



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.11.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

Criminal Appeal No. 339 of 2017

Murugesan @ Kanja Murugesan

.. Appellant

Versus

State by
The Inspector of Police,
Hogenakkal Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.

.. Respondent

Criminal Appeal is filed under Section 374 (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, to set aside the conviction and sentence imposed vide judgment of the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, dated 27.04.2017, passed in S.C. No. 73 of 2016, in erroneously convicting the Appellant herein / first Accused under Section 304 (ii) of IPC and sentencing him to 10 years rigorous imprisonment and fine of Rs.1,000/- in default to undergo 1 years rigorous imprisonment.

For Appellant : Mr. M.G. Udayashankar
for Mr. R. Thamaraiselvan

For Respondent : Mrs. G.V. Kasthuri
Additional Public Prosecutor



WEB COPY



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

J U D G M E N T

This Criminal Appeal had been filed to set aside the judgment of conviction and order of sentence imposed on the Appellant/Accused-1 by the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, in S.C. No. 73 of 2016, dated 27.04.2017.

2. The learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, vide impugned judgment dated 17.02.2015, has convicted the Appellant/Accused-1 as follows : -

Conviction under section	Sentence Awarded
304(ii) IPC	To undergo ten years of rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- and in default, to undergo one year of rigorous imprisonment.

3. The period of conviction already undergone by the Appellant/Accused-1 was also ordered to be set off by the Trial Court as contemplated under Section 428 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.



4. While convicting the Appellant/Accused-1, as mentioned above, the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri acquitted Accused-2 to Accused-7 from the charge under Section 304 r/w 109 of IPC.

5. The brief facts, which are necessary for disposal of this Criminal Appeal, are as follows:-

5.1. P.W-1 -Rajesh is a resident of West Mambalam, Chennai went to Hoganekkal as a tourist along with his wife Gomathi, his two sons Sachin and Darshan, his father-in-law Krishnamoorthy, mother-in-law Gowri. That apart his brother in law Ranjith Kumar, his wife Gokila along with his 10 month old female child named Suchitra also accompanied P.W-1 to Hoganekkal. It is stated that P.W-1 went to Hoganekkal to celebrate his wedding anniversary on 30.08.2015. P.W-1 and others stayed in C.M. Lodge, Hoganekkal on 29.08.2015. On 30.08.2015, at about 1.30 p.m, P.W-1 and 9 others went to Hoganekkal Water falls for a boating. In the boating zone, they met an agent who is engaged in booking the tourist for boating in the Coracle. On seeing him, P.W-1 requested for a trip in the Coracle along with his family members. The said Agent in turn asked Appellant/Accused-1 to take P.W-1 and others in his Coracle.



Accordingly, all the 9 have boarded the Coracle owned by the Appellant/Accused-1. According to the Appellant/Accused-1, when P.W-1 asked for life-jacket, the Appellant/Accused-1 has not given the life jacket(s). Similarly, when P.W-1 asked as to whether it is feasible for 9 persons to have a ride in his coracle, he replied in the affirmative. Therefore, P.W-1 and 8 others boarded the coracle of the Appellant/Accused-1. However, when the Coracle was nearing a place called *Maamarathu Kadavu* in Thommasikkal rock, water peeped inside the Coracle and on seeing the same, Appellant/Accused-1 dived to safety. However, P.W-1 and others submerged in the water but fortunately, P.W-1, his wife Gomathi (P.W-2) and first son were saved by the on lookers. Except P.W-1, his wife and first son, six others traveled in the coracle operated by Appellant/Accused-1 died. In this context, on the basis of the complaint given by P.W-1, the case in Crime No. 173 of 2015 was registered on 30.08.2015 by the Inspector of Police, Hoganekkal Police Station for the offence punishable under Section 304 of the Indian Penal Code against the Appellant/Accused-1 and subsequently, the Accused 2 to 7 were also roped in as Accused in the case, who are agents and who facilitated the ride of P.W-1 and others in the Coracle operated by Appellant/Accused-1.



WEB COPY

5.2. Before the trial Court, in order to prove the charges against the Appellant/Accused-1 and 6 others, the prosecution examined as many as 20 witnesses as P.W-1 to P.W-20 and marked documents as Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-25. That apart, the Coracle operated by Appellant/Accused-1 on the fateful day was projected as M.O-1. On behalf of the defence, neither any witness was examined nor any document marked. The witnesses examined on the side of Prosecution are Rajesh, who is the Complainant in the case and who was examined as P.W-1. P.W-2 is the wife of P.W-1, who was also part of the occupants in the coracle operated by the Appellant/Accused-1.

5.3. P.W-3 is Mr. R.Saravanan, the Village Administrative Officer, who has witnessed the arrest of the Accused, Seizure Mahazar and also the confession statement of the first Accused.

5.4. P.W-4 is Dr. T. Kathiravan, who treated P.W-1, P.W-2 and their son on 30.08.2015 at Government Hospital, Pennagaram and issued Ex.P-4 to Ex.P-6, copies of the Accident Registers.



5.5. P.W-5 is Mr. Manoharan, who is the colleague of the first Accused. P.W-6 is a witness of the Observation Mahazar. P.W-7. Ms.Anbumani, is a temporary Staff of the Hogenakkal Panchayat Office and who was in-charge of issuing tickets for the tourists to have a Coracle ride at Hogenakkal falls. P.W-7 deposed regarding the issuance of tickets to the tourists.

5.6. P.W-8, Mr. S.N. Chandrakasan, is the father of the deceased Kokila. He is a hearsay witness. He is not a direct witness to the incident.

5.7. P.W-9 Dr. K. Thunder Chef, is the one who had conducted autopsy on the body of (i) Dharshan, son of P.W-1 and aged 2½ years old (ii) the deceased Gowri (iii) the deceased Krishnamoorthy (iv) the deceased Ranjithkumar and (v) the deceased Sudhiksha, 10 months old female child. He had issued Postmortem certificates and issued Ex.P-8- Postmortem certificate for 2 ½ years old child Dharshan. Ex.P-9 Postmortem certificate for the deceased Gowri. Ex.P-10, requisition letter to conduct autopsy on the body of deceased Krishnamoorthy and Ranjithkumar. Ex.P-11 Postmortem report of the deceased Krishnamoorthy. Ex.P-12, Postmortem report of the deceased



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

Ranjithkumar and Ex.P.13 Postmortem report of the 10 months old child
Sudhiksha.

5.8. P.W-10 Dr. Arivazhagan had conducted Autopsy on the body of deceased Kokila, W/o. Ranjithkumar and issued Ex. P-14, Postmortem certificate for her.

5.9. P.W-11 Mr. Venkatesan, is the Superintendent in the office of the District Rural Development Agency, Dharmapuri. He had deposed regarding the steps taken by the authorities to ensure the safety of the visiting tourists at Hogenakkal falls and about the procedures to be adopted for coracle rides.

5.10. P.W-12 Mr.Saravanan is the Secretary of a Women Self-Help Group named Speed. He was treated as hostile witness by the Prosecution. He did not support the case of the Prosecution.

5.11. P.W-13 Mrs. Selvarani is the President of Chellamuthumari Women Self-Help Group, who had deposed regarding the letting out of safety vests for the tourists at Hogenakkal.



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

WEB COPY 5.12. P.W-14 is the Sub-Inspector of Police Mr. Kumaresan, who had conducted inquest over the body of the 2½ years old child Dharshan and issued Ex.P-17, Inquest Report regarding his death.

5.13. P.W-15 is Mr. Kanagesan, Inspector of Police, who had conducted inquest over the body of the deceased - 10 months old Sudhiksha and issued inquest report under Ex.P-19.

5.14. P.W-16 is Mr. Chandran is the Special Sub-Inspector of Police who had received complaint from P.W-1 Rajesh. The oral complaint given by P.W-1 Rajesh was recorded by P.W-16. He had handed over the same to the Inspector of Police, Hogenakkal Police Station.

5.15. P.W-17 is Mr. Rathnakumar, Inspector of Police, who had conducted inquest over the body of the deceased Ranjithkumar, aged 35 years and issued Ex.P-20 Inquest report.

5.16. P.W-18 is Mr. Andavar, Inspector of Police, who had



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

recorded the complaint received by P.W-16 and registered a case in Hogenakkal P.S. Cr. No.173 of 2015 under Ex. P-21, FIR. He had sent the copies of the FIR to the higher officials of the Police Department and the original complaint and FIR were sent to the Court of Judicial Magistrate, Pennagaram.

5.17. P.W-19 is Mr. Soman Rajan, who had conducted inquest over the body of the deceased Kokila and issued inquest report under Ex.P-22.

5.18. P.W-20 is Mr. Manigandan, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Pennagaram, who, in his deposition, stated that on 30.08.2015, he had received information that in Hogenakkal, the Coracle had capsized and the persons who took ride drowned. He further deposed that he sought help of Fire Service Personnel and along with Police party, he went to the place of occurrence to retrieve the bodies and to help the persons who drowned. Subsequently, he had conducted investigation based on the case registered by P.W-18, recorded statement of witnesses and filed final report before the Court of District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Pennagaram.

5.19. The trial Court, after due trial, upon considering the oral and



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

documentary evidence, convicted the Appellant/Accused-1 for the offence under Section 304 (ii) of the Indian Penal Code, as referred to above.

6. Challenging the judgment of conviction and order of sentence imposed on the Accused/Appellant by the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, dated 27.04.2017 in S.C. No. 73 of 2016, the present Criminal Appeal had been filed.

7. Mr. M.G. Udayashankar for Mr. R. Thamaraiselvan, learned Counsel appearing for the Appellant/Accused-1 submitted that the deposition of each of the witness and the judgment of learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri are contrary. He has stated that P.W-1 and P.W-2, who had taken Coracle ride in Hogenakkal also drowned but subsequently, they were saved by the other nearby Coracle operators. In the cross-examination of P.W-1, he denied the suggestion that the inmates in the Coracle wanted to take selfie in the mobile phone and it led to the accident. He also denied that all the occupants of the coracle sat in one side and due to overweight, imbalance was caused to the coracle, which resulted in drowning of the inmates. The suggestion to the witness that they were given safety vests but they had refused to wear was also denied



by P.W-1. In this context, the learned counsel invited attention of this Court to the deposition of P.W-5, a colleague Coracle operator. In his cross examination, P.W-5 had clearly stated that there was video recording in the place where life jackets were provided. Life jacket was provided on payment of Rs.5/- and it is not provided by Coracle operators, but by the Women Self-Help Group on payment of Rs.5/-. Therefore, the allegation of P.W-1 that he requested for life jackets but it was not provided by the Appellant/Accused-1 is false and untenable.

8. Further, the learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused-1 also invited the attention of this Court to the evidence of P.W-6 employee of a hotel. He, in his cross examination, admitted that on the next day, papers carried news item that when the occupants of the Coracle attempted to take selfie in the mobile phone, ignoring the advice of the Coracle operator, the accident had occurred in which the Coracle capsized and six people died. The learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused-1 also stated that P.W-20, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Pennagaram in his cross examination admitted that in the complaint, P.W-1 had stated that one life jacket was given and that was put on the minor child. That apart, P.W-10, photographer in the place where the tourists took Coracle ride. By



referring to his submission, the learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused-1 contended that if photographs had been seized by the Investigation Officer and marked as a document, it could have weakened the Prosecution case and that is the reason why they were not produced before the trial court. That apart, P.W-10, photographer admitted in his cross examination that the accident had occurred when the inmates of the Coracle attempted to take selfie midway in the Hogenakkal falls and it was reported in the media. Thus, there is clear evidence through the cross examination of the Prosecution Witnesses particularly P.W-5 and P.W-6 that the victim along with his family members did not listen to the advice of the Accused and they moved to one side of the Coracle for taking selfie which resulted in imbalance and consequently, the Coracle capsized causing death of 6 inmates. P.W-5 was just behind the Coracle operated by the Accused. His evidence gains more weightage. Similarly, P.W-6 employee of the hotel, where inmates were residing, had deposed that on the next day, it was reported in the newspaper that only due to the inmates attempted to take selfie, the Coracle capsized.

9. It is the submission of the learned Counsel appearing for the Appellant/Accused-1 that from the evidence available through P.W-1 to



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

P.W-20, the Prosecution failed to prove the charge that only due to the negligence of the Coracle operator, the accident occurred and it caused the death of 6 inmates of the Coracle. Therefore, the judgment passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri convicting the Accused for the offence under Section 304(ii) of IPC is perverse and is liable to be set aside.

10. In support of his submissions, the learned counsel for the Appellant/Accused-1 relied on the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of **Mahadev Prasad Kaushik vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another** (Criminal Appeal No. 1625 of 2008 arising out of Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No. 2023 of 2007) dated 17.10.2008. In that case, the complainant brings his father to the clinic run by the Accused. After examining the patient, the Accused administers injections but within half an hour, the father of the complainant died. Therefore, at the instance of the complainant, in the private complaint, a direction was issued to cause an investigation into the complaint. The Police, after investigation, files a final report holding that the father of the deceased died even before he reached the clinic of the Accused due to heart attack and the deceased did not take any treatment in the clinic of the deceased.



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

Accordingly, the investigation was closed. On notice, protest petition was filed by the complainant and it was observed by the learned Magistrate that there are eye witnesses to the incident who have stated that the deceased was administered three injections by the Accused and within half an hour, his body turned blue. Therefore, it was directed that the closure report filed by the investigation officer is illegal. Challenging the order of the learned Magistrate, a Revision Petition No. 368 of 2007 was filed which was also dismissed by the High Court. On appeal before the Honourable Supreme Court, it was observed that to bring home Section 304 (ii) into play, it must be shown that the death is caused by doing an act with knowledge that it is likely to cause death but without any intention to cause death or to cause such bodily injury as is likely to cause death. The Honourable Supreme Court while partly allowing the appeal, held that the process for an offence punishable under Section 304, IPC is misconceived on the facts of the case and the process could only be issued for an offence under Section 304A of IPC.

11. He also relied on the decision in ***Jacob Mathew vs. State of Punjab and another (Appeal (Crl) No.144-145 of 2004) dated 05.08.2005***. In the said decision, the Doctors of a clinic were sought to be



prosecuted on the ground that the complainant's elder brother was admitted in the hospital in a private ward on 15.02.1995. On 22.02.1995, suddenly, the patient suffered breathlessness. The complainant contacted the duty nurse, who in turn called the doctor to attend the patient. It is alleged that no Doctor turned up for 20 to 25 minutes. Thereafter, the Appellant/Accused-1 and Dr. Allen Joseph connected an oxygen cylinder to the mount of the patient, but breathing decreased. The oxygen cylinder was found to be empty and therefore another cylinder was brought and in that process 5 to 7 minutes was wasted. Ultimately, the patient died. When the matter reached the Honourable Supreme Court, it was observed as follows:-

“A medical practitioner faced with an emergency ordinarily tries his best to redeem the patient out of his suffering. He does not gain anything by acting with negligence or by omitting to do an act. Obviously, therefore, it will be for the complainant to clearly make out a case of negligence before a medical practitioner is charged with or proceeded against criminally. A surgeon with shaky hands under fear of legal action cannot perform a successful operation and a quivering physician cannot administer the end-dose of medicine to his patient.

If the hands be trembling with the dangling fear of facing a criminal prosecution in the event of failure for whatever reason whether attributable to himself or not, neither a surgeon can successfully wield his life-saving scalper to perform an essential surgery, nor can a physician successfully administer the life saving dose of medicine. Discretion being better part of valour, a medical professional would feel better advised to leave a terminal patient to his own fate in the case of emergency where the chance of success may be 10% (or so), rather than taking the risk of making a last



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

WEB COPY

ditch effort towards saving the subject and facing a criminal prosecution if his effort fails. Such timidity forced upon a doctor would be a disservice to the society.”

12. Thus, it is submitted by the learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused-1 that in this case, the victims have contributed themselves by not wearing life jacket which was proved by evidence. The victims have not acted with normal prudence and they have invited the accident. On the other hand, there is nothing to show that the Appellant/Accused-1 negligently operated the coracle and accordingly, the learned Counsel prayed for allowing this Appeal.

13. Per contra, Mrs. G.V. Kasthuri, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for the Respondent submitted that the evidence of P.W-1 to P.W-20 were cogent and consistent with respect to the negligence with which the Appellant/Accused-1 operated the coracle. The evidences P.W-1 and P.W-2 ought to be given weightage as they were also drowned along with others, but fortunately they were saved by the other Coracle operators. It is the duty of the Coracle operator to pay Rs.5/- for safety vests, which the Appellant/Accused-1 failed to collect. On the other hand, without ensuring that the occupants of the Coracle are wearing the safety



jackets, the Appellant/Accused-1 started operating the coracle. Thus, only due to the sheer negligence of the first Accused, the Coracle capsized resulting in the death of 6 inmates who took Coracle ride.

14. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor also invited the attention of this Court to the evidence of P.W-11 Mr. Venkatesan, through whom the prosecution marked Ex.P-15 which spells out the safety measures taken by the State and which is to be insisted upon by the Coracle operators. Ex.P-15 states that in the presence of the Coracle Owners' Association Members, the District Collector of Dharmapuri had issued guidelines to be followed while taking tourists for a ride. As per the said proceedings, the Coracle operators have to pay Rs.5/- for each of the safety vest to the Women Self-Help Group. Further, the Government, under Ex.P-16 clearly indicated that if there is any violation, the Coracle operator himself will be made liable. Thus, the Prosecution has proved the case against the Appellant/Accused-1-Accused No.1. The Judgment of the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri is well reasoned judgment and it does not warrant any interference by this Court. This Appeal lacks merit and hence it is to be dismissed.



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

Point for consideration:

WEB COPY

Whether the judgment of the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, in S.C.No.73 of 2016 dated 27.04.2017 is to be set aside as perverse and the Appellant/Accused-1 is to be acquitted from the charge under Section 304 (ii) of IPC ?

15. Heard Mr. M.G. Udayashankar for Mr. R. Thamaraiselvan, learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused-1 and Mrs. G.V. Kasthuri, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

16. Perused the evidence of Prosecution witnesses, P.W-1 to P.W-20 and the documents marked as Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-25, and the judgment of the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri.

17. On perusal of the evidence of P.W-1 and P.W-2, it is evident that the victims of the accident have engaged the Appellant/Accused-1 for a coracle ride and enquired as to whether 9 people can take a ride in one coracle. P.W-1 himself ought to have refused for such a ride in one Coracle. Instead, he ought to have engaged 2 coracles for 9 members in his family. Thus, there is contributory negligence on the part of the victims. Also as per the evidence of P.W-13 Selvarani, President of



Women Self Help Group, the Coracle operator who takes the inmates for ride, has to pay Rs.5/- for life jacket. As per her evidence, she had given 6 life jackets to the inmates on the fateful day, but whether it was properly worn by them or not is not known. If what is stated by P.W-13 is true it is for the inmates to have taken the ride carefully by wearing the safety jacket. In such event, even if the Coracle capsized, they would not have drowned. Thus, there is negligence on the part of the victims as well.

18. As per the deposition of P.W-1, in his cross-examination, he had admitted that on the next day of the accident the news reports in the media reported that those who had taken Coracle ride attempted to take selfie near the falls which resulted in Coracle losing balance and all the inmates drowned. P.W-2 wife of P.W-1 in her cross-examination denied that they had taken selfie which was projected as the cause for the accident. Also when they were confronted regarding wearing of life jacket, P.W-2 claimed ignorance. If they had worn life jacket, they would have floated on the water when the coracle submerged. The evidence of P.W-5 clearly indicates that there was violation of the safety measures by the victims themselves for which the Coracle operator cannot be held responsible. In this case it was an option as on the date of the accident. That is why, those



who drowned in the Coracle did not wear the life jacket without paying Rs.5/- to the Women Self-Help Group. Therefore, the conviction of the Appellant/Accused-1 by shifting the blame on him is found unacceptable.

19. From the evidence of the Prosecution witnesses P.W-1, P.W-2, P.W-5 and P.W-13 it is clear that there is no foolproof system in place for the safety of the Coracle riders who takes Coracle ride. The Coracle as such is nothing but a big basket made out of bamboo which has rubber sheet underneath the basket to prevent water entering into the Coracle. Anyone who is not proficient in swimming will be agitated when water enters into the Coracle and it will prove to be dangerous and risky. Here in this case, the deceased and the witnesses P.W-1, P.W-2 and P.W-3, who are from Chennai, are not experienced in swimming, but by the attraction of the water in the falls, they had taken the Coracle ride ignoring the safety measures. Ex.P-15 would show that the wearing of safety jackets is not implemented as a compulsory measure and was not practically implemented in the place where tourists are attracted.

20. Before delivering this Judgment, this Court had requested the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, to visit the Hogenakkal



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

Water Falls to make a report regarding the safety of the tourists and the operation of the Coracle ride by the authorities concerned. He had filed a report whereby it is stated that the swimmers and ambulance were available in case of any mishap but on the date of the accident on 30.08.2015 it appears that there was no such system in place. From the report of the learned Principal District Judge, it is found that there is no mandatory inspection regarding the quality of the Coracle at regular intervals. Swimmers are available in the place of Coracle ride. The State Disaster Response Force Station is available but there are no sufficient staff. Therefore, the learned Principal District Judge had suggested for a regular Fire Station in case of emergency. As per the report of the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, in the year 2023, 36 drowning cases have been reported. There is no full time Doctors available in the premises of the main water falls area where tourists flock in large number for Coracle ride. Thus, strict vigil is not available for the safety of the visitors and no regulatory mechanism is in place. The proceedings of the District Collector under Ex.P15 is found not satisfactory or foolproof as it is not implemented strictly which had given rise to this unfortunate mishap.

21. In the light of the above and having regard to the arguments



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

put forth by the learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused-1 and the cross-examination of P.W-1, P.W-2, P.W-5 and P.W-13, the judgment of the learned Principal District Judge convicting the first Accused/Appellant/Accused-1 for the offence under Section 304(ii) of IPC and sentencing him to undergo imprisonment for 10 years with fine of Rs.1,000/-, is found to be perverse.

22. In the light of the above discussion, the point for consideration is answered in favour of the Appellant/Accused-1 and against the Respondent. The judgment of the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, in S.C.No.73 of 2016 dated 27.04.2017 is to be set aside as perverse and the Appellant/Accused-1 is to be acquitted from the charge under Section 304 (ii) of IPC.

23. Considering the report of the learned Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri, in order to prevent such occurrence, the State Government is requested to carry out a study regarding the safety measures in place and the laxity in implementing such measures by engaging State Disaster Response Force with the help of National Disaster Response Team also National Institute of Ocean Technology. The ways and measures can be



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

suggested to improve safety or safety measures in Hogenakkal water falls to ensure that no further loss of lives is occurred. Also in the interest of the tourists, the State Government may get expert advice from the Navy or National Institute of Oceanography regarding the safety of the Coracles which carry tourists across falls. Till such time, Coracle ride can be banned or restricted. If the Coracle ride is to be considered, Government can implement safety measures strictly by ensuring that the Coracle riders/tourists compulsorily wears safety vests.

In the result, **this Criminal Appeal stands allowed.** The judgment of conviction and sentence of imprisonment imposed on the Appellant/Accused-1 by the learned Principal District Judge of Dharmapuri, in S.C.No.73 of 2016, vide impugned judgment dated 27.04.2017, for the offence under Section 304(ii) IPC is hereby set aside. The Appellant/Accused-1 is acquitted from all the charges. The bail bond executed by Appellant/Accused-1 is ordered to be cancelled. The fine amount paid, if any, by the Appellant/Accused-1 is to be refunded.

29.11.2024

mjs/srm



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The learned Principal District Judge,
Dharmapuri.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Hogenakkal Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
- 4.The Section Officer, VR Records,
High Court, Chennai.

Copy to:

1. The Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.The Additional Chief Secretary,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Tourism Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 4.The Director General of Police,



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

Head of Tamil Nadu State Police Force,
Post Box No.601, Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore, Chennai – 600 004.

5.The Inspector General of Police,
Tamil Nadu Disaster Response Force,
No.17, Boat Club Road,
Rajaannamalai Puram,
Chennai – 600 028.

6.The District Collector,
Collectorate,
Salem Main Road,
Virupachipuram (RV),
Dharmapuri – 636 705.

7.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Superintendent of Police,
Dharmapuri – 636 705.



WEB COPY



Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.,

mjs/srm

Judgment in
Crl.A.No.339 of 2017

29.11.2024