an appeal against an order of acquittal emerge:
>
> (1) An appellate court has full power to review, re-appreciate and reconsider the evidence upon which the order of acquittal is founded.
>
> (2) The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 puts no limitation, restriction or condition on exercise of such power and an appellate court on the evidence before it may reach its own conclusion, both on questions of fact and of law.
>
> (3) Various expressions, such as, "substantial and compelling reasons", "good and sufficient grounds", "very strong circumstances", "distorted conclusions", "glaring mistakes", etc. are not intended to curtail extensive powers of an appellate court in an appeal against acquittal. Such phraseologies are more in the nature of "flourishes of language" to emphasise the reluctance of an appellate court to interfere with acquittal than to curtail the power of the court to review the evidence and to come to its own conclusion.
>
> (4) An appellate court, however, must bear in mind that in case of acquittal, there is double

presumption in favour of the accused. Firstly, the presumption of innocence is available to him under the fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence that every person shall be presumed to be innocent unless he is proved guilty by a competent court of law. Secondly, the accused having secured his acquittal, the presumption of his innocence is further reinforced, reaffirmed and strengthened by the trial court.

(5) If two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of the evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal recorded by the trial court.

The judgment reported in (2019) 5 SCC 460 Sham Lal Vs. State of Haryana and others is relied for the proposition that the law is well settled that an acquittal by the trial Court should not be interfered with unless it is totally perverse or wholly unsustainable.

15. Considered the rival submissions and perused the records.

16. Points for consideration:

1. Whether the prosecution has established beyond any reasonable doubt, the demand of illegal gratification, acceptance of money by the first respondent on his behalf and on behalf of the second respondent as illegal gratification and its recovery?

2. Whether the trial Court has without properly appreciating the evidence, acquitted the respondents on the basis of the flimsy and immaterial contradictions?

3. Whether this appeal has to be allowed?

17. As stated already, the charges against the respondents are that the respondents/accused demanded a sum of Rs.10,000/- as illegal gratification from PW2 when PW2 presented the sale deed for registration to avoid the valuation of the property as house site and for valuing the property as agricultural land so that PW2 need not have to pay higher stamp duty. PW2 is the defacto complainant and PW4 is his friend. They are examined to prove the demand of illegal gratification by the respondents prior to the trap proceedings. PW3 was examined to prove the demand made on the date of trap proceedings. It is seen from the evidence of PW2 and Ex.P2 complaint that his Samandhi PW11

purchased an extent of 53 cents out of the total extent of 95 cents in S.No.35/1B, 35/3 32/2B in Elampillai Village. PW2 purchased the remaining 42cents through the sale deed on 12.06.1997. When he presented the sale deed for registration on 12.06.1997, he was given a receipt for Rs.2,200/- towards the registration charges. First respondent told him that the documents will be released only after verifying that the land purchased is an agricultural land after the inspection by the District Registrar. He was informed by his son in law that the property was inspected by the respondent on 26.06.1997. The next day, he visited the Sub Registrar's office, Maguvanchavadi and saw the first respondent in connection with the sale deed. The second respondent was also sitting by his side. When he asked them about the sale deed, the first respondent demanded Rs.15,000/- and then told him that his Samandhi paid Rs.13,500/- and therefore, he too has to pay like his Samandhi. If he pays the money demanded by them, the land will be assessed as agricultural land, otherwise, he would have to pay higher stamp duty. When he expressed his inability to pay the amount demanded by them, the first respondent told him to pay Rs.10,000/- and he would convince the second respondent. Second respondent also told him to pay the money demanded and he would act favourably. On 01.07.1997, he again met the first respondent with regard to the sale deed. The first respondent asked him whether he brought the money and when he said that he did not bring the money, first respondent said to have informed PW2 that only if he pays the money, he would be favourable to him, otherwise, he has to face the adverse consequences. Then PW2 gave the complaint Ex.P2. PW4, friend of PW2 mostly supports the evidence of PW2.

18. The main contentions of the respondents is that though the lands were originally classified as Ryotwari punjai as per the revenue records, there are two houses in the lands. That apart, there are buildings in and around the lands purchased. Therefore, the lands were ordered to be assessed as house site by the second respondent. Aggrieved against the order assessing the land as house site and that PW2 had to pay additional sum towards the stamp duty and registration charges, he had given a false complaint.

19. In this regard, respondents brought to the notice of this Court, the evidence of PW2 during the course of his cross examination. It is seen from the evidence of PW2 that he had given a petition to the District Registrar, Chennai, on 13.07.1997, wherein he alleged the reason for paying the money. He also mentioned that the unauthorised claim of excess stamp duty should be withdrawn. It is also mentioned in this petition that he approached the first respondent several times in connection with the sale deed and that the first respondent

informed him that the documents would be released after inspection by the first respondent. The first respondent also informed him that the sale deed was sent to the I.G.'s office and it would be returned after 25 days. It is also his evidence that the sale deed relating to 34 cents was released to him only after sending the sale deed to the Special Collector. This evidence of PW2 makes it clear that there was an issue with regard to the assessment of the land in question as to whether it has to be assessed as an agricultural land or as house site. After the inspection by the respondents, it was sent to the I.G.'s office. Only after the Special Collector cleared the documents, the documents were given to PW2.

20. It is the evidence of PW2 that first respondent informed him that the sale deed relating to 34 cents would be released only after inspection by the second respondent to find out whether the land is an agricultural land or a house site. Subsequently, both respondents inspected the land on 26.06.1997. Thereafter, it is claimed by PW2 that he met the respondents at Maguvanchavadi. Though respondents said to have demanded a sum of Rs.15,000/- as bribe and reduced it to a sum of Rs.10,000/- in the petition dated 13.07.1997 sent by PW2, it is claimed by him that he was asked to pay excess stamp duty. It is also stated in the petition dated 13.07.1997 that he was informed that the documents was sent to I.G's office. The specific allegations against the respondents is that the demand of illegal gratification for assessing the land as agricultural land instead of house site so that PW2 need not have to pay higher stamp duty. When the document was already sent to the I.G.'s office for assessment and it was informed by the first respondent to PW2 that the documents would be received only after 25 days, a fundamental and strong doubt arises as to whether the respondents would have demanded the illegal gratification as alleged by PW2. It has to be borne in mind that the respondents' case is that they refused the request of PW2 to assess the land as an agricultural land and therefore, PW2 and the person close to him developed enmity against the respondents and gave false complaint.

21. As per the case of the prosecution and the evidence of PW 2 and PW4, the first demand of illegal gratification was made on 27.06.1997, followed by the demand made on 01.07.1997 and on the date of the trap on 02.07.1997. Both PW2 and PW4 had given evidence with regard to the demand alleged to have been made by the respondents on 27.06.1997, 01.07.1997 and 02.07.1997. PW3, official trap witness supports the evidence of PW2 and PW3 about the demand made on 02.07.1997. However, when the evidence of these witnesses read together shows that during the course of chief examination PW2 told that after entering the office along with PW3 and PW4, they found the first respondent. He came from

his seat, took PW2 to his room and asked whether he brought money. PW2 told him that there is some shortage in the money. Then the first respondent told PW3 that PW2 admitted to pay the money to the District Registrar, now he says that there is shortage in the amount, District Registrar would mistake him. Thereafter, he received the money from PW2. During the course of chief examination his evidence is that at the time of receiving the money, PW3 was standing by his side. He also claimed that the first respondent came out of his room and then took PW2 to his room and asked money. However, during the course of cross examination, he stated that the room in which he was talking with the first respondent is situated on the east to the room of the first respondent's room. The first respondent's room is facing western side and he was sitting facing eastern side. Nobody who is waiting outside could see what he was talking to the first respondent. When he was talking to the first respondent, the persons accompanying him (PW3 and PW4) were standing outside. This evidence of PW2 creates a strong suspicion as to whether PW3 and PW4 were present when alleged demand said to have been made on 02.07.1997. Therefore, the evidence given by PW3 and PW4 with regard to their presence at the time of alleged demand made on 02.07.1997 and acceptance of the bribe money by the first respondent is highly doubtful.

22. PW4 during the course of his evidence stated that on 02.07.1997, PW3 said to have informed the first respondent that he had paid money to PW2 and therefore, requested the first respondent to receive the money even if it is less. However, PW3 has not given any such evidence. He has not stated that he had given money to PW2, for him to pay to the first respondent. This evidence of PW4 shows that he is keen to give evidence supporting the case of the prosecution with a view to get the conviction to the accused contrary to the facts and the evidence given by PW3. It is claimed that the first demand was made on 27.06.1997, however, during the course of cross examination, PW2 stated that he did not meet the first respondent on 27.06.1997 in connection with the sale deed. It is suspicious as to whether there was a demand on 27.06.1997 as claimed by PW2 and PW4. It is his evidence that on 27.06.1997, his son in law accompanied him to the Sub Registrar's office. However, his son in law contradicts his evidence and stated that after 12.06.1997, he has not visited the Sub Registrar's office. There is no evidence from PW11 Samandhi of PW2 that he paid bribe to the respondents for registering the sale deed.

23. In view of the aforesaid contradictions which are not minor or immaterial contradictions, but material contradictions touching upon the alleged demand of bribe, this Court concurs with the view of the trial Court that there is a serious doubt with regard to the alleged demand made by the respondents to

perform their official duty. The demand is sine qua non to prove the charges of acceptance of illegal gratification. When the alleged demand made by the respondents is surrounded with the aforesaid material contradictions in the evidence of PW2, PW3 and PW4, it is not safe to conclude that the prosecution has proved the demand of illegal gratification by the respondents beyond any reasonable doubt.

24. Though the sum of Rs.10,000/- was recovered from the first respondent and the Sodium Carbonate - Phenolphthalein test tested positive for the presence of Sodium Carbonate - Phenolphthalein in the right and left hand fingers and the pant, when the demand of illegal gratification is not satisfactorily proved, mere acceptance and recovery of money from the first respondent would not establish the charges against the accused, especially when the respondents offer a probable explanation that the amount was received in connection with the stamp duty, with reluctance on the part of the first respondent to receive the amount.

25. In the light of the above discussed material contradictions in the evidence of the material witnesses and improbability of making demand of illegal gratification after the document was sent to the I.G.'s office and assessment of stamp duty, and the other reasons stated in the judgment of the trial Court, this Court is of the considered view that the trial Court has taken the right decision to acquit the respondents/ accused and this decision, in the considered view of this Court does not require any interference.

26. In the result, this Court confirms the judgment of the Special Judge for Prevention of Corruption Act cases, Salem, in Spl.C.C.No.58 of 2000, dated 03.10.2013, acquitting the respondents for the offences under Sections 7 and 13 (2) r/w. 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and dismisses this Criminal Appeal. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions, if any, is also closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ep/sli

To

1. The Special Judge for Prevention of Corruption Act cases,
   Salem.

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
   Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
   Salem - 4.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
   High Court, Madras.

Copy To:-

The Section Officer,
Criminal Section,
High Court, Madras.

+1cc to Mr.M.Abdul Razack, Advocate, S.R.No.29859
+1cc to Mr.P.Palaninathan, Advocate, S.R.No.30049

CRL.A.NO.589 OF 2014

AD(CO)
PBS/25/05/2022