



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 11.3.2024

Delivered on : 30.4.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Criminal Appeal No.81 of 2017

T.Mathalagan
(sic for T.Mathialagan)

Appellant

vs.

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Cuddalore.

Respondent

Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374 Cr.P.C. against the judgment dated 25.1.2017 in Spl.C.C.No.6 of 2010 rendered by the Special Judge Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Cuddalore.

For Appellant : Mr.John Sathyan, Senior Advocate
for Mr.S.Manuraj

For Respondent : Mr.S.Santhosh
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

JUDGMENT

Challenging the judgment of conviction and sentence rendered by the Special Judge Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Cuddalore in C.C.No.6 of 2010, the sole accused has come up with the present Criminal Appeal.



WEB COPY 2. The appellant stands convicted and sentenced as under:-

<i>Legal provision</i>	<i>Sentence imposed</i>
Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988	One year rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs.1000/- in default to pay the fine, to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of three months.
Section 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988	One year rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs.1000/- in default to pay the fine, to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of three months.
The sentences shall run concurrently.	

3. At the relevant point of time viz., on 3.9.2009, the appellant was working as Village Administrative Officer of Serakuppam, Panruti Taluk, Cuddalore District and he was a Public Servant as defined under Section 2(c) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The allegation levelled against the appellant is that he had demanded a sum of Rs.2000/- as illegal gratification from one Kothandaraman for effecting name transfer in patta.

4. The case of the prosecution elicited from the evidence of the prosecution witnesses is as under:-

i) One Kothandaram, PW2, an agriculturist, who resides in



Aabathanapuram lodged a complaint, Ex.P2 on 8.9.2009 at 8.30 am with the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption Wing, Cuddalore contending that on 24.8.2009, he had submitted an Application, Ex.P4 along with two supporting documents for name transfer of patta standing in the name of his father in respect of 43 ares of land in Survey No.124/8 in the Taluk Office Cuddalore, whereupon, he was advised in that office to approach the Village Administrative Officer, the appellant after a week's time and accordingly, he had approached the appellant in his office on 3.9.2009 at 11.00 am and at that time, the appellant had demanded a bribe of Rs.2000/- and thereby, he was constrained to lodge the complaint, Ex.P2 on 8.9.2009.

ii) On receipt of such a complaint, PW9, Thiru.Sekar, Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption Wing, Cuddalore had registered an FIR, Ex.P11 and sent requisition to the Zonal Director, Veterinary Department, Cuddalore and Assistant Director, Cooperative Audit, Cuddalore seeking assistance of the officials for conducting a trap. Accordingly, PW3, Abdul Razak, Record Clerk from the office of the Zonal Director, Veterinary Department, Cuddalore and one Sivasakthivel, Cooperative Audit Officer from the office of the Assistant



Director, Cooperative Audit, Cuddalore were deputed and they reached the office of the Vigilance and Anti Corruption office on 8.9.2009 at 12.00 noon. On their arrival, PW9 had introduced PW2, de facto complainant to the said witnesses and vice versa and apprised the witnesses about the complaint.

iii) Subsequently, PW9 asked PW2 as to whether he brought the bribe money as demanded by the appellant and thereupon, PW2 had produced two currency notes of Rs.1000/- each. Those notes were given to the witnesses for counting and noting down the serial numbers of the same and thereafter, a demonstration was made for conducting the trap with the assistance of one Hydher Beik, Head Constable 1327 and another Head Constable 467 by name Rajamanickam and thereby the witnesses were apprised of the significance of the test and thereafter, the chemical content used for demonstration of trap was destroyed.

iv) Subsequently, PW9 had instructed PW2 to keep the money in the left pocket of his shirt and visit the office of the appellant alongwith PW3 and if the appellant demands bribe, PW2 can proceed according to his desire and on receipt of money by the appellant, PW2 was instructed to come out and give signal by scratching his head



using his right hand. In this regard, PW9 had also prepared Ex.P3 handing over mahazar, which was duly signed by the de facto complainant, PW2, the prosecution witnesses and PW9.

v) Thereafter, on 8.9.2009 at 1.05 pm, the entire team containing the prosecution witnesses, police personnel and PW2 went in the Government vehicle went to the office of the appellant and reached there at about 1.50 pm. Having dropped PW2 and PW3 near the office of the appellant, PW9 and his team members including the another official witness Sivasakthivel have hidden themselves near the office of the appellant.

vi) PW2 and PW3, who went inside the office of the appellant at about 2.00 pm, had come out at about 2.15 pm and PW2 had shown the pre-arranged signal to the team of PW9 and thereupon, he was called near them and enquired about the happenings inside the office of the appellant. On the narration made by PW2 about the demand and acceptance of bribe by the appellant and the same having been reiterated by PW3, the team of PW9 had entered into the office of the appellant, wherein, PW2 had identified the appellant to PW9.

vii) After identifying the appellant, PW9 had introduced himself to him and commenced the phenolphthalein test with the aid of the



Head Constable Rajendran. Sodium Carbonate mixture was made in two clean glass tumblers in one of which, the appellant was made to dip his left hand and thereupon, the mixture turned into light pink, which was poured into a glass bottled, sealed and labelled as No.1 and on the label, it was named as appellant's left hand dipped mixture, whereupon PW3, another witness Sivasakthivel, appellant and PW9 have affixed their signature. The same procedure was repeated for the right hand of the appellant and on the mixture having turned into light pink, it was poured into a clean glass bottle, named and labelled as No.2 and the same was signed by the same witnesses. After giving alternate shirt to the appellant, his shirt was also dipped into the similar mixture made by the Head Constable and on the mixture having turned into light pink, it was poured into another glass bottle, named and labelled as No.3 and signature of the witnesses were affixed therein. Those three bottles were marked as M.O.2 series while the seized currency notes were marked as M.O.1 series and the shirt of the appellant was marked as M.O.3.

viii) When the Inspector of Police, PW9 had asked the appellant as to why he got bribe, the appellant was keeping quiet and thereupon, PW9 had arrested the appellant. Subsequently, PW9 had



prepared a mahazar, Ex.P6 at 4.15 pm for the occurrence that had taken place between 2.00 pm and 4.00 pm in the office of the appellant and gave a copy of the same to the appellant. Then PW9 had prepared Observation Mahazar, Ex.P7 and Rough Sketch, Ex.P8 wherein PW3 and another witness Sivasakthivel had signed as witnesses. Then, PW9 had asked about the application received from PW2 and the appellant had produced the same from his table drawer. PW9 had submitted a requisition to the Chief Judicial Magistrate for a search to be conducted in the house of the appellant and thereafter, he, alongwith prosecution witnesses, went to the house of the appellant at Kolakkudi and conducted the search and having found no suspicious materials, he prepared a statement, Ex.P9, which was signed as witness by P.Ws.2 and 3 and a copy of the same was given to the appellant. Subsequently, PW9 had remanded the appellant to the court and sent the seized material objects to the court under Form 95 and submitted the case file to PW10, Inspector of Police Thirumal for further investigation.

ix) PW10, Thirumal, Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption Wing, Cuddalore, who took up the case for further investigation on 10.9.2009, had sent the material objects viz., the



three bottles containing the sodium carbonate mixture and the shirt seized from the appellant to Forensic Sciences Department through the Grade I Police Constable Thiru.Thillai Govindaraya Perumal.

x) PW8, Kirubakaran, Scientific Assistant, Forensic Sciences Department, who conducted the test on the material objects, had submitted his Report, Ex.P10 dated 16.9.2009.

xi) PW10, had enquired P.Ws.2 to 9 on various dates and recorded their statements and submitted the enquiry report to the Directorate of Vigilance and Anti Corruption.

xii) PW1, who was the Revenue Divisional Officer, Cuddalore District at the relevant point of time, having received a communication alongwith the FIR and the connected documents from the Directorate of Vigilance and Anti Corruption on 20.1.2010 seeking permission to initiate criminal proceedings against the appellant, had issued the sanction order, Ex.P1 on 28.1.2010 to proceed against the appellant.

xiii) Subsequently, PW10 had enquired the Revenue Divisional Officer, PW1 on 26.2.2010, recorded his statement and on completion of investigation, had filed the charge sheet on 2.3.2010 against the appellant for the offences punishable under Sections 7 and 13(2) read



with 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

WEB COPY

5. The case was taken on file in Special Case No. 6 of 2010 by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Cuddalore District. On summoning, the Appellant/accused appeared. Copies of relevant papers were furnished to the Appellant/accused under Section 207 of Cr.P.C. and charges were framed. The accused had denied the charges and sought for trial. In order to bring home the charges against the accused, the prosecution examined P.Ws.1 to 10 and marked Exs.P1 to P11 and Mos.1 to 3. On the side of the defence, the appellant had marked one document as Ex.D1.

6. On completion of the evidence, the appellant/accused was questioned under Section 313 Cr.P.C. as to the incriminating circumstances found in the evidence of prosecution witnesses and the accused had stated that he had been falsely implicated in the case and submitted a written statement of defence.

7. The Trial Court, on considering the entire materials, found the accused/appellant guilty and imposed punishments, as referred to



above, which is under challenge in the present Criminal Appeal.

WEB COPY

8. The submissions of the learned Senior Counsel Mr. John Sathyan, appearing for the appellant are as under:-

i) The sanction order, Ex.P1 given by PW1, the Revenue Divisional Officer granting permission to proceed against the appellant is without going into any materials of the case and thus, it is unsustainable in law.

ii) The Trial Court failed to appreciate that in trap cases, it is the burden of the prosecution to prove the case beyond reasonable doubt and the prosecution has not discharged such a burden in this case.

iii) The Trial Court failed to take into consideration the material contradictions between the evidence of the de facto complainant as PW2 and the shadow witnesses as PW3 with regard to the handing over of money and the recovery of documents, especially when there is no strong evidence with regard to recovery.

iv) PW4 Tahsildar speaks in his evidence that the Application submitted by PW2 for name transfer of Patta was incomplete and bereft of materials and thereby it was kept in the office of the Tahsildar and not forwarded to the office of the appellant, which



improbabilises the case projected by the prosecution as if the appellant had demanded bribe for effecting name transfer in the patta.

v) The cross examination of PW2, the de facto complaint would prove that he went to the office of the appellant 15 days prior to the alleged date of acceptance of bribe on which date alone the appellant had demanded the bribe and there is no explanation from PW2 for the delay of 15 days that had taken place between demand and acceptance, which creates a doubt in the case of the prosecution, but, the same has not been taken into consideration by the Trial Court in proper perspective.

vi) PW3, shadow witness has not supported the case of the prosecution and he was treated hostile, however, in the cross examination conducted by the prosecution, nothing has been elicited to prove the case of the prosecution

vii) The Trial Court has ignored the settled law that receipt of money and recovery thereof alone cannot be construed as offence until and unless the demand is proved by the prosecution.

viii) The trial court has failed to consider that the entire case of the prosecution is full of material contradictions and the defects in the case of the prosecution would prove that the alleged recovery of bribe



money is false, doubtful and the entire trap alleged by the prosecution itself is a stage managed one without any foundational facts.

ix) The Trial Court has failed to consider that when two views are possible, the view which is favourable to the appellant has to be accepted and benefit of doubt has to be extended to the appellant.

9. Mr.S.Santhosh, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that the prosecution has proved its case beyond all reasonable doubts with the cogent evidence adduced by the prosecution witnesses. He would submit that though some minor contradictions have been pointed out by the appellant, those do not have much significance when the appellant was caught red handed and the prosecution has proved its case and when the appellant has not rebutted the presumption under Section 20 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

10. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the materials available on record including the written arguments and additional written arguments filed on behalf of the appellant.



11. The allegation levelled against the appellant/accused is that he, being a Village Administrative Officer, demanded and accepted bribe from PW2 for effecting patta name transfer and caught red handed. While it is the case of the appellant that the role of the appellant, being a Village Administrative Officer, is only to verify whether the documents relating to the title in respect of the property and pass the application to his higher authority and it is a team work to be carried out by the revenue officials like Surveyor, Revenue Inspector and Tahsildar for effecting name transfer in the patta, the foremost defence taken by the appellant/accused is that the Application submitted by PW2, the de facto complainant itself was incomplete and bereft of details and thus, it was held up with other officials of the Department as elicited from the evidence of P.W.4, which shatters the core case of the prosecution that the appellant had demanded and accepted bribe for effecting the patta name transfer.

12. It is the further case of the appellant that the de facto complainant had encroached some extent of land of his neighbour and the same came to light on the survey conducted at the instance of the appellant being a Village Administrative Officer, due to which, the de facto complainant had developed grudges against the appellant and to



settle his score, he had implicated the appellant in the trap case by thrusting the tainted money.

13. The appellant would further contend that the prosecution has not proved its case against the appellant with foundational facts and there is an unexplained delay in lodging the complaint, that there is no corroboration among the prosecution witnesses, especially, PW3 turns hostile and without considering the scope of demand of bribe by the appellant, the sanctioning authority has accorded sanction for proceeding against the appellant and the Trial Court has erred in convicting the appellant with all dents in the case of the prosecution and thereby, seeks for acquittal by extending the benefit of doubt to the appellant.

14. The appellant is more specific in taking a stand as if there is a confusion with regard to the colour and design of the shirt recovered and produced in court as spoken by PW3, the official witness and PW9, the Trap Laying Officer.

15. The case of the prosecution as spoken by the de facto



complainant, PW2 is that he had applied for patta name transfer on 24.8.2009 in the Taluk Office, Cuddalore and subsequently, he had approached the appellant in his office on 3.9.2009, when the appellant had demanded a bribe of Rs.2000/- and thereupon, PW2 had approached the Inspector of Police, PW9 and lodged the complaint, Ex.P2 on 8.9.2009 and thereby there is a delay of about **five days** in lodging the complaint from the date of demand alleged to have been made by the appellant and it is not 15 days, as wrongly contended by the appellant in the grounds of appeal. A function in the family of PW2's relative is attributed to be the reason for the delay by PW2 and the same has been spoken by PW2 in his chief examination itself, which appears to be very natural. Apart from that PW2 has not admitted anywhere in his cross-examination as if he had met the appellant 15 days prior to the date of complaint. Further, such delay in lodging a criminal complaint itself will not be fatal to the prosecution case.

16. Coming to the demand and acceptance of bribe, PW2, the de facto complainant has categorically spoken in his evidence about the demand made by the appellant on 3.9.2009 when he enquired about



his request for patta name transfer. A perusal of his cross examination reveals that the appellant had cross examined him with suggestions that in the matter of patta name transfer, only Tahsildar has got power and VAO has no power and that the application submitted by him was bereft of information. In this regard, it is relevant to note that PW2 had deposed that he had studied only upto 4th standard. The innocent admission of the witness with that much literacy cannot be taken advantage by the appellant to ignore the fact that the VAO has an important role in the matter of issuance of patta and name transfer of patta. Similarly, from the evidence of PW4, Tahsildar to the effect that the application of PW2 was kept pending in the land survey department as it was bereft of information, it cannot be inferred that there was no scope for the appellant to demand bribe , especially, when it was admitted by PW4 to the effect that the pendency of the application due to bereft of information was not conveyed to PW2, the de facto complainant.

17. With regard to the demand on the date of trap and acceptance of bribe money, PW3 corroborated with PW2 by specifically contending that when himself and PW2 met the appellant on the



particular day, he had enquired PW2 as to whether he brought the money as demanded by him. He is more specific in contending that the appellant had informed PW2 that his application is pending with the Surveyor and hence, he required a copy of his application for doing the needful at his end and thereupon, PW2 had produced a copy of his application, which was received by the appellant and kept in his table drawer and thereafter, the appellant had demanded for money upon which, PW2 had produced the money which, the appellant had received in his left hand and counted with both of his hands and kept in his shirt pocket and informed PW2 that he would complete the work. PW3 also spoke in his evidence that when PW9 TLO had enquired the appellant as to why he received the money, the appellant was keeping quiet.

18. Sofar as the evidence of PW3 is concerned, it is seen that he had categorically spoken in his chief examination with regard to the demand and acceptance of bribe on the date of trap and the subsequent trap proceedings, whereas, he was treated as hostile witness on his replies to certain suggestions made by the appellant, to the effect that for the query made by PW2, the appellant had



answered that the application of PW2 had not been received by him and on receipt of the same alone, he could do the needful and thereupon, PW2 had submitted a copy of his application with the tainted money to the appellant.

19. After giving such answers, it appears that PW3 had stumbled and had given a peculiar statement that on seeing that PW2 had offered money with a copy of his application, the appellant had questioned him as to why he offers money and he assured PW2 that on receipt of application from the Survey Department, he would complete the work, however, PW2 had thrust the money and thereupon the appellant had received the same, counted and kept the same in his shirt pocket.

20. By cross examining PW2 and PW3, the appellant sought to take different stands with regard to the tainted money in his possession at the time of trap. On one hand, he seeks to contend that it was thrust by PW2 to implicate him in the trap case due to the grudge PW2 had developed on a previous incident where at the instance of the appellant, the encroachment of PW2 came to light. On



the other hand, through the evidence of PW3, a hostile witness, he seeks to take a stand as if the money was given by PW2 by keeping the same alongwith a copy of his application. Another stand taken by the appellant by suggesting PW2 in his cross examination that PW2 had thrust the money into the shirt pocket of the appellant, which the appellant tried to prevent, however, PW2 had successfully kept the money into the shirt pocket of the appellant.

21. Though various stands have been taken by the appellant by way of defence, the appellant had failed in taking a stand through the cross examination of PW3 as if PW2 had forced the appellant to receive the bribe money by keeping the same alongwith the copy of his application, without realising that he is handling a double edged weapon. When he had already suggested to PW2 during his cross examination about a previous enmity or grudge PW2 might have developed against the appellant, it is surprise to note that the appellant had not raised any objection nor complained about the act of PW2 in thrusting the bribe money in any form, either into the shirt pocket or alongwith the copy of the application. Per contra, the phenolphthalein test conducted on the hands of the appellant proves



the case of the prosecution.

WEB COPY

22. It appears that the appellant had chosen to mainly rely on the evidence of PW3, who was treated as hostile on some contradictory statements he made, to probabalises the theories of defence. By choosing so, this court feels, the appellant had chosen to subject himself into a stalemate. In this regard, it is relevant to note that after his chief examination on 13.2.2013, his cross examination was postponed at the instance of the appellant for the reason best known to him and he was cross examined only on 4.1.2016 nearly after three years. Thereby, this court is left with no other option except to conclude that probably due to lapse of such a long period, the witness could have forgotten the facts and circumstances of the case and might have stumbled.

23. In ***Vinod Kumar vs. State of Punjab*** (Criminal Appeal No.554 of 2012 dated 21.1.2015), the Apex Court has held as under:-

"40. Reading the evidence in entirety, his evidence cannot be brushed aside. The delay in cross-examination has resulted in his pre-varication from the



WEB COPY



examination-in-chief. But, a significant one, his examination-in-chief and the re-examination impels us to accept the testimony that he had gone into the octroi post and had witnessed about the demand and acceptance of money by the accused. In his cross-examination he has stated that he had not gone with Baj Singh to the vigilance department at any time and no recovery was made in his presence. The said part of the testimony, in our considered view, does not commend acceptance in the backdrop of entire evidence in examination-in-chief and the re-examination. The evidence of PW6 and PW7 have got corroboration from PW8. He in all material particulars has stated about the recovery and proven the necessary documents pertaining to the test carried with phenolphthalein powder. The fact remains that the appellant's pocket contained phenolphthalein smeared currency notes when he was searched. It is apt to take note of the fact that the currency notes that have been recovered from the right side of the pant pocket were actually prepared by



WEB COPY



PW8 by smearing them with phenolphthalein powder.

The appellant was caught red-handed with those currency notes. In is statement recorded under Section 313 of CrPC he has taken the plea that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated due to animosity. No explanation has been given as regards the recovery. Therefore, from the above facts, legitimately a presumption can be drawn that the accused-appellant had received or accepted the said currency notes on his own volition. The factum of presumption and the testimony of PW6 and 7 go a long way to show that the prosecution has been able to prove demand, acceptance and recovery of the amount. Hence, we are inclined to hold that the learned trial Judge and the High Court have appositely concluded that the charges leveled against the accused have duly been proven by the prosecution. It is not a case that there is no other evidence barring the evidence of the complainant. On the contrary there are adequate circumstances which establish the ingredients of the offences in respect of



WEB COPY



which he was charged."

24. The Constitution Bench of the Apex Court in **Neeraj Dutta v. State (NCT of Delhi), (2023) 4 SCC 731** has held as under:-

"87. Therefore, this Court cautioned that even if a witness is treated as "hostile" and is cross-examined, his evidence cannot be written off altogether but must be considered with due care and circumspection and that part of the testimony which is creditworthy must be considered and acted upon. It is for the Judge as a matter of prudence to consider the extent of evidence which is creditworthy for the purpose of proof of the case. In other words, the fact that a witness has been declared "hostile" does not result in an automatic rejection of his evidence. Even, the evidence of a "hostile witness" if it finds corroboration from the facts of the case may be taken into account while judging the guilt of the accused. Thus, there is no legal bar to raise a conviction upon a "hostile witness" testimony if corroborated by other reliable evidence."



WEB COPY

25. A piece of contradiction sought to be relied on by the appellant is variation with regard to M.O.3 shirt recovered from the appellant. Of course, Ex.P6, recovery mahazar denotes that the shirt recovered as a striped half shirt, while it has been marked as while colour checked shirt and during the cross examination of PW3 by the appellant, he would contend that the appellant had kept the money into the pocket of his while colour checked shirt and after a few other statements, he had taken a stand as if the shirt showed to him by then was not the one actually recovered.

26. Again, sofar as the contradiction in the evidence of PW3, the lapse of long duration between his chief examination and cross examination cannot be ignored. Further, the minor contradiction in recording the design of the shirt recovered from the appellant in the recovery mahazar or identifying the same by the prosecution witness is not so vital and in the opinion of this court, it may not have any impact on the substratum of the case of the prosecution or on the core issue and it can be ignored, especially, when the prosecution has proved its case of demand, acceptance and recovery of the tainted



money from the possession of the appellant and thereby raised a presumption under Section 20 of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

27. Similarly, this court is of the view that the evidence of PW4, the Tahsildar P.Thachanamurthy and the admission made by PW6, Thulasingham, the Deputy Tahsildar at Headquarters to the effect that the application submitted by PW2, de facto complainant for patta name transfer was withheld in the Survey Section since it was bereft of necessary documents is not going to rescue the appellant as the prosecution, by cross examining PW4, who was treated as hostile witness, has established that the information with regard withholding of the application was not conveyed to PW2.

28. In view of the foregoing discussion, this court feels that the prosecution has proved its case beyond all reasonable doubts and raised a presumption against the appellant under Section 20 of the Prevention of Corruption Act and the appellant has failed in rebutting the same and thereby, this court does not find any merit in the Criminal Appeal warranting interference with the findings of the Trial Court on merits. Accordingly, the judgment of conviction rendered by



the Special Judge Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Cuddalore in Spl.C.C.No.6 of 2010 is confirmed.

29. Sofar as the sentence is concerned, it is brought to the notice of this court by the learned Senior Counsel for the appellant that the criminal proceedings initiated against the appellant is of the year 2010, at the verge of his retirement for the offence alleged to have been committed in the year 2009 and now, the appellant is in the dusk of his life and suffering from various ailments and he has produced copies of medical records/discharge summary to show that he had underwent surgery for Coronary Artery Disease.

30. Considering the plea on sympathetic grounds, this court feels that the sentence imposed on the appellant on both the counts can be **modified to one of simple imprisonment for one year each** from rigorous imprisonment for one year, which shall run concurrently, while confirming the sentence of fine imposed by the Trial Court. Accordingly, it is modified. The trial Court is directed to secure the accused to enable him to undergo the remaining period of sentence, less the period of sentence already undergone by the accused.



WEB COPY



31. In the result, the Criminal Appeal allowed in part only to the extent indicated above.

30.4.2024

Index: Yes/No.
Internet: Yes/No.
ssk.

To

1. Special Judge,
Chief Judicial Magistrate Court,
Cuddalore.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption,
Cuddalore.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



28

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

ssk.

P.D. JUDGMENT IN
Criminal Appeal No.81 of 2017

Delivered on
30.4.2024