



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 10.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Orders Reserved On 25.02.2020	Orders Pronounced On .11.2022
----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

K.Subramanian @ A.K.Subbu

... Petitioner/A-1 in
Crl.R.C.(MD).No.283/2018

G.Mahendran

... Petitioner/A-4 in
Crl.R.C.(MD)No.311/2018

Pakkirisamy

... Petitioner/A-2 in
Crl.R.C.(MD).No.150/2019

Vs.

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Special CBI, ACB, Chennai.
FIR No.RC 54(A)/2006

... Respondent
in all revisions

COMMON PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition filed under Sections 397 and 401 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the judgment made in C.A.Nos.17, 7 & 10 of 2014 respectively dated 28.02.2017 on the file of the learned II Additional District and Sessions Court, Tiruchirappalli confirming the judgment made in C.C.No.8 of 2007 dated 31.12.2013 on the file of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tiruchirappalli and set aside the same.



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

For Petitioner in
Crl.R.C.(MD).No.283/2018 : Mr.C.Muthusavaranan

For Petitioner in
Crl.R.C.(MD).No.311/2018 : Mr.Veerakathiravan,
Senior Counsel
for M/s.Veera Associates

For Petitioner in
Crl.R.C.(MD).No.150/2019 : Mr.R.Maheswaran

For Respondent
in all revision petitions : Mr.N.Nagendran
Special Public Prosecutor
for CBI Cases

COMMON ORDER

These Criminal Revisions arise out of common judgment in Calender Case in C.C.No.8 of 2007.

2. The petitioner in Crl.R.C.No.283 of 2018 is A-1, petitioner in Crl.R.C.No.150 of 2019 is A-2 and petitioner in Crl.R.C.No.311 of 2018 is A-4. There are totally four accused in this case. All the accused convicted in C.C.No.8 of 2007 by a judgment of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tiruchirappalli dated 31.12.2013.



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

3. The petitioner/A-1 filed an appeal in Crl.A.No.17 of 2014, petitioner/A-2 filed an appeal in Crl.A.No.10 of 2014 and petitioner/A-4 filed an appeal in Crl.A.No.7 of 2014. The II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tiruchirappalli, by separate judgments dated 28.02.2017 dismissed the appeal of the petitioners confirming the conviction and sentence passed by the trial Court. Against which, the present revisions.

4. During trial on the side of the prosecution 30 witnesses examined as P.W.1 to P.W.30 and marked 51 documents as Exs.P1 to P51. On the side of the defence, no witnesses or exhibits marked.

5. The background of the case is that on 09.06.2001, A-4 lodged a complaint stating that while he was doing exercise near the Union Club, a two wheeler bearing No.TN 45 E 4116 came in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against him, thereby, he sustained fracture and got admitted in hospital. The Traffic Investigation Wing, Cantonment, Tiruchirappalli registered a road traffic accident case in Crime No.179 of 2001 for offence under Sections 279 and 338 I.P.C. During investigation A-3/Karunanidhi surrendered and confessed that he committed the offence and thereafter let out on bail. On conclusion of investigation, charge sheet filed in S.T.C. No. 831 of 2001 before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tiruchirappalli.



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

A-3 admitted the offence and paid the fine amount of Rs.1,500/- on 25.06.2001. Following the same, on 27.06.2001, A-1 filed claim petition on behalf of A-4 in M.C.O.P.No.2229 of 2001 claiming compensation for a sum of Rs.2,00,000/-. The CBI while investigating RC 54(A)/2006, came to know about the false claim made by A-1, projecting accidental fall of A-4 as though he sustained road traffic accident injury. A-2 given his vehicle TN 45 E 4116 as the vehicle involved in the accident. A-3 is the driver of the vehicle, who caused the accident. In the meanwhile, the Insurance Company investigator found that many of the claim petitions were filed with false particulars substituting the claimants/beneficiaries, vehicles and in some cases accidental fall and injury are projected as though road accident cases.

6. There were 5 accidents in Tiruchirappalli District alone. (i) Crime No.300 of 2001 has been registered by Lalgui Police Station, (ii) Crime No. 204 of 2001 has been registered by Jeeyapuram Police Station, (iii) Crime No.1051 of 2001 has been registered by Thiruverumbur Police Station and (iv) Crime No.559 of 2001 has been registered by Ramji Nagar Police Station. In all these cases, the vehicle involved was TN 45 E 4116. Thus including this case there have been five cases projected. In five cases, it has been shown as the vehicle TN 45 E 4116 is involved in an accident and the



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

WEB COPY

rider in three of the cases is M.Karunanidhi and in two other cases Pakkirisamy and Anand. Five claim petitions have been filed by A-1 using false, fabricated documents and also involving others in conspiracy of cheating. Hence, the Insurance Company filed writ petitions before this Court in W.P.Nos.39956 & 39968 of 2005. This Court directed CBI to conduct investigation with regard to the false insurance claim and thus the case came to be re-opened on the directions of this Court and CBI re-registered the F.I.R. in RC MA1 2006 0054 dated 29.11.2006, conducted investigation, found involvement of the four accused, charge sheet filed. On conclusion of the trial, the trial Court convicted all the accused and sentenced them to undergo 6 months simple imprisonment for the offence under Sections 120-B r/w 182 I.P.C., 2 years simple imprisonment for the offence under Sections 420 I.P.C. and imposed a fine of Rs.2,000/- to each of the accused, in default to undergo three months simple imprisonment, 2 years simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 471 I.P.C. and imposed a fine of Rs.2,000/- to each of the accused, in default to undergo three months simple imprisonment and 1 ½ years simple imprisonment for the offence under Section 420 r/w 511 I.P.C. and imposed a fine of Rs.2,000/- to each of the accused, in default to undergo three months simple imprisonment. The sentences are directed to run concurrently.



7. The present case is that A-1/K.Subramanian, Advocate, who predominantly practicing Motor Accident Claims cases. A-2/V.Pakkirisamy, a Railway Employee, known to A-1. A-3/Karunanidhi is known to A-2. A-1 and A-2 entered into a conspiracy. As per the conspiracy A-2 was to collect the details about the persons, who got injured in accident and taking treatment in hospital. They would be approached to give false complaint as though road traffic accident occurred. A-2 agreed to project the TVS Champ TN 45 E 4116 purchased by him as the vehicle involved in the accident. A-3 projected as rider of the vehicle in most of the accident cases. Using the Insurance coverage of the vehicle, false Motor Accident claim petitions would be filed.

8. During the period between April 2001 to December 2001, A-1 and A-2 conspired with other persons filed claim petitions in Tiruchirappalli for road accident cases. On 08.06.2001 at about 6.45 hours, while A-4/Mahendran was going to Premier Fitness Centre near Union Club in his motor cycle, he fell down, sustained fracture in his right leg. On the same day, he got admitted in Maruti Hospital, informed Doctors that he fell down from his motor cycle near his house. The Accident Register recorded for the same reason. During his stay at hospital, A-1 met A-4 instigated him to give



WEB COPY

false complaint as though he was hit by a two wheeler bearing No.TN 45 E 4116. Thereafter a complaint lodged before the Traffic Investigation Wing, Cantonment, Tiruchirappalli stating that while A-4 was doing exercise on the road, he was hit by TVS Champ TN 45 E 4116 driven by A-3. One Nagamuthu, Head Constable initially registered the case and investigated. Later, one Selvadurai, Sub Inspector of Police continued the investigation. At that time A-3/Karunanidhi appeared before the Sub Inspector along with two wheeler TN 45 E 4116 and its documents, confessed the involvement in the accident and submitted the documents. Thereafter, he was shown arrest and thereafter released on bail. Later on conclusion of investigation, charge sheet filed for the offence under Sections 279 and 338 I.P.C. in S.T.C.No.831 of 2011 before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tiruchirappalli. On 25.06.2001, A-3/Karunanidhi pleaded guilty and paid the fine amount. As per the plan, A-1 filed a claim petition in M.C.O.P.No.2229 of 2001 claiming compensation of Rs.2,00,000/-. As per the directions of this Court, CBI took up the investigation, recorded statement of witnesses.

9. During investigation, the criminal conspiracy between A-1 to A-3 in cheating the Insurance Company by filing false claim using the vehicle of A-2, was unearthed. Originally, the vehicle was purchased by one Anthony



Raj and later he exchanged the vehicle in a Exchange Mela and vehicle was shown to be sold to one Ravikumar of Peravoorani, a fictitious person. The vehicle and document was in possession of A-2, who raised loan using the documents, produce the vehicle in the road accident cases. In this case, A-3, voluntarily surrendered and confessed that he dashed against A-4. The conspiracy and falsehood revealed by examination of witnesses and collection of documents and thereafter charge sheet filed before the concerned Court. The trial Court on the evidence and documents produced, by a detailed judgment, convicted the accused, against which, they preferred an appeal. The appeals got dismissed confirming the trial Court judgment.

10. The contention of the petitioner/A-1 is that he is a practicing Advocate in Tiruchirappalli, predominantly, filing Motor Accident Claims cases. Learned counsel submitted that P.W.21 and P.W.23 has not supported the case of the prosecution and there was a long gap between the accident and the claim petition. The uncle of accident victim, an Advocate, confirm that he took A-1 to meet his cousin. Further, there is no iota of evidence against the petitioner/A-1 to prove the case of the prosecution that he has filed false M.C.O.P. cases. Further, the petitioner/A-1 has got nothing to do with the other accused. Normally, advocate or advocate clerk's refer cases,



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

hand over documents to the petitioner to file accident claim petitions and on their instructions, petitioner/A-1 files claim petitions. It is the usual practice, which is followed even by other Advocates. The petitioner had brought all these facts by way of cross examination and also given detailed explanation while questioned under Section 313 Cr.P.C. The trial Court as well as Lower Appellate Court failed to consider the same and the petitioner had been convicted merely on surmises and conjectures.

11. The petitioner/A-2 submitted that the vehicle TVS Champ TN 45 E 4116 is in the name of one S.Anthony Raj, the petitioner is not the owner of the vehicle. There is no material to show that the petitioner conspired with the other accused. There are witnesses and evidence to show that the above vehicle was purchased by Anthony Raj, who had thereafter exchanged the vehicle in a Exchange Mela and the vehicle was purchased by one S.Ravikumar of Peravoorani. Neither Anthony Raj nor Ravikumar examined as witnesses in this case. In the absence of the same, the petitioner cannot be held as owner of the vehicle. A financier is projected against the petitioner to implicate the petitioner as though he had hypothecated his vehicle, submitted the documents of Anthony Raj and obtained loan. Further, the stand taken by the prosecution that the petitioner/A-2 has got two Insurance certificates one



from National Insurance Company and another from the United India Insurance Company while the 1st insurance policy was still in force with National Insurance Company, there is no reason to have second insurance for the same period. The petitioner is also projected as though he conspired with A-1 to find out the accident victims in various hospitals and provide particulars to A-1. Further projected as though he gave assurance to the victims that adequate compensation would be obtained for them. He further submitted that there is lot of contradiction and discrepancies between the oral and documentary evidences. Both the Courts below failed to properly appreciate the same. It is proved that the vehicle does not stand in the name of the petitioner/A-2. In such circumstances, the petitioner/A-2 cannot be convicted.

12. The contention of the petitioner/A-4 is that the case in Crime No. 179 of 2001 culminated into S.T.C. No.831 of 2001, in which, one Karunanidhi/A-3 appeared, pleaded guilty and paid the fine amount. The competent Court given a detailed order, which has become final. There is no appeal or any order to re-open the investigation by filing appropriate petition under Cr.P.C. On the contrary, against the legal principles the respondent police registered a case in F.I.R.No.RC 54(A)/2006, conducted fresh



investigation with regard to the same facts, which earlier investigated and reached finality, which is not proper. The respondent police either by way of further investigation or fresh investigation ought to have filed appropriate petition, set aside the earlier order passed and thereafter to proceed with the investigation. Failing to do so, the respondent police cannot conduct any further investigation and any investigation conducted is illegal, irregular and as such any conviction based on the respondent investigation is not proper. A-1 in this case filed M.C.O.P.No.2229 of 2001. The petitioner has not signed the petition in M.C.O.P.No.2229 of 2001. In view of the same, the petitioner cannot be prosecuted and convicted for offence under Section 420 r/w 511 I.P.C. There is no evidence to show that the petitioner conspired with the other accused in making false claim petition under M.C.O.P.

13. P.W.3 is the resident Doctor of Maruti Hospital, the petitioner/A-4 immediately after injury got admitted in the hospital and took treatment. At that time, on the advise of the Doctor particulars of the accident given, otherwise petitioner was worried that it would become police case and it would take some time for initiation of treatment, hence, for the purpose of immediate treatment, he stated that he fell down from his bike and sustained injury. The prosecution case itself is that A-1 to A-3 fabricated documents for



the purpose of monetary benefits under the Motor Vehicles Act before the Tribunal. The petitioner has got nothing to do with the claim made by them. The police officials, who earlier investigated Crime No.179 of 2001, filed charge sheet in S.T.C. No.831 of 2001, have not disputed or stated anything that earlier investigation was improper, false and the details given by the petitioner/A-4 are with false details. None of the earlier investigation officers stated anything against the petitioner. Finding of the case in S.T.C.No.831 of 2001 is not disputed. The trial Court convicted the petitioner on surmises and conjectures and the lower Appellate Court failed to independently consider the evidence and materials. On the other hand, mechanically confirmed the conviction of the trial Court. Hence, prayed for setting aside the order of the Courts below.

14. Learned Special Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent submitted that A-4 fell down on 08.06.2001, sustained injury. P.W.1 along with another admitted him in Maruti Hospital. In the hospital, initially A-4 stated that he sustained injury due to fall from his motor cycle and not in a road accident. Thereafter, he was approached by A-1, who informed that the injury can be projected as road traffic accident, A-2 owner of TN 45 E 4116 will project the vehicle involved in the accident and A-3 will admit that he is



the rider of the vehicle, who caused the road accident and appropriate compensation amount can be obtained from the Insurance Company. Agreeing to the conspiracy, A-4 changed his stand and projected as though it was a road accident. The respondent Police on the complaint of A-4 conducted investigation, at that time A-3 voluntarily surrendered before the respondent Police, admitted that he caused the accident using the vehicle of A-2, produced all the relevant documents of the vehicle. Thereafter, he was shown arrest, bail was granted, sureties executed, investigation completed and charge sheet filed. After some time, A-3 pleaded guilty and paid the fine amount. Taking advantage of these developments, A-1 filed the accident claim petition before the Tribunal using the forged documents, which was created by all the accused. The CBI while investigating, similar false Insurance claims cases stumbled upon the above case. In the meanwhile, the National Insurance Company investigator in his preliminary enquiry found that the false claim made by the petitioners, in a concerted manner public money was attempted to be swindled by projecting false claims. The false claim became rampant involving false vehicle, false injured persons, in some cases, police, insurance personnels, advocates have all contributed for the false claims which became uncontrollable.



15. Added to it, it is seen that A-2 in a covert manner, came in possession of the vehicle and its documents, which is spoken by the dealer M/s.Siraj Agencies. A-2 for obvious reasons not changed the registration of the vehicle into his name, on the other hand, used the vehicle for all purpose. A-2 had hypothecated the vehicle with P.W.24 by submitting vehicle documents including his personal documents and particulars, which clearly exposes the contra stand taken by A-2. It is seen that P.W.22, the Advocate Clerk of A-1 clearly state about A-2 and A-3 visiting office of A-1 on a regular basis. P.W.25 advocate clerk of another advocate, stood as surety during bail for A-3, clearly state that only on the request of A-1, he gone to the police station and executed the surety bond. This clearly confirms the complicity of A-1. A-4's primary defence is that on 08.06.2001, he gone for morning exercise to the Premier Fitness Centre in his bike and at that time, he fell down. Thereafter, P.W.1-Rajaraman, who is the instructor in the fitness centre took him and admitted in the hospital. The Doctor, who recorded accident register not examined. P.W.2, who treated him had recorded in Exs.P2 and P3 that A-4 met with road accident, got injured and fractured his right leg. The statement of A-4 that he is not aware about the conspiracy and forgery committed by the other accused in this case would fall flat as could be seen from the complaint lodged by him in Ex.P13. His



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

signatures marked as Q1 and Q2 sent to the handwriting expert-P.W.27, confirms that the signature is in conformity with S1 to S9, the specimen signature of A-4. Hence, A-4 had committed forgery by providing false vehicle particulars. Hence, he consciously participated in the commission of offence.

16. P.W.30 investigating officer, in his evidence confirmed that on 12.02.2007, A-4 written a letter informing that on 08.06.2001, immediately after the accident, he became unconscious and then taken to the hospital, later one Subbu given the particulars of the two wheeler TN 45 E 4116 and that is the reason, the same is reflected in the complaint Ex.P13. According to the investigating officer, on the attendant circumstances, it is only an after thought to escape from the offence. Further submitted that the trial Court addressed all the points raised by the petitioners by a well reasoned judgment. The Lower Appellate Court independently assessed the evidence and dismissed the appeals and confirmed the conviction. Hence, in these cases, there is no perversity or illegality to interfere with the finding of the trial Court.



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

17. The learned Special Public Prosecutor further relied upon the decision of the Apex Court reported in ***AIR 2017 SC 2161*** in the case of ***Mukesh and another vs. State for NCT of Delhi and others*** for the point that in the case of conspiracy under Section 10 of the Evidence Act anything done by anyone of them in reference to their common intention, is admissible against the others. He further relied upon the decision of the Apex Court in ***Crl.A.No.1261-1262 of 2017 dated 01.08.2017*** in the case of ***CBI vs. M.Sivamani***, wherein in a case of false accident claim, the High Court held that false documents were given to public servant and no proceedings can be initiated in view of the bar under Section 195(1)(a)(i) of Cr.P.C, the Apex Court referring to various citations and further adverting to the orders passed in W.P.Nos.7389, 39956 and 39968 of 2005 giving direction to entrust the investigation to CBI forthwith in respect of the complaints filed by the National Insurance Company as well as other Insurance Companies, held that in view of the same, the contention of the petitioners cannot be sustained. Hence, prayed for dismissal of these revision petitions.

18. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Special Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent Police and perused the materials available on record.



WEB COPY

19. Considering the submissions and on a perusal of material, it is seen that the petitioner/A-1, Advocate, who predominantly practicing on the Motor Accident Cases. He filed Motor Accident claim petition for A-4 in M.C.O.P.No.2229 of 2001. The presence of A-1 in the hospital is confirmed by P.W.23, who is an Advocate and brother-in-law of A-4, during his visit to Maruti Hospital, Tiruchirappalli. During the relevant period, five petitions of similar nature claiming compensation were filed by A-1. In all the cases, the vehicle TN 45 E 4116 is projected as vehicle involved in the accident and most of the cases, A-3 is the rider of the two wheeler. A-2 and A-3 visits A-1 office often, which is confirmed by the evidence of P.W.22, clerk of A-1. Added to it, A-3 surrendered, confessed about the case. Thereafter he was arrested and then granted bail. P.W.25 executed surety for A-3 at the instance of A-1. The petitioner/A-1 involvement is not a stray incident. He committed well orchestrated crime in conspiracy with the other accused. In view of the same, this Court is not inclined to entertain the revision filed by the petitioner/A-1.

20. As regards A-2, Associate of A-1, who has been entrusted of the job of identifying accident victims and pass on the information to A-1 to



make arrangement for filing claim petitions. Further, he purchased a vehicle bearing No.TN 45 E 4116, consciously not strike out the name of Anthony Raj and registered his name. The vehicle was taken to a Exchange Mela where it was recorded to be sold to one Ravikumar of Peravoorani. It is confirmed that no such person as Ravikumar available in Peravoorani. On the other hand, vehicle documents are in possession of A-2, who availed hypothecation loan from P.W.24, who confirms production of vehicle, submission of vehicle documents by A-2 and also his personal documents. Thus, A-2 though attempted to camouflage, his involvement got exposed and evidences produced. The trial Court on the evidence, rightly convicted A-2. Hence, in a concerted manner, A-2 participated in the offence, for one of the accident projected himself as rider. Petitioner/A-2 executed surety to A-3 in some cases. Thus, A-2 actively and consciously involved in the offence along with other accused. In view of the same, this Court is not inclined to entertain the revision filed by the petitioner/A-2.

21. As regards petitioner/A-4, it is seen that on 08.06.2001 A-4 sustained injury, which is not in dispute. Whether the injury sustained by way of road accident or by accidental fall is the moot point. P.W.1 – Instructor in the Fitness centre after coming to know that A-4 got injured, found A-4



sitting over the bench, immediately rushed to A-4 with the help of one Prabhu, admitted A-4 in Maruti Hospital, Tiruchirappalli. On arrival of A-4's father, he left the hospital. The other witness, Prabhu, subsequently due to head injury lost his memory, unable to speak, which is confirmed by P.W.4. P.W.2 is the Orthopaedic Surgeon, who treated A-4, conducted surgery on the same day. He saw the accident register-Ex.P1 with lot of corrections and erasers. He cancelled the accident register/Ex.P2 and written the fresh accident register/Ex.P3. He gave treatment to A-4, which is confirmed by Exs.P1 and P4. P.W.3 is the another Doctor from the Maruti Hospital confirms the treatment given to A-4 for his fracture. Thus, A-4 immediately rushed to the hospital, taken treatment for injury sustained. P.W.2 clearly record that A-4 fell down due to accident with another vehicle. The prosecution ought to have examined the casualty medical doctor, who recorded Ex.P2, strangely no such steps taken. The positive evidence in favour of A-4 is, P.W.2 given treatment and recorded in the accident register Ex.P3 that A-4 sustained injuries due to accident. His treatment further confirmed by P.W.3. The police personnel conducted earlier investigation in Crime No.179 of 2001 which culminated into S.T.C.No.831 of 2001. P.W.7 – Ravichandran, Grade-I Constable, P.W.8 – Rajamanickam, Writer, P.W.9 – Selvadurai, Sub Inspector of Police, P.W.10 – Madhana Gopal, Grade-I



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

Constable, P.W.11 – Nagamuthu, Head Constable and P.W.12 – Palaniappan, Constable all attached to the Traffic Investigation Wing, Tiruchirappalli (South). These witnesses clearly state the receipt of complaint from A-4. Thereafter, visiting scene of occurrence, recording statement of witnesses, preparation of rough sketch and observation mahazar and other details of investigation. Thereafter on completion of investigation charge sheet filed. As regards the accident, injury sustained by A-4 is confirmed by these witnesses.

22. The only doubt cast is that A-3 appeared voluntarily, produced the vehicle documents and confessed about the accident. Thereafter on filing of the charge sheet, A-3 pleaded guilty, paid the fine amount. There is no evidence to show that at any point of time, A-4 met A-2 and A-3. A-1 to A-3 acted independently taking advantage of the situation and the injury sustained by A-4. A-4 had given an explanation that he was informed by one Subbu about the vehicle number and particulars, which may be possible, otherwise also he had been to the hospital immediately after the injury. At that time in good faith he believed and lodged complaint/Ex.P13. For this point alone A-4 cannot be said to be conspirator with the other accused in commission of the offence. Added to it, the investigation was primarily for



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

the purpose of finding out the preparation of forged documents making false accidental claims. In this case, the specific stand of A-4 is that the signature found in the claim petition in M.C.O.P.No.2229 of 2001/Ex.P18 is forged one, it is not of A-4 further this signature not tallied with the petitioner's signature. The Handwriting Expert confirms the same. A-4 not filed any claim petition. In view of the same, this Court finds that the petitioner/A-4 not co-conspired with the other accused, not created any documents for the purpose of making false claim and the evidence of P.W.1 and earlier investigating team confirms about the accident and A-4 sustaining injury. The Doctors, who treated him confirms the same. Petitioner/A-4 apart from providing the vehicle number, he had no role thereafter, added to it, A-4 categorical explanation is that he has not filed and aware about any claim petition. The trial Court and the Lower Appellate Court have failed to consider the these aspects and wrongly convicted the petitioner/A-4.

23. In view of the same, this Court is inclined to allow the revision filed by the petitioner/A-4 alone. Accordingly, Crl.R.C.(MD) No.311 of 2018 is allowed and the petitioner/A-4 is acquitted from all the charges.



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

24. As regards Petitioners/A-1 and A-2 are concerned, the revisions filed by them in Crl.R.C.(MD) No.283 of 2018 and Crl.R.C.(MD) No.150 of 2019 are dismissed.

10.11.2022

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
rsi

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Special CBI, ACB, Chennai.
- 2.The II Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

rsi

**Pre-delivery common order in
Crl.R.C.(MD)Nos.283 & 311 of 2018 and 150 of 2019**

10.11.2022