BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 30.04.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **B.PUGALENDHI**

CRL OP(MD) Nos.7012, 7450 and 8129 of 2026 and
CrlMP(MD)No.7562, 8044 and 8750 of 2026

<u>In Crl OP(MD)No.7012 of 2026:</u>

Revathi ...Petitioner/A2

Vs

1.The State,
Rep by Special Sub Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station, Thanjavur.
[Crime No.36 of 2025]

2.Magamtha ...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the entire records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.36 of 2025 on the file of the Inspector of Police, DCB, Thanjavur District and quash the same as far as the petitioner is concerned.

<u>In Crl OP(MD)No.7450 of 2026</u>

1.Manikandan

2.P.Aadhithiya

3.Kavitha Senthilkumar
4.Sujatha Manikandan ...Petitioners

Vs

1.The State,
Rep by Special Sub Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,Thanjavur.
[Crime No.36 of 2025]

2.Magamtha ...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the entire records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.36 of 2025 on the file of the Inspector of Police, DCB, Thanjavur District and quash the same as far as the petitioners are concerned.

In CrlOP(MD)No.8129 of 2026

1.B.Nagarajan

2.Senthilkumar ...Petitioners

Vs

1.The State,
Rep by Special Sub Inspector of Police,
Tamil University Police Station,
Thanjavur.
[Crime No.87 of 2026]

2.Magamtha ...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the entire records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.87 of 2026 on the file of the Special Sub Inspector of Police, Tamil University Police Station, Thanjavur District and quash the same as far as the petitioners are concerned.

For Petitioners	: Mr.A.Ramesh Senior Counsel for Mr.R.Ashwin
For Respondent No.1	: Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram Additional Public Prosecutor
For Respondent No.2	: Mr.N.Anandha Padmanabhan Senior Counsel for M/S.CRM Legal in all CrlOPs

COMMON ORDER

These petitions are filed by the accused to quash the proceedings which is pending as against them on the file of the respective respondent police stations.

2.The criminal original petitions in CrlOP(MD)No.7012 of 2026 and CrlOP(MD)No.7450 of 2026 are filed by accused No.2 and accused Nos.9 to 12 respectively in Crime No.36 of 2025 on the file of the District Crime Branch, Thanjavur. The criminal original petition in CrlOP(MD)No.8129 of 2026 is filed by the accused in Crime No.87 of 2026 on the file of the Tamil University Police Station. The accused in Crime No.87 of 2026 are also shown as an accused in Crime No.36 of 2025 and the defacto complainant in both cases is one and the same. Therefore, with the consent of the parties, these applications are heard together and disposed by way of this common order.

3.The gist of the case in Crime No.36 of 2025 on the file of the District Crime Branch, Thanjavur is as under:

The defacto complainant one Magamatha is a septuagenarian and resident of Singapore holding an Overseas Citizen of India (OCI) card. Her husband is a businessman involved in the shipping industry at Singapore and passed away in the year 2015 leaving behind huge properties in India. There were certain litigations instituted by relatives and SARFAESI proceedings pending with regard to the properties and she was finding it difficult to manage the litigations and the properties. At that time, one Sumathi/ A7, an erstwhile employee of her husband approached her and advised her in resolving the issues. She introduced the defacto complainant to one Konguvel Chellapan / A8 working as a Public Relations Officer in a hotel in Chennai and he in turn introduced the defacto complainant to one Nagarajan/ A4, the law officer of that hotel and advocates, A6 and A1. The accused have projected as if the relatives of the de facto complainant were attempting to abduct her for the sake of properties and under the guise of defending the cases regarding the properties, the accused have obtained her signatures in blank papers, vakalatnamas and also advised her to execute power deeds to save her properties. With these power documents and blank documents, they have created various sale deeds among themselves without her knowledge and cheated her of properties to the tune of Rs.700 crores. They also broke open into the house and lockers of the defacto complainant and taken away documents, ornaments and jewels in her absence. The accused allegedly intimidated her and her children with dire consequences and therefore, she has lodged a complaint through the Consulate General of India in Singapore and thereafter lodged this complaint before the Superintendent of Police, Thanjavur in 2025. On the basis of the same, a case in Crime No.36 of 2025 was registered on 27.12.2025 for the offences under Sections 406, 409, 420, 465, 467, 468, 470, 471 of the IPC read with Section 120B of the IPC.

4.The gist of the case in Crime No.87 of 2026 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Tamil University Police Station is as under:

The de facto complainant was present inside the Joint Registrar Office, Thanjavur on 16.03.2026 in connection with obtaining official details regarding her properties. At about 3.00pm, the accused, one Nagarajan and Senthilkumar along with unknown persons entered the office, pointed at her and watched at her in an intimidating manner creating fear and emotional distress to her. Thereafter, when the de facto complainant wrongfully restrained her near the Collectorate premises and threatened her and using filthy and abusive language towards her. For the above incidents, the case in Crime No.86 of 2026 was registered on 17.03.2026 for the offences under Sections 191(2), 126(2), 296(b) and 351(2) of the BNS and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women (Amendment Act) 2002.

5.The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners questioned the sustainability of these FIR's and his submissions are summarised as under:

(i)These proceedings arose out of a property dispute relating to the estate of one Shaik Serjadueen which is purely civil in nature and the same has been given a criminal colour. Civil suits are pending on the subject matter filed by and against the 2^{nd} respondent. However by suppressing the same, the criminal case has been registered.

(ii) The complaint of civil nature has been registered by the respondent police as a criminal case without conducting any preliminary enquiry as contemplated under Section 173 of the BNSS.

(iii)The defacto complainant admits in her complaint about the execution of power of attorney and other documents in the Sub Registrar Office, however criminal case has been registered against the petitioners, as if documents have been executed by impersonation.

(iv)The complaint is vague, bald one and lacking any foundational facts to set criminal law in motion. There is no specification of the exact dates, details of the documents and the specific role played by each accused is not disclosed in the complaint.

(v)The admitted case of the defacto complainant is that she has executed power of attorney documents, which are registered one, in favour of one B.Nagarajan / A4 in the years 2016 and 2017. She had appeared before the Sub Registrar Office, provided her PAN card, Aadhaar card and ID card for registering each power of attorney document. Further, the defacto complainant had filed income tax returns in India for the assessment years 2017 to 2023, wherein the sale proceeds of every property of the defacto complainant has been declared in the income tax returns and she had also paid the capital gains tax. The sale consideration of her properties was not only reflected in her income tax returns but also reflected in her bank accounts. While so, her complaint is prima facie wrong without any materials constituting a criminal offence and therefore, the complaint has to be thrown out.

(vi) All the documents were executed from the year 2017 till 2022. The defacto complainant has lodged an earlier complaint bearing No.GI/041383/2024 on 20.09.2024 on the very same set of facts, which was already enquired by the police and it was closed as civil in nature. Suppressing the closing of the earlier complaint, the present complaint has been lodged in the year 2025. Further, the complaint has been lodged belatedly for the incidents relating to the years from 2017 to 2022 and no explanation has been provided for such delay in filing the complaint.

(vii)The complaint has been filed in the form of a request to the respondent police to recover the properties and money of the petitioner from the accused. Therefore, it becomes clear that the criminal law has been set in motion with an object to recover money from the accused. It is a settled position of law that the criminal courts cannot be used as a tool for recovery of money or enforcing of civil rights. The disputes related to financial claims, property rights or any breach of obligations are to be adjudicated before the competent civil court by filing civil suits. However, the defacto complainant has lodged a complaint regarding a civil dispute on the basis of which a criminal case has been registered.

(viii)The mere existence of a financial dispute or alleged loss does not constitute a criminal offence, in the absence of the essential ingredients of the penal provisions invoked. A reading of the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant would show that the entire dispute revolves around the alleged financial transactions and recovery of properties, for which the appropriate remedy lies only before the civil forum. The attempt to give a criminal colour to such civil disputes, with a view to exert pressure and expedite recovery, amounts to abuse of process of the criminal justice system and warrants interference from this court.

(ix)Even as per the allegations in the first information report, there is no specific allegation involving the dishonest inducement or delivery of property and hence the offence under Section 420 IPC is not made out. Further, the documents have admittedly been executed by the defacto complainant and there are no materials to show her signatures were obtained without her consent or knowledge. Therefore, the offences for forgery under sections 467, 468 and 471 IPC are not made out. As the materials do not reveal the commission of any cognizable offence or the meeting of minds of the accused, the offence of criminal conspiracy under section 120B IPC is not made out.

(x)The offence under Section 409 IPC is predicated upon criminal breach of trust which requires a pre-existing relationship of entrustment and subsequent dishonest misappropriation of the property so entrusted. On the other hand, Section 420 IPC requires deception and fraudulent inducement existing at the very inception of the transaction. Hence, these two offences are mutually inconsistent and cannot exist together at the same time.

6.According to the learned Senior Counsel, the respondent police is acting as a collection agent for the defacto complainant and they have foisted the case in Crime No.87 of 2026 at the instance of influential persons in order to coerce the petitioners to cancel the documents executed by them 7 years ago. He has pointed out that these complaints have been lodged by the defacto complainant in view of the hike in land prices and to get back the lands already sold away.

7.The learned senior counsel has relied on the following judgments in support of his contentions:

1.Mohammed Wajid & Ors vs. State of UP [AIR 2023 SC 37 84]

2.Andhra Pradesh vs. P.V.Pavithran [1990 AIR 1266]

3.Chellappa & Co & Others vs. J.Mariya Amalraj [2019 LW CRL 2148]

4.Samta Naidu & Ors vs. State [2020 NSC 248]

5.Delhi Race Club (1940) Ltd and Ors vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors [AIR 2024 SC 4531]

8.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police objected to the contentions of the petitioners and has made his submissions which are summarised as under:

(i) The defacto complainant is a resident of Singapore. Her husband Shaik Sirajudeen was having several properties in Thanjavur district. Her husband died in the year 2015 and her relatives created problems, cases have been filed in respect of the properties and the defacto complainant faced difficulties in managing the same. At that point of time, one Vidhya Sumathi / A7 an erstwhile employee of her husband had approached the defacto complainant that she would help her in solving the issues. She also introduced one Kongu Chellappan /A8 to the 2nd respondent, who acted as a kingpin in the commission of the offence and he brought in other accused persons Nagarajan/A4, Patricia and Prakash /A6. Nagarajan and Prakash are Advocates. They have obtained signatures of the defacto complainant in blank papers and vakalathnamas and guided her in executing power deeds to solve the issues and to raise funds.

(ii) On the strength of the power of attorneys, Prakash/A1, Revathi/A2, VM.Baskaran/A3 have executed numerous sale deeds on the properties of the defacto complainant. The respondent police so far collected around 150 registered documents executed by the accused between 2017 and 2023. All the documents were executed by the power holders with a common recital that the properties were being sold for the purpose of reinvestment. Conspicuously, there is no reinvestment or purchase of any property in the name of the defacto complainant. The sale proceeds have been dishonestly diverted by the accused persons for their wrongful gain.

(iii)Most of the sale deeds executed by the power holders reveal that the sale consideration was received in cash. This suspicious and untraceable mode of transaction, without any reinvestment, establishes fraudulent misappropriation and concealment of the sale proceeds.

(iv) A general power of attorney was executed by the 2nd respondent in favour of A.M.Bhaskaran/A3 on 04.07.2017 vide document No.2788 of

2017, with regard to 20.65 acres of land. Immediately on 07.07.2017, the power holder has executed 50 sale agreements in favour of his daughter Revathi/A2. All the documents were executed with an advance amount of Rs.10,000/- and subsequently the documents were cancelled with an intent to create multiple encumbrances. The property was sold at a cost of Rs.8,20,00,527/-, whereas the market value of the property is around Rs.25 crores. Though the petitioner / A2 claims that the sale consideration was paid to the principal, no document or receipt has been produced evidencing the same, which shows that the claim of the petitioners is completely false.

(v)The said Revathi / A2 has obtained a property in her favour vide document No.8211 of 2022 through power agent Prakash/A1, on 12.11.2022 and on that date, the defacto complainant was not in India. This transaction was executed by collusive means and the sale consideration of Rs.1,03,23,000/- was neither paid in cash or any other mode and it has also not been disclosed either by the vendor or the purchaser.

(vi) The preliminary investigation and the enquiry report obtained from the Bureau of Immigration reveals that several documents have been fraudulently executed in SRO, Thanjavur Joint - I, when the 2nd respondent was not in India. Several specific transactions have been identified as fraudulent transactions including Document Nos.6196, 6197 and 6198 of 2020, 2476 of 2021 and 5337 of 2022, since at the relevant point of time, the defacto complainant was not present in India.

(vii) The documents executed through the power agents in favour of the accused persons create serious suspicion, since the immigration records show that at the relevant point of time, the defacto complainant was not present in India, however, life certificates have been created and used in the transactions. It is also found that a fake life certificate was issued by one Dr.Rajagopal. Thus the fabrication of records and fraud are established.

(viii) The customer application form relating to the Mobile No.80156 35180 linked to the defacto complainant's PAN and bank account is purchased by Prakash / A1 and the e-mail id muhammathad@gmail.com linked thereto was created by Prakash/A1, thereby enabling unlawful access and manipulation of her financial identity. It was found that Nagarajan /A4 along with his brother Prakash/ A1 and Revathi /A2 linked the fabricated e-mail id and mobile number to the defacto complainant's PAN and thus the credentials of the defacto complainant have been misused.

(ix)The auditor of the defacto complainant namely one Ramalingam during the investigation has stated that all the particulars relating to the income and financial details required for filing the income tax returns of the defacto complainant for the period between 2018 and 2023 were furnished only by the accused.

(x)The purported general power of attorney documents executed in favour of Prakash /A1 vide Document Nos.390 of 2019, 1104 of 2019, 7617 and 7071 of 2022 are in Tamil and general power of attorney executed in favour of VM.Bhaskaran / A3 is in English, whereas the defacto complainant is not conversant with the Tamil language, thus it is found that those documents were obtained without the consent of the defacto complainant.

(x)One of the power holders namely VM.Bhaskaran / A3 is the father of Revathi /A2 which discloses the nexus and collusive involvement of the accused persons in the fraudulent transactions.

(xi) One Vidhasree Sumathi /A7 who was acting as the personal assistant and power agent of the 2nd respondent for managing the day-to-day affairs of the petrol bunk, in collusion with Prakash /A1, Revathi / A2, Manikandan / A9, Aadhithya /A10, Kavitha and other accused persons, has fraudulently misused the cheques of the 2nd respondent. A sum of Rs.2,02,61,518/- has been siphoned off by the accused from the bank account of the defacto complainant in HDFC Bank and an amount of 8,25,04,489/- has been siphoned off by the accused from the bank account of the defacto complainant in Federal Bank in a fraudulent manner and the details of the amounts credited into the bank account of the accused persons are provided below:

Sl.No	Name	Amount in Rs.
1	B.Prakash/A1	12,15,000
2	Revathi, MD of Saket Multi Ventures /A2	63,18,000
3	V.M.Bhaskaran / A3	32,90,000
4	B.Nagarajan / A4	1,01,72,000
5	S.Senthil Kumar/ A5	8,00,000
6	Petricia Joany /A6	43,44,000
7	Vidhyasree Sumathi / A7	9,79,104
8	V.Manikandan/ A9	1,31,12,559
9	B.Aadithya / A10	10,85,000

(xii) One Revathi /A2 has played a vital and dominant role in the fraudulent transactions. Adthitya /A10 and Manikandan /A9 are the beneficiaries. Kavitha and Sujatha have acted in collusion in committing the offence. Senthil Kumar/ A5 was also involved in the fraudulent transactions.

(xiii)The materials collected so far, make out a prima facie case as against the petitioners and other accused persons for the offences involving criminal conspiracy, cheating, forgery and fraudulent misappropriation of properties. Further, the respondent police has to co-ordinate with multiple authorities including the Bureau of Immigration, forensic experts, the income tax authorities and other departments to unravel the entire fraudulent scheme. Since the materials prima facie reveal the commission of cognizable offences the criminal case has been registered and investigation is required to unearth the truth. Hence, he prays that these petitions be dismissed.

7.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent / de facto complainant has made his submissions as follows:

(i) The 2nd respondent is the wife of one Shaik Serajudeen and is a Singapore citizen holding Overseas Citizen of India (OCI) card. The said Shaik Serajudeen was a businessman involved in the shipping industry and passed away on 26.07.2015. Thereafter, the accused persons have approached the 2nd respondent, portraying themselves to be associates of her husband, and offered to look after her husband's estate and properties for the benefit of the defacto complainant and her children. However, they have taken advantage of the defacto complainant's lack of legal knowledge and conspired together to obtain the signature of the 2nd respondent on various documents using which they have taken over the properties of her husband.

(ii) Sridhivya Sumathi /A7 approached the defacto complainant as an ex-employee of the late Shaik Serajudeen and offered to assist her in clearing certain loans. The said Sumathi introduced the defacto complainant to one Konguvel Chellapan /A8, who in turn introduced the other accused with the petitioner/A2. All the accused were connected by employment in a hotel and one Revathi/A2 and Patricia /A6 resided with the defacto complainant and actively canvassed her into believing the accused persons.

(iii) Thereafter, the defacto complainant was made to sign on various power of attorneys in favour of the accused persons and their companies and also execute sale deeds to transfer properties to the name of the accused from the year 2017 till 2022.

(iv) The accused persons have obtained a cheque book signed from the defacto complainant and have also made her to execute power of attorneys under the guise of resolving litigations and settling loans. However, the accused persons misused the same to take over the properties of the 2nd respondent.

(v) The accused are part of a land grabbing syndicate and all the sale consideration purportedly paid into the bank account of the 2nd respondent, were siphoned back into the bank accounts of the accused using the signed cheque book obtained from the 2nd respondent.

(vi) The accused persons have opened various bank accounts in the name of the 2nd respondent and her children without their knowledge. A false case for drug related offence was registered as against the 2nd respondent at Singapore at the instigation of the accused, so that they could dispose of the properties of the 2nd respondent. However, the Singapore Police were satisfied that the 2nd respondent was not involved in any offence and initiated investigation to find out, who provided false information regarding her.

(vii) The income tax returns of the 2nd respondent were filed by the accused persons and she was cheated and defrauded of her properties due to the schemes of the accused persons.

(viii) The 2nd respondent being an elderly woman and an overseas Indian Citizen residing in Singapore was not present in India when these activities took place and hence took some time to gather details regarding the activities of the accused. Therefore, there was some delay in filing the complaint as against the accused persons. However, there are clear materials to establish fraudulent activities on the part of the accused persons and the 2nd respondent has also provided the details of the properties taken over by the accused persons in her complaint. Hence, he prays that these petitions be dismissed so that further investigation can be carried out to unearth the activities of the accused.

8.This court has considered the rival submissions made and perused the materials placed on record.

9.The case in Crime No.36 of 2025, has been registered on the complaint of the 2nd respondent/ defacto complainant. The defacto complainant is a septuagenarian woman and a resident of Singapore holding OCI card. Her husband died in the year 2015 due to cancer at Chennai. Her husband was having several properties in and around Thanjavur district, which are involved in various litigations. It appears one Vidhyasree Sumathi /A7, who was an associate of her husband at Sinagpore, has approached the defacto complainant for rendering assistance, introduced A8 and through A8, the other accused have been introduced to the defacto complainant. The properties of the defacto complainant were transferred only by power of attorney documents. Through the power of attorney documents, several other documents have been created among the accused. There is some connection among the accused as the accused Nos.2, 3, 4 and 8 are working in the Hotel Le Meridien.

10.As pointed out by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, the recitals in the sale documents have been made as if the properties have been sold for the purpose of investment in some other properties. However it appears that sale proceeds deposited in the 2nd respondent's bank accounts and reflected in the income tax returns was simultaneously transferred from the bank account of the defacto complainant to the bank accounts of the accused. The respondents have placed bank account statements of the defacto complainant from the year 2016 till 2026 before this court showing that a sum of Rs.4,12,15,663/- has been transferred from the account of the defacto complainant to the accused persons.

11.The income tax returns have been placed before this court by A2. The learned senior counsel appearing for the defacto complainant by referring to the income tax returns produced by A2 pointed out that the income tax returns have been filed by the accused without the knowledge of the defacto complainant, in order to create records, as if the sale proceeds have been received by the defacto complainant and shown in her income tax returns as capital gains.

12. The auditor of the defacto complainant has been examined during investigation and he appears to have stated before the police that the income tax

return has been filed only at the instance of A2. It appears in order to get the OTP number for filing returns, the accused's phone number has been mentioned in the income tax returns, instead of the defacto complainant's phone number.

13.All these materials make out a prima facie case as against the accused in Crime No.36 of 2025, which needs to be investigated. At the same time, the submissions of the learned senior counsel for the petitioners that this complaint itself has been foisted in view of the hike in price of the lands and the petitioners have been coerced to cancel the documents also has to be taken into account by the investigating agency.

14.The apprehension of the petitioners is based on the subsequent case registered in Crime No.87 of 2026 on the file of the Tamil University Police Station. The allegations in Crime No.87 of 2026 is an act of intimidation and abusement. Admittedly, there is no injury caused to the defacto complainant. Such a complaint would certainly create an impression as apprehended by the petitioners and the other accused and this would also divert the process of investigation in Crime No.36 of 2025. Admittedly, the defacto complainant has executed certain power documents in favour of the accused through which the other documents have been created. The documents in question have been executed between 2017 and 2022. For the same, a complainant has been lodged in the year 2025. There is some delay in filing the complaint. The residence of the defacto complainant being at Singapore, her age and apprehensions regarding the accused cannot cure this delay. Apart from this excuse, the allegation of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the defacto complainant that a criminal case for drug related offence was foisted as against the defacto complainant is a matter, which needs to be investigated. Further, the case of the defacto complainant that the documents have been registered when she was at Singapore using fake life certificates also needs to be investigated by the respondent police. The investigating agency has also collected materials for the transfer of huge amounts of money from the bank account of the defacto complainant to the accounts of the accused. The same also needs to be investigated. The accused have produced the Income Tax Returns of the defacto complainant before this court. The auditor of the defacto complainant has provided a statement claiming that all the information has been provided by accused No.2 and not the defacto complainant. The mobile numbers of the accused and their email IDs have been shown in the contact details in the Income Tax Returns of the defacto complainant which also needs to be investigated. The investigating agency claims that these Income Tax Returns were filed by the accused with an intention to create records as if the sale proceeds from the properties of the defacto complainant were shown in the Income Tax Returns and thereafter, the amounts have been siphoned away by the accused. Since a larger issue is involved in Crime No.36 of 2025, this court is of the opinion that the subsequent case registered in Crime No.87 of 2026 would only divert the issue and would also attribute motive as against the respondent police.

15.In view of the above discussion,

(i)The petitions in CrlOP(MD)No.7012 of 2026 and CrlOP(MD)No.7450 of 2026 are dismissed.

(ii)The petition in CrlOP(MD)No.8129 of 2026 is allowed and the proceedings in Crime No.87 of 2026 on the file of the Tamil University Police Station is quashed.

(iii)The respondent police, namely the District Crime Branch, Thanjavur shall not harass the accused in Crime No.36 of 2025 under the guise of conducting investigation. In the event if they require any materials or information from the accused, the same may be obtained by written communications and by way of registered post. If the accused are not co-operative and are not furnishing the required documents, adverse inference may be drawn as against them.

(iv)The respondent police shall provide necessary protection to the defacto complainant in Crime No.36 of 2025.

(v)The Sub Registrars concerned, immigration authorities, forensic department and the Income Tax Department are expected to cooperate with the investigating agency by furnishing the required documents without unnecessary delay. Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

30.04.2026

DSK

To

1.The Special Sub Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,
Thanjavur.

2.The Special Sub Inspector of Police,
Tamil University Police Station,
Thanjavur.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

B.PUGALENDHI.J.,

DSK

CRL OP(MD)Nos.7012, 7450 and 8129 of 2026

30.04.2026