



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1460 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

Criminal Revision Case No. 1460 of 2018

and

Crl. M.P. No. 17105 of 2018

1.Ramachandran
2.Thenmozhi
3.Raja
4.Shyamalavalli
5.Prakash Kumar

.. Petitioner

Versus

State represented by
Inspector of Police
Vellore Police Station
Incharge, All Women Police Station
Vellore, Namakkal District.
(Crime No.2 of 2012)

.. Respondent

Criminal Revision case is filed under Section 397 and 401 of Cr.P.C to set aside the judgment in C.A. No. 28 of 2018, dated 22.11.2018 on the file of the Court of Sessions, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal confirming the judgment passed in C.C. No. 81 of 2012, dated 23.03.2018 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.T.Muruganantham
For Respondent	:	Mr. S. Vinoth Kumar
		Government Advocate (Crl side)



ORDER

WEB COPY The Criminal Revision Case has been filed to set aside the judgment of the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal in C.A.No.28 of 2018, dated 22.11.2018 confirming the judgment passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi in C.C.No.81 of 2012, dated 23.03.2018.

2. The brief facts of the case, which are necessary for disposal of this Criminal Revision Case, are as follows:-

2.1. The marriage between the *De-facto Complainant* and the first Petitioner was solemnised on 06.03.2011 at Vellore, Namkkal District. At the time of marriage, as demanded by the Petitioners, the mother of the *De-facto Complainant* offered 100 sovereigns of gold ornaments to her and 17 ½ sovereigns of gold ornaments to the first Petitioner/first Accused. That apart, 1 kilogram of silver and a Swift Car worth Rs.6 lakhs was purchased and given to the first Petitioner. At the time of marriage, the first Petitioner/first Accused was employed in Annamalai University and after the marriage, the *De-facto Complainant* stayed along with Accused-2 father in law (since deceased), Accused-3 mother in law, Accused-4 maternal uncle, Accused-5 sister of Accused-1 and Accused-6 husband of Accused-5. It is stated that Accused-4 maternal uncle of Accused-1 is staying in the same locality, but most of the



time, he used to come to the house of Accused-1 and stayed for most of the

times. According to the *De-facto Complainant*, the Accused 1 to 6 subjected her to acute matrimonial cruelty by demanding the balance 4 lakhs of Rupees inasmuch as the car presented was only worth Rs.6 lakhs but what was promised by her mother was Rs.10 lakhs in cash. Since the first Accused/husband was working in Chidambaram, he used to come to the matrimonial house during Saturdays and Sundays. When the *De-facto Complainant* complained to her husband regarding the cruel treatment meted out to her, he also demanded her to come back with the balance Rs.4 lakhs else she will not be permitted to step inside the matrimonial home. According to the *De-facto Complainant*, on 06.05.2011, the first Petitioner demanded her to bring Rs.1 lakh and driven her to her mother's house. On the next day viz., 07.05.2011, the mother of the *De-facto Complainant* came to the matrimonial home accompanied by the *De-facto Complainant* and offered Rs.11,000/- by saying that she will pay the balance amount shortly. However, on 29.05.2011, the *De-facto Complainant*, accompanied by her mother, went to Chennai to write the Bank competitive examination and after returning back, she called the first Accused and said that she had reached Karur. However, the first Accused has replied that if she could mobilise the balance Rs.4 lakhs, she can come to the matrimonial home, otherwise, it is better to stay in her mothers



WEB COPY

2.2. Notwithstanding the same, the mother of the *De-facto Complainant* accompanied by the *De-facto Complainant*, went to the matrimonial home, but the Accused 1 to 6 locked the door and refused to permit them inside the house. Therefore, on 04.06.2011, the mother of the *De-facto Complainant*, accompanied by her brothers and the *De-facto Complainant* went to the house of the Accused where the brothers of the mother of *De-facto Complainant* sought time to pay the balance amount. However, the Accused refused to such plea and driven the *De-facto Complainant*, her mother and her brothers out of the matrimonial house. According to the *De-facto Complainant*, for the purpose of attending an interview at Chennai, she required her dresses and for that purpose, she went to the matrimonial home on 11.06.2011. However, on that day, the Accused had refused to permit her inside the house and driven her out of the house by throwing her belongings. Unable to tolerate such cruel treatment, the *De-facto Complainant* had given a complaint to All Women Police Station, Vellore, which was marked as Ex.P-1.

2.3. In Ex.P-1, among other things, the *De-facto Complainant* had complained that from the date of marriage, the first Accused refused to have sexual intercourse with her and the purpose of marriage itself is defeated. She



had also complained that the first Accused openly declared that the *De-facto Complainant* is black skinned and stout and therefore, he did not like her, however, for the purpose of the dowry to be offered, he agreed for the marriage. The *De-facto Complainant* also complained that within a short period of marriage, the Accused 1 to 6 demanded the balance sum of Rs.4 lakhs as dowry and on that score, she was subjected to matrimonial cruelty.

2.4. The complaint under Ex.P-1 was forwarded to the Social Welfare Officer, Namakkal, P,W-12. On the basis of such complaint, on 16.12.2011, an enquiry was conducted in the office of the Social Welfare Officer, Namakkal. Further, on 13.02.2012, she went to the matrimonial home and conducted an enquiry. After such enquiry, P.W-12 sent a report stating that the *De-facto Complainant* was subjected to cruel treatment by the Accused for non-payment of the amount demanded as dowry. Ex.P-4 is the report submitted by P.W-12. On the basis of such report, P.W-10, Special Sub-Inspector of Police registered a case in Crime No. 2 of 2012 for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A of IPC and Sections 3, 4 and 6 of The Dowry Prohibition Act against the Accused. Ex.P-3 is the First Information Report. Based on Ex.P-3, P.W-13 had taken up investigation and proceeded to the scene of occurrence namely the matrimonial house of the *De-facto Complainant* where she had recorded the statement of Ameer and Sakthivel



and also prepared an observation mahazar under Ex.P-5. She also recorded the statement of Rajendran, Kannadasan, Baskar, Geetha on 27.03.2012. After concluding her investigation, she had filed the final report before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi on 29.06.2012 as against the Accused for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A of IPC and Sections 3, 4 and 6 of The Dowry Prohibition Act which was taken on file by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi in C.C. No. 81 of 2012.

2.5. The learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi issued notice for appearance of the Accused and on appearance of the Accused, copies were furnished to them under Section 207 Cr.P.C. After hearing the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor and the learned Counsel for the Accused, the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi Vellore, had framed charges against the Accused for the offences under Sections 498-A of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The Accused denied the charges and claimed to be tried. Therefore, trial was ordered. During trial, P.W-1 to P.W-13 were examined and Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-6 were marked. On behalf of the Accused, no witness was examined, but Ex.D-1, the profile of *De-facto Complainant* given to the matrimonial website, was marked.

2.6. The learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi after considering the oral and documentary evidence held the Accused 1 to 6 as guilty of the offence



and convicted and sentenced them as follows:-

First Accused	He was found guilty for the offence under Section 498A of IPC and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of two years with fine of Rs.500, in default, to undergo 2 months simple imprisonment. He was found guilty of the offence under Section 3 of The Dowry Prohibition Act and sentenced to undergo 3 years simple imprisonment with fine of Rs.500 failing which to undergo 2 months simple imprisonment. He was found guilty of the offence under Section 4 of The Dowry Prohibition Act and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of Rs.500/-, in default to undergo simple imprisonment for two months.
Accused 3 to 6	They were found guilty for the offence under Section 498A of IPC and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of two years with fine of Rs.500 each, in default, to undergo 2 months simple imprisonment each. They were found guilty of the offence under Section 3 of The Dowry Prohibition Act and sentenced to undergo 3 years simple imprisonment with fine of Rs.500 failing which to undergo 2 months simple imprisonment each They were found guilty of the offence under Section 4 of The Dowry Prohibition Act and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of Rs.500/-, in default to undergo simple imprisonment for two months each.

The aforesaid sentence imposed against the Accused 1, 3 to 6 were ordered to run concurrently.

3. As the second Accused died during trial, the charge against him stood abated.



4. Aggrieved by the Judgment of conviction, the Petitioners herein filed Criminal Appeal No. 28 of 2018 and it was dismissed by confirming the conviction and sentence. Therefore, the present Criminal Revision Case is filed by the Petitioners.

5. The learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners submitted that Ex.P-1 Complaint contains 7 pages. Since P.W-2 was serving as Tahsildar, the subject matter of the complaint was referred to Social Welfare Officer. The Social Welfare Officer to please P.W-2 had given a report for registering a case against the in-laws of P.W-1 for the offence under 498(A) of IPC. Accordingly P.W-10 Sub-Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Paramathi Vellore had registered a complaint under Section 498(A) of IPC, Section 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act against Accused-1 and Section 498(A) r/w.109 of IPC, Section 3 of Dowry Prohibition Act r/w.109 of IPC, Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and Section 498(A) of IPC against Accused-3 to Accused-6.

6. It is the contention of the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners that P.W-12 was a Social Welfare Officer and a colleague of P.W-2. Therefore, a false report was given by P.W-12 to P.W-13. Also it is the



contention of the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners that Accused-1 had filed H.M.O.P No.1 of 2011 before the Sub Court, Karur against P.W-1 for divorce. It was filed within one year of their marriage and it was dismissed on technical grounds. P.W-1 also filed H.M.O.P for restitution of conjugal rights before the very same Sub Judge and it was also dismissed. Also, P.W-1 filed a maintenance case, seeking maintenance from Accused-1 before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Karur. The learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Karur after holding enquiry, ordered maintenance of Rs.5,000/- per month and it was subsequently enhanced.

7. According to the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners, in the year 2018, P.W-1 given an advertisement seeking alliance for her and subsequently she contracted a second marriage without getting a Decree of Divorce from the competent Civil Court dissolving the marriage between her and the first Accused. Therefore, in the light of the subsequent developments, the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners seek to set aside the conviction and sentenced imposed on them by the Courts below.

8. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the Respondent submitted that on 29.05.2011, P.W-1 went to write Bank Exam



along with her Mother P.W-2. On 01.06.2011, P.W-1 returned to her matrimonial house. At that time, Accused-1 and Accused-3 to Accused-6 demanded a sum of Rs.4 Lakhs as a condition precedent to step into the matrimonial home. Since the *De-facto Complainant* could not pay such money she was not permitted to come insider the matrimonial home and therefore, she left to her mother's house. Subsequently on 04.06.2011, the brothers and sisters of P.W-2 came to the residence of Accused-1 and convened Panchayat and they agreed to provide the sum of Rs.4 lakhs on condition Accused-1 live with P.W-1 happily. However, within a short time, on 11.06.2011, P.W-2 the Mother of P.W-1 received information stating that the belongings of P.W-1 were kept outside the matrimonial house. During that time, P.W-2 was working as Tahsildar at Karur. P.W-2 came to the residence of matrimonial house of P.W-1 by engaging a car from Karur. She picked up P.W-1 along with her belongings and left to Karur. On the way, they lodged a complaint to P.W-11 Sub-Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Paramathi Vellore.

9. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) further contended that as Revisional Court, this Court cannot re-assess the evidence. The Courts below, on appreciation of the evidence made available, rightly convicted and



sentenced the Petitioners herein for the offences under Section 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act. During the course of trial, the Petitioners/Accused failed to provide any rebuttal evidence but they have only filed Ex.D-1 to show that the *De-facto Complainant* is searching for an alliance for her second marriage or contracted a second marriage, which is not material for adjudication in this case. In this case, it has to be examined as to whether the Petitioners have committed the offences alleged against them or not.

10. It is the further submission of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) that the Accused-1 also contracted second marriage and even in the second marriage, his wife had given a complaint for similar offence and got decree of divorce. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), as per instructions from the Investigation Officer in this case, also submitted that the Accused-1 had contracted third marriage.

11. Above all, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that P.W-5 is the neighbour of Accused-1, Accused-3 to Accused-6 and a grocery shop owner. He has categorically stated that the Accused, demanding dowry, have thrown the articles outside the house and demanded the *De-facto Complainant* to step into the house only with the dowry amount.



P.W-9 is the Taxi Driver who had accompanied P.W-2 to Karur to the matrimonial home to pick up P.W-1 along with her belongings. He had deposed that he also helped P.W-1 and P.W-2 to pick up the belongings that were kept in front of the house. According to the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), even at the time of marriage, P.W-1 and his family members demanded Rs.10 lakhs. However, P.W-2, mother of P.W-1 offered a Swift Car worth Rs.6 lakhs. Therefore, for the balance sum of Rs.4 lakhs P.W-1 was subjected to acute matrimonial cruelty. Such demand was proved by the Prosecution evidence P.W-1 to P.W-13. The Prosecution has not only examined P.W-1 and P.W-2 but also independent witnesses to prove that there was a demand for money and for non-payment of such money, the *De-facto Complainant* was driven out of the matrimonial house. Taking note of the above evidence, the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi had rightly convicted the Accused and it was also confirmed by the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) also submitted that such well considered judgment of the courts below need not be interfered with by this Court in exercise of the revisional power.

12. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) also submitted that



if the arguments of the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners is to be accepted, the Revision Petitioner-1 will be left scot-free to lead a wayward life ignoring the laws of the land and the social norms in the society. He contracts the marriage with the sole intention of extracting dowry and not interested in family relationship. His only intention is to abuse women, get enriched from the dowry amount, which is prohibited under the Dowry Prohibition Act. Further, the Accused No.1 is a Professor in Annamalai University and using that as a social status symbol, he contracts marriage and ill-treats wife for more dowry. Therefore, if this Revision is allowed and the conviction recorded by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi and confirmed in appeal by the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal are set aside, he and his mother, sister and brother-in-law will be emboldened to indulge in similar offences. Accordingly, he prayed for dismissal of this Criminal Revision Case and to confirm the judgment of conviction rendered by the Courts below.

Point for consideration:

Whether the judgment of conviction recorded by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi in C.C. No.81 of 2012, dated 23.03.2018 and confirmed by the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal in C.A.No.28 of 2018, dated 22.11.2018 is to be set aside as perverse?



Crl.R.C.No.1460 of 2018

WEB COPY13. Heard Mr. T. Muruganantham, learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners and Mr. S. Vinoth Kumar, learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side). Perused the judgment of learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi, in C.C. No. 81 of 2012, dated 23.03.2018 and the judgment of the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal, in C.A. No. 28 of 2018, dated 22..11.2018.

14. The learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners, at the outset, submits that P.W-1 *De-facto Complainant* in this case had contracted a second marriage without dissolving the marriage solemnised with the first Accused through the competent Civil Court. Therefore, he would submit that the judgment of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi, which was confirmed by the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal, has to be set aside. This submission cannot be accepted. If P.W-1 had contracted second marriage during the subsistence of the matrimonial relationship with the first Accused, it is for the first Accused/Husband to agitate his right before the competent Criminal Court by preferring criminal complaint for bigamy. But that was not done so far by the first Accused. On the other hand, the first Accused himself filed H.M.O.P seeking divorce, which was dismissed on



technicalities by the learned Sub Judge, Karur. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the Revision Petitioner himself contracted a second marriage when the marriage with P.W-1 is subsisting. Even the second marriage did not last as the second wife of Accused-1 herein had given a similar complaint against the Accused-1 and his family members and subsequently, she had obtained decree of divorce against the first Accused/Husband in this case. Now, the first Accused has contracted third marriage.

15. Be that as it may. In the present complaint given by P.W-1, it was alleged that she was subjected to matrimonial cruelty in all forms and manifestations. It is her specific plea that at the time of her marriage, her mother has offered 100 sovereigns of gold jewels to the De-facto Complainant, 17½ sovereigns of gold jewels to Accused-1, silver articles, household articles and a Swift Car worth about Rs.6 lakhs. However, after marriage, Accused-1 to Accused-6 demanded that the mother of P.W-1 promised to offer Rs.10 lakhs but the Swift Car is worth only Rs.6 lakhs. Therefore, they demanded the balance amount of Rs.4 lakhs to be paid as a condition precedent of allowing P.W-1 to live in the matrimonial house. P.W-1 has let in evidence narrating the factual events that had unfolded in the matrimonial life. It is her specific complaint that on 11.06.2011, she went to the matrimonial home to take her



dress as she had to attend an interview at Chennai on 15.06.2011. However, she noticed that the Bureau, cot, Air-conditioner machine have been kept in the portico of the house. When questioned, Accused-1 categorically asserted that unless the balance sum of Rs.4 lakhs is paid, she will not be permitted inside the matrimonial house. Therefore, it is evident that the demand for Rs.4 lakhs has been made by the Accused frequently and for non-payment of such amount, P.W-1 was not permitted to step inside the matrimonial home.

16. On scrutiny of the evidence let in on the side of the Prosecution, it is seen that P.W-3 Jayaram is having his provisional stores in the locality and he knew the family members of the Accused. According to P.W-3, on 06.03.2011, the marriage between P.W-1 and Accused-1 was solemnised during which the mother of P.W-1 offered 100 sovereigns of gold jewels to the *De-facto Complainant* and 17½ sovereign of gold jewels to Accused-1. P.W-3 also deposed that Accused-1, demanding dowry, had driven P.W-1 out of the matrimonial house. He also deposed that on 11.06.2011, when P.W-1 came to the matrimonial home to take her dresses, she was not permitted inside the house by demanding as to whether she had brought the balance dowry amount. When P.W-1 replied that she has no such money, they have kept the articles in the portico and asked P.W-1 not to return to the matrimonial house without the



money. When P.W-1 contacted her mother-P.W-2, she came in a car and questioned the Accused as to why they have to keep all the articles in the portico. However, Accused-1 to Accused-6 stated that they never expected your daughter – P.W-1 to return empty hand and unless the amount demanded is paid, she will not be permitted to enter into the matrimonial house. P.W-3 was also cross-examined by the Petitioners but nothing favourable could be elicited therefrom.

17. P.W-5 is also running a provisional store in the locality. He has deposed that during the month of June 2011, there was commotion in the house of the Accused and when he went there, he saw the Accused assaulting the *De-facto Complainant* and she came out crying. He further deposed that the *De-facto Complainant* called some one in phone. He also deposed that her belongings have been thrown in the portico and they were seen scattered.

18. P.W-9 was the Driver during the relevant time and he had accompanied P.W-2 to the house of the Accused. On reaching the house of the Accused, it is stated that the fifth Accused was holding the tuft of the P.W-1 and driving her out of the matrimonial home. He also stated that P.W-2 time and again has stated to him that his daughter was given in marriage to



Accused-1 and from the date of marriage, her daughter was not treated well by him and her in-laws.

19. On scrutiny of the deposition of P.W-1, P.W-2, P.W-3, P.W-5 and P.W-9, it is seen that within three months of marriage, the Petitioners/Accused subjected the *De-facto Complainant* to acute matrimonial cruelty by demanding dowry. P.W-12 is the Social Welfare Officer, who has personally inspected the matrimonial home and caused a personal enquiry. After such enquiry, she had forwarded the report to All Women Police Station, Vellore stating that the complaint given by the complainant is *prima facie* true and the complainant was subjected to matrimonial cruelty by demanding dowry. It is on the basis of such complaint, P.W-10 registered a case against the Petitioners and after investigation, P.W-13 Inspector of Police (In-charge), All Women Police Station, Vellore, laid a charge sheet before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi.

20. On a over all consideration of the evidence of the Prosecution Witnesses, it is clear that within three months of marriage, the *De-facto Complainant* was driven out of the matrimonial home. It is also evident that even at the time of marriage, 100 sovereigns of gold jewels were offered to



De-facto Complainant, 17½ sovereigns of gold jewels were presented to

Accused-1 apart from a Swift Car worth Rs.6 lakhs. Notwithstanding the same, P.W-1 was driven out of the matrimonial home demanding the balance sum of Rs.4 lakhs. The fact that the *De-facto Complainant* was subjected to acute cruelty by demanding dowry is sufficiently proved by the Prosecution. The trial Court as well as the Appellate Court on proper appreciation of evidence made available, held that the Petitioners are guilty of the offences to which they are charged.

21. In this case, the criminal law was set in motion by the wife complaining that she was subjected to matrimonial cruelty by demanding dowry by her husband and in-laws. Apart from giving complaint, she also stepped into the witness box and deposed against the Petitioners. Her deposition is also supported by the deposition of P.W-2 to P.W-13 and they are cogent and satisfactory. While so, if this Revision is allowed, it will set a wrong precedent to the greedy individuals like the Revision Petitioners to misuse matrimonial relationship for their selfish intention of illegal aggrandizement by exploiting the matrimonial relationship for accumulating wealth by illegal means. This is prohibited under The Dowry Prohibition Act. The Accused-1 in this case is working as a Professor in Annamalai University.



He had contracted third marriage. If he is allowed to go scot-free, women of marriageable age in the society may not be safe. Therefore, considering the social norms and the laws in the Statute book, the Accused/Petitioners herein are violators of law and social norms. Along with the first Accused, his mother, sister and sister's husband and his maternal uncle have also indulged in such offence whereby spoiled the matrimonial life of the *De-facto Complainant* for greed of money. Therefore, the judgment of conviction recorded by the trial Court and confirmed by the Appellate Court need not be interfered with.

22. This Court exercising the powers of revision cannot re-appreciate the evidence unfolded in this case. All that is required is to assess as to whether the judgment of the Courts below are based on evidence, in consonance with law and is a plausible verdict. In the present case, as mentioned above, the Courts below, on proper appreciation of facts as well as law, had rightly convicted and sentenced the Petitioners by applying the law. This Court, in exercise of the power of revision, does not find any reasons to interfere with such decision of the Courts below. Therefore, this Court is of the view that this is not a fit case where it will be justified to interfere with the concurrent findings rendered by the Courts below, based on the material



CrI.R.C.No.1460 of 2018

evidence made available.

WEB COPY

23. The point for consideration in this case is answered against the Revision Petitioners and in favour of the Prosecution. The judgment of conviction recorded by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi in C.C.No.81 of 2012, dated 23.03.2018 and confirmed by the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Namakkal in C.A.No.28 of 2018, dated 22.11.2018 is found proper and the same is to be confirmed.

In the result, **this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed.**

The Revision Petitioners are directed to surrender before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi within 15 days from the date of uploading of this Order on the website of this Court. The learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi is directed to issue warrant to the Petitioners/Accused Nos. 1, 3 to 6 in C.C.No.81 of 2012 and shall report compliance to this Court.

The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Paramathi Vellore is directed to secure the Accused Nos. 1, 3 to 6 in C.C.No.81 of 2012 (Crime No.2 of 2012) to undergo the period of detention as per the judgment of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi in C.C.No.81 of 2012, dated 23.03.2018. If the Accused absconds, the Inspector of Police, All Women



Crl.R.C.No.1460 of 2018

Police Station, Paramathi Vellore shall file appropriate Petition before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramathi to declare them as proclaimed offenders and attach the properties of the Accused, both movable and immovable belongings under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

08.03.2024

shl

Internet : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order



Crl.R.C.No.1460 of 2018

WEB COPY

- To
1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Paramathi.
 2. The Sessions Judge,
Fast Track Mahila Court,
Namakkal.
 3. The Inspector of Police,
Vellore Police Station
Incharge, All Women Police Station
Vellore, Namakkal District.
 4. The Public Prosecutor
Madras High Court,
Chennai – 600 104.
 5. The Section Officer,
VR Records,
High Court, Chennai.

Note: Registry is directed to sent this order through e-mail also.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1460 of 2018

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J

shl

Crl.R.C.No.1460 of 2018
and
Crl.M.P.No.17105 of 2018

08.03.2024