IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **31.01.2024**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P. No.27474 of 2023 & Crl.M.P.No.19035 of 2023

N.Palani ... Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption,
City-II Detachment Nandanam,
Chennai – 600 035. ... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records in Spl. S.C.No.10 of 2023 pending for trial on the file of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate cum Special court, Chengalpet and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Madhan

For Respondents : Mr.S.Santhosh
Government Advocate [Criminal Side]

O R D E R

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the proceedings pending against the petitioner/sole accused in Spl.S.C.No.10 of 2023 on the file of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate – cum – Special Court, Chengalpet.

2. The petitioner is the sole accused facing trial in Spl.S.C.No.10 of 2023 for the offence under section 13 [2] read with 13 [1] [d] of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988. The allegation as against the petitioner/ accused as per the charge sheet is extracted herein :

> "The Accused Tr.N.Palani, formerly worked as Sub-Registrar, Padappai Sub-Registry, Kanchipuram District from 16.11.2009 to 04.07.2012 now is working as Manager, Olo. the Dy. Inspector General of Registrar, Guindy, Chennai Zone. Hence the accused is a public servant as defined u/s. 2(c) of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988 during the relevant period of occurrence.
>
> One Tmt.Balambal F/age 80 W/o. Raghavan residing at B-25, Panneerselvam Salai, K.K.Nagar, Chennai-79 had purchased a land measuring 2.61 acres in survey No.241/2A2 and 241/2B along with other landed properties in Varadharajapuram Village, Sriperumbudur Taluk, Kanchipuram District in the year 1983 vide Document No.2716/1983 of Sub-

Regisrar Office, Tambaram, Kanchipuram District from one Saraswathi Ammal W/o. Nataraja Mudaliar.

After purchase, the patta was transferred in the name of Tmt.Balambal in the year 1983 and the patta book No.180 was issued to Tmt.Balambal. Subsequently computerized patta No.1876 also was issued in the year 1996 to the above said Tmt.Balambal. Then Tmt.Balambal had formed an approved layout in the name of "Mahalakshmi Nagar" vide CMDA approval No.PPD/LO/18/96 and sold the plots. The balance stretch of land measuring 1.10 acres in survey No.241/2A2 and 241/2B was retained by her, for her future use. All the Revenue records such as Patta, Chitta, Adangal, "A Register, Encumbrance certificate etc. reflects the name of Tmt.Balambal as land owner from 1983 itself. The Encumbrance certificates and the records (sale deed in favour of Tmt.Balambal) of Sub-Registrar, Padappai Taluk, Kanchipuram District shows that Tmt.Balambal is the absolute owner of the land situated in the above said survey numbers.

Meanwhile one Tr.Kamaraj S/o. Tr. Ganesan, 43/22, 8th Cross Street, Trustpuram, Kodampakkam with Criminal intention to grab the above said 1.10.acres remaining portion out of 2.61 acres of land entered in to a criminal conspiracy with 1) Tr. Yuvarajaprasad, 2) Tr.R.Murthy. and 3) Tr.Boominathan to commit offences of impersonation creating forged documents, used the forged documents as genuine, forgery for the purpose of cheating. In pursuance of the criminal conspiracy the said Kamaraj fabricated a general power of attorney as if, one

Tr.Selvasekaran, adopted son of Tmt. Saraswathiammal (She was the original owner who sold the property in survey No. 241/2B & 241/2A2 to the above said Tmt.Balambal) had executed general power of attorney to Tr.Kamaraj on 28.02.2011, with the connivance of above said Tr.Yuvarajaprasad, Tr.Murthy and Tr.Boominathan. Tr.Murthy, Father in law of Tr.Boominathan impersonated as Selvasekaran the son of one Tr.Nataraja Mudaliar and signed as if, the original Tr.Selvasekaran had executed the general power of Attorney by using bogus address of No.21, Balaji Nagar, South Street, Hasthinapuram, Chrompet, Chennai-83 and placed the document for registration at Sub-Registry, Padappai, Kanchipuram on 28.07.2011. The above document was registered at Sub-Registry- Padappai as Document 238/2011, dated:28.02.2011. In continuation of the above transaction, the said Tr.Kamaraj divided the land of 1.10 acre belongs to Tmt.Balambal in to house plots and sold them to the persons of Tmt. Chitra, Tmt.Ananthi, Tmt.Sakunthala, Tmt.Jenothanaseeli, Tmt.Gomatheeswari, W/o. Yuvarajaprasad, Tmt.Amutha, Tr.Palani, Tr.Saravanan, Tr.Chinnasamy, Tr.Shanmugam, Tmt.Uma Maheswari, Tmt. Sasi Reka, Tr.Yuvaraj Prasad, Tr.Banumoorthy by using the forged document of General Power of Attorney in favour of Tr.G.Kamaraj, S/o. Ganesan.

The then Sub-Regisrar Padappai the accused colluded with and conspired with said Tr.Kamaraj, Tr.Murthy, Tr.Boominathan and Tr.Yuvarajaprasad had facilitated to register the bogus power of attorney in favour of said Tr.G.Kamaraj. The accused failed to verify the records available with him in the sub-Registry, Padappai. The accused being sub-Registrar, before registering the Power of Attorney failed to verify the legal heir certificate, death certificate if any original parent deeds, Encumbrance certificate, Revenue records such as 'A' Register, Patta, etc., as per the circular of Inspector General of Registration circular letter No.20564/C1/2007 dated 17.05.2007 committed criminal breach of trust by violating the rules and Regulations and violating the rules and regulations and violating the circular issued by Inspector General of Registration.

And in continuation of the registration of bogus document of General power of attorney / document No.238/2011 dated 28.02.2011, the accused had knowing fully well, had colluded with the persons Tr.Kamaraj, Tr.Murthy, Tr.Boominathan and Tr.Yuvarajaprasad committed criminal misconduct by public servant, abusing his official position and thereby facilitated the above land grabbers to commit offences of creating forged documents, used the same as genuine, cheating, to facilitate above private individuals to obtain undue pecuniary advantage and had registered Doc. 1014/2012, dated: 17.02.2012 in favour of Tmt. Amutha, Doc. 1015/2012, dated: 17.02.2012 in favour of Tmt.Banumathi, Doc, 1020/2012, dated: 17.02.2012 in favour of Tmt. Gomatheeswari, Doc.2419/2012, dated: 29.03.2012 in favour of Tr.K.Palani, Doc.2420/2012, dated: 29.03.2012 in favour of Tr.P.R.Saravanan, Doc.2421/2012, dated:29.03.2012 in favour of Tmt.Uma Maheswari, Doc.2704/2012, dated:30.03.2012 in favour of Tr.Yuvaraj Prasad, Doc.2702/2012, dated: 30.03.2012 in favour of Tmt.Sasireka, Doc.2703/2012, dated:30.03.2012 in favour of Tr.Yuvaraj Prasad, Doc.2418/2012, dated:29.03.2012 in favour of P.R.Shanmugam, Doc.2417/2012, dated:29.03.2012 in favour of Tmt.Ananthi, Doc.2422/2012, dated: 29.03.2012 in favour of P.R.Chinnasamy the value of which being crores of rupees at market value.

The accused failed to verify, the documents in support of the right over the property of the general power holder, to identify the property, its survey number, sub-division number, area length and breadth, schedule of property, 'A' register mentioned in the guideline register to be compared and the accused failed to satisfy himself whether the conditions in Form No.XVIII were followed when Tr.Kamaraj executed the above sale deeds. Thereby the accused had conspired commit to and abet the offences of land grabbers and in collusion with land grabbers for their undue pecuniary advantage he had caused loss to the said Tmt.Balambal at the time of above execution of sale deeds. Thereby the accused being public "servant abusing his official position, had committed criminal misconduct by public servant by dishonestly acting in violation of the circulars and Rules and regulations, allowed Tr.Kamaraj, Tr.Murthy, Tr.Boominathan and Tr.Yuvaraj Prasad private individuals to facilitate them to obtain undue pecuniary advantage and thereby caused loss to the said Tmt.Balambal. Thereby the accused had come offences punishable u/s. 13(2) r/w. 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988. Hence, the charge."

3. [i] Mr.Madhan, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was working as Sub Registrar at Padappai office during the period between 16.11.2009 and 04.07.2012. During the relevant period, he has registered several documents. The charges levelled against the petitioner is that during the relevant period he being the Sub Registrar colluded and conspired with private persons and allowed them to register a bogus Power of Attorney without verifying legal heir certificate, revenue records, namely A Register, patta etc. Yet another allegation levelled against him is that he has violated the circular issued by the Inspector General of Registration vide Circular No.20564/C1/2007 dated 17.05.2007 dated 17.05.2007 which mandates scrutiny to be done on the documents produced for registration and the action to be taken on the complaint of forged documents registered before the Sub Registrar and for having violated another letter No.42938/C1/2009 dated 29.10.2009 which mandates the Sub Registrar to verify certain documents when Power of Attorney is produced for registration before the Sub Registrar.

[ii] The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the allegations made in the charge sheet do not disclose commission of any

offence and make out a case against the accused for the offence under section 13 [2] read with 13 [1] [d] of the Prevention of Corruption Act. The ingredients of the offence are absolutely lacking and there is absolutely no material to show that the petitioner either had criminal intent or that he had obtained illegal gratification. On the other hand, the acts of the petitioner would only amount to not having followed the rules or violated the Rules which is improper or contrary to the departmental norms. There is no evidence to show that the petitioner had acted with with dishonest intention to obtain undue pecuniary advantage. The learned counsel would further submit that there is no direct evidence for the offence punishable under section 13 [1] [d] of Prevention of Corruption Act to show that the petitioner had acted with dishonest intention. Mere conduct and action of the accused violating the Rules and departmental norms would not amount to criminal misconduct by a public servant. The learned counsel further submitted that the dishonest intention is sine qua non to attract the offence punishable under section 13 [1] [d] of the Prevention of Corruption act and when such ingredients are lacking, the case of the petitioner squarely falls within the category of 3 of the cases enumerated in the **State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and others** reported in **1992 Supp. [1] 335**.

[iii] The learned counsel further submitted that irregularities and administrative lapses and violation of department circulars would only have resulted in departmental action against the petitioner and the criminal prosecution cannot be justified. He would further submit that a separate case has also been registered against the petitioner in Crime No.10 of 2019 against the petitioner and his wife for having possessed disproportionate assets and till date the respondent has not filed the final report even after the lapse of four years. As far as the facts of this case is concerned, absolutely no case has been made out as against the accused under section 13 [1] [d] of Prevention of Corruption Act and in such circumstances, the continuation of the proceedings is an abuse of process of law and would seek for quashing of the proceedings. In support of his contentions, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the following judgments.

(a) **C.K.Jaffer Sharief Vs. State** reported in **2013 [1] SCC 205;**

(b) **M.Narayanan Nambiar Vs. State of Kerala** reported in **AIR 1963 SC 1116;**

(c) **State of Haryana and others V. Bhajan Lal and Others** reported in **1992 Supp. [1] 335.**

4. The respondent has filed detailed counter. The relevant paragraphs are extracted herein :

"11) It is humbly submitted that, the accused petitioner Tr.N.Palani, then Sub-Regisrar Padappai colluded and conspired with the land grabbers/brokers Tr.Kamaraj. Tr.Murthy, Tr.Boominathan and Tr. Yuvarajaprasad and facilitated to register the bogus power of attorney vide Doc. No.238/2011 at Padappai Sub-Registry, in favour of said Tr.G.Kamaraj. The accused / petitioner has aided the above said persons wantonly without verifying the records.

12) It is humbly submitted that, as per the circular of Inspector General of Registration Circular letter No.20564/C1/2007 dated 17.05.2007, it is a bounden duty of the Sub-Registrar, to verify the legal heir certificate, death certificate if any original parent deeds, Encumbrance Certificate, Revenue records such as 'A' Register, Patta, etc., before registering the General Power of Attorney. It is further submitted that, the accused / petitioner Tr.N.Palani, the then Sub-Registrar, Padappai Sub-Registry in grass violation of the above Inspector General of Registration Circulars and without any previous document. the accused / petitioner registered the above Power of Attorney in favour of Tr.Kamaraj (land grabber / broker).

13) It is humbly submitted that, as per the circular of Inspector General of Registration circular No.42938/C1/2009, dated:29.10.2009, "The Power of Attorney must contain in the recital the details of how the property belongs to the Principal either quoting the previous documents number (or) the Patta and other Revenue records and if the Patta is in others name

like father etc., how it devolved upon the Principal. The Sub-Registrar shall verify the above records in original for genuineness by requesting the parties to produce them. If those are not mentioned and produced as stated above Sub-Registrar shall return the document with a check slip for inclusion production and re-presentation". It is further submitted that, the accused / petitioner Tr.N.Palani, the then Sub-Registrar, Padappai Sub-Registry wontedly by violating the above Inspector General of Registration Circulars and registered the above Power of Attorney in favour of Tr.Kamaraj (land grabber/broker) and made a criminal breach of trust.

14) It is humbly submitted that, the accused/ petitioner Tr.N.Palani failed to verify, the documents in support of the right over the property of the general power holder, to identify the property, its survey number, sub-division number, area length and breadth, schedule of property with 'A' register and guideline register. The accused / petitioner failed to satisfy himself whether the conditions in Rule No. XVIII were followed when Tr.Kamaraj executed the above sale deeds. Thereby the accused had conspired and aided land grabbers. He also caused for loss to the said Tmt.Balambal at the time of above execution of sale deeds. Thereby it is ascertained that, the accused being public servant abusing his official position, had committed criminal misconduct by dishonestly acting in violation of the circulars and Rules and regulations, allowed Tr.Kamaraj, Tr.Murthy, Tr.Boominathan and Tr.Yuvaraj Prasad private individuals to facilitate them to obtain undue pecuniary

advantage and thereby caused loss to the said Tmt.Balambal. Based on this General Power of Attorney document, the title of the land was transferred to many private individuals.

15) It is humbly submitted that, the accused/petitioner Tr.N.Palani, stated in this petition Grounds in Para No. IV & V, has accepted that he failed to carry out the above Inspector General of Registration circulars and registered the above General Power of Attorney. Further it is submitted that, the accused / petitioner has attributed his heavy work load for the registration of the above General Power of Attorney in favour of Tr.Kamaraj could not be a reasonable explanation.

16) It is humbly submitted that, subsequently, the above land was sold out by the land grabber/broker Tr.Kamaraj to the general public and registered 17 documents in the above Sub-Registry, it created a mental agony, monitory loss and suffering to the general public."

5. Mr.S.Santhosh, learned counsel for the respondent would submit that the petitioner was working as a Sub Registrar at Padappai SRO office during the period from 16.11.2009 to 04.07.2012. During the relevant period, one Thiru R.Murthy, S/o.Ramasami impersonated his name as Tr.Selvasekaran S/o.Natarajamudaliar son of Tmt.Saraswathi Ammal had created forged General Power of Attorney for the land to an extent of 1.10 acres in S.No.241/2A2 and 241/2B standing in the name of Tmt.Balambal

and based on that fabricated Power of Attorney, the petitioner during the relevant period permitted registration of 17 sale deeds. He had not followed the Rules and general circulars issued by the Inspector General Registration and allowed the private individuals to gain unlawfully and thereby caused loss to the owner of the property namely Tmt.Balambal. He would further submit that though there is no direct evidence of him receiving or obtaining illegal gratification from any person, there are materials to show that he has amassed assets disproportionate to his income after registration of the documents. Further, based on the complaint given by one Tmt.Balambal, a case in crime No.82 of 2013 has been registered by the District Crime Branch, Kancheepuram Land Grabbing Cell for the offences under sections 419, 120B, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC and in respect of the disproportionate assets, a case was registered against the petitioner in Crime No.3 of 2017 by the respondent. He would further submit that though there may not be direct evidence the conduct of the petitioner amassing disproportionate assets would show that he had obtained illegal gratification.

6. Heard Mr.K.Madhan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.S.Santhosh, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

7. The petitioner, who was formerly working as a Sub Registrar, Padappai, Kancheepuram District from 16.11.2009 to 04.07.2012, has been charge-sheeted for the offence under Section 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The specific allegation against the petitioner is that he colluded and conspired with the other persons namely, Kamaraj, Moorthy, Boominathan and Yuvaraj Prasad and facilitated them to register bogus Power of Attorney in favour of Kamaraj. The further allegation is that the petitioner failed to verify the records available with him in Sub-Registrar Office, Padappai. The duty of the petitioner before registering the GPOA is that he has to verify the legal heir certificate and death certificate if any, and the original parent deeds, encumbrance certificate, revenue records such as A register, patta and etc., whereas, the petitioner herein had failed to verify the same and particularly, not followed the circular issued by the Inspector General of Registration vide No.20564/c1/2007 dated 17.05.2007 and facilitated the other persons to register the document.

8. Further, based on the above unlawful act, the petitioner with full knowledge had colluded with the above persons and committed criminal

misconduct as a public servant by abusing his official position and facilitated the land grabbers to commit the offence of creating forged documents and to used the same as genuine and thereby, indulged in cheating in order to facilitate other to obtain undue pecuniary advantage and caused loss to the original owner of the property and allowed the land grabers to gain unlawfully by registering the above documents. Thereby, the petitioner/accused had committed the offence under Section 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

9. The respondent during investigation had examined 27 witnesses and relied on 36 documents. The statements of the witnesses 1 to 26 were recorded during the investigation and 36 documents are enclosed along with the final report to prove the charges.

10. Section 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 reads as follows:-

> 13. **Criminal misconduct by a public servant**:- (1) A public servant is said to commit the offence of criminal misconduct,-
>
> (a)...
> (b)...
> (c)...

(d) if he,

i) by corrupt or illegal means, obtains for himself or for any other person any valuable thing or pecuniary advantage; or

(ii) by abusing his position as a public servant, obtains for himself or for any other person any valuable thing or pecuniary advantage; or

(iii) while holding office as a public servant, obtains for any person any valuable thing or pecuniary advantage without any public interest; or

11. A reading of Section 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 would reveal that a public servant is stated to have committed misconduct if he, by abusing his position as a public servant, while holding office as a public servant, obtains for himself or for any other person any valuable thing or pecuniary advantage by corrupt or illegal means. To fall within the ambit of sub-clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, the decision/conduct of the public servant must be dishonest, amounting to corruption.

12. Further, to attract the term 'abuse' as contained in Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, the prosecution has to establish that the official concerned used his position for something it is not intended. In totality, the dishonest intention is the gist of the offence under Section

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

13. The prosecution alleges that the petitioner in collusion with the other persons and by not following the directions given by his superior authorities had helped them to register documents and thereby, facilitated them to grab the properties belonging to the original owners. The main allegation is that the accused had acted contrary to the rules and circulars of the Department.

14. Dishonest intention is *sine qua non* to attract the offence punishable under Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act. Nowhere in the statements, it is shown that the petitioner had acted with a dishonest intention. The conduct and action of the accused in non-following the rules would not amount to criminal misconduct by a public servant. Further, there is absolutely no evidence other than the case registered against the petitioner and his wife at a later point of time in Crime No.82 of 2013 for possession of assets disproportionate to their income, as stated in the counter. There is no material to show that the petitioner had obtained any pecuniary advantage in the transaction connected with this particular case resulting in possession of disproportionate assets. As stated above, dishonest intention is

the crux of the offence under Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

15. In ***C.K.Jaffer Sharief v. State*** reported in ***2013 (1) SCC 205,*** the Hon'ble Apex Court had considered the question whether violation of the rules and departmental norms would amount to the offence under Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act. The relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder:-

> *"If in the process, the rules or norms applicable were violated or the decision taken shows an extravagant display of redundance it is the conduct and action of the appellant which may have been improper or contrary to departmental norms. But to say that the same was actuated by a dishonest intention to obtain an undue pecuniary advantage will not be correct. That dishonest intention is the gist of the offence under Section 13(1)(d) is implicit in the words used i.e. corrupt or illegal means and abuse of position as a public servant."*

16. In ***M. Narayanan Nambiar v. State of Kerala*** reported in ***AIR 1963 SC 1116,*** the Hon'ble Apex Court, while dealing with Section 5 of the 1947 Act, has held that dishonest intention should be the gist of the offence.

17. As stated above, the perusal of the prosecution records and statements reveal only a violation of the rules, norms and departmental circulars issued in respect of perusal of documents. There is absolutely no documents to show that the petitioner acted with dishonest intention and committed other acts. When the ingredients of the alleged offences are lacking, the proceedings pending against the petitioner is nothing but an abuse of process of law.

18. The case of the petitioner falls within the category (3) as enumerated in the case of ***State of Haryana and Others vs. Bhajan Lal and Others*** reported in ***1992 Supp. (1) 335.*** The relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder:-

> *"102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any*

precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

(1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non- cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or

complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge."

19. This Court is of the opinion that without there being any material for dishonest intention, the proceedings pending against the petitioner in Spl.S.C.No.10 of 2023 on the file of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate cum Special Court, Chengalpattu, is nothing but an abuse of process of law and it is liable to be quashed.

20. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the

case in Spl.S.C.No.10 of 2023 on the file of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate cum Special Judge, Chengalpattu, is quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. However, the respondent is at liberty to proceed in accordance with law in respect of Crime No.82 of 2013.

31.01.2024

vrc

To,

1. The Inspector of Police,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption,
City-II Detachment Nandanam,
Chennai – 600 035.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

vrc/ham

Crl.O.P. No.27474 of 2023

31.01.2024