

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Date:27.08.2014

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.VENUGOPAL

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.412 of 2009

K.Obuliraj

... Appellant

-Vs.-

The State represented by
Inspector of Police
Annathanapatty Police Station
Salem.

...Respondent

Appeal against the judgment of conviction dated 22.06.2009 passed by the Learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Salem, in S.C.No.174 of 2008.

For Appellant : Mr.K.V.Shanmuganathan

For Respondent : Mr.A.N.Thambidurai
Additional Public Prosecutor

J U D G M E N T

The Appellant/Accused has preferred the instant Criminal Appeal challenging the conviction and sentence dated 22.06.2009 passed by the Learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Salem, in S.C.No.174 of 2008.

2. The Accused/Appellant was found guilty in respect of an offence under Section 306 of IPC and was awarded with the punishment of three years Rigorous Imprisonment and also he was directed to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/-and in default of payment of fine, he was directed to undergo additional sentence of three months Rigorous Imprisonment.

3. The case of the Prosecution is that two years prior to 04.07.2007, Soundappan's (PW.1's) daughter Suseela was given in marriage to the Appellant/Accused. As a result of wed lock, a female child was born to them and it was nine months old and 40 days. Before the occurrence, the deceased Suseela and the Appellant/Accused came to Gandhi Nagar at Maniyanoor, within the jurisdiction of Annathanapatty to have a separate residence. Subsequently, since Suseela was not turning out work properly, the Appellant/Accused frequently beat her. Further on 04.07.2006 at about 2.30 p.m in the Afternoon, because of Suseela not cleaning the house, an oral quarrel arose between them and because of that, the Appellant/Accused beat

his wife Suseela. Since the Appellant/Accused beat and harassed his wife Suseela, she had committed suicide on 04.07.2006 at 4.00 p.m by placing the Sari on Appellant's House's fan hook. In this background, the Respondent/ Inspector of Police, Annathanapatty police station filed a charge sheet against the Appellant/Accused in respect of an offence under Section 306 of IPC before the Learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Salem.

4. On the basis of the accusation levelled against the Appellant/Accused, the trial Court on 19.01.2009 framed necessary charge in respect of offence under Section 306 of IPC and the same was read over and explained to him. The Appellant/Accused denied the charge framed against him.

5. Before the trial Court, on the side of the Prosecution, witnesses PW.1 to PW.11 were examined and Ex.P1 to Ex.P12 were marked and two sari pieces were marked as M.O.1 (series). On the side of the Appellant/Accused, no one was examined as a witness and no

document was marked.

6. When the Appellant/Accused was questioned under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. relating to the incriminating circumstances appearing in the evidence against him, he denied his complicity in the crime.

The Appellant's submissions:

7. The Learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused submits that the trial Court had committed a grave error in convicting the Appellant/Accused, in the absence of any evidence produced by the Respondent/Prosecution to support the charge of 'abetment to commit suicide'.

8. According to the Learned Counsel for the Appellant, the deceased Suseela was not at all subjected to dowry harassment and in fact, PW.1 to PW.3, viz., father, mother and brother of the deceased had categorically admitted that the deceased (Suseela) was leading a harmonious, peaceful and happy married life with the

Appellant/Accused.

9. The main grievance of the Appellant is that the trial Court was not correct in coming to the conclusion that the deceased was driven to commit suicide by the Appellant/Accused in the absence of any iota of evidence to support the same.

10. Continuing further, the Learned Counsel for the Appellant proceeds to contend that the trial Court erred in placing reliance on the deposition of PW.1 to PW.3 to the effect that the Appellant/Accused had informed them that he had beaten the deceased on the fatal day as she has failed to keep the house in clean condition.

11. Lastly, it is represented on behalf of the Appellant that the present case is a case of 'no evidence' and that the trial Court convicted the Appellant/Accused without keeping in mind the ingredients of Section 306 of IPC by relying upon a sole circumstance, viz., that of a petty quarrel that took place between the

Appellant/Accused and his wife Suseela, on the fateful day.

12. The Learned Counsel for the Appellant/Accused in support of his contention that mere fact that the husband treated the deceased wife with cruelty was not enough to bring the present case within four corners of the ingredients of Section 306 of IPC relied on the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **2007 (10) SCC 797 (Kishori Lal ..vs.. Sate of M.P.)** wherein at special page 799 in paragraphs 6 to 8, it is observed and laid down as under:-

6. Section 107 IPC defines abetment of a thing. The offence of abetment is a separate and distinct offence provided in IPC. A person, abets the doing of a thing when (1) he instigates any person to do that thing; or (2) engages with one or more other persons in any conspiracy for the doing of that thing; or (3) intentionally aids, by act or illegal omission, the doing of that thing. These things are essential to complete

abetment as a crime. The word "instigate" literally means to provoke, incite, urge on or bring about by persuasion to do any thing. The abetment may be by instigation, conspiracy or intentional aid, as provided in the three clauses of Section 107. Section 109 provides that if the act abetted is committed in consequence of abetment and there is no provision for the punishment of such abetment, then the offender is to be punished with the punishment provided for the original offence. "Abetted" in Section 109 means the specific offence abetted. Therefore, the offence for the abetment of which a person is charged with the abetment is normally linked with the proved offence.

7. In cases of alleged abetment of suicide, there must be proof of direct or indirect acts of incitement to the commission of

suicide. The mere fact that the husband treated the deceased wife with cruelty is not enough. (See Mahendra Singh v. State of M.P.). Merely on the allegation of harassment, conviction in terms of Section 306 is not sustainable. There is ample evidence on record that the deceased was disturbed because she had not given birth to any child. Pws.8, 10 and 11 have categorically stated that the deceased was disappointed due to the said fact and her failure to beget a child and she was upset due to this.

8. If the background facts are analysed, it is crystal clear that the prosecution has failed to establish its case. That being so, the appeal deserves to be allowed, which we direct.”

13. Also, the Learned Counsel for the Appellant seeks in aid of the Judgment dated 05.01.2010 in Criminal Appeal No.1301 of 2002 reported in CDJ Law Journal (*CDJ 2010 SC 004*) between "*Gangula Mohan Reddy ..vs.. State of Andhra Pradesh*" whereby and whereunder in paragraph 15, it is observed and held as follows:-

"15. Learned Counsel also placed reliance on another judgment of this Court in Ramesh Kumar v. State of Chhattisgarh (2001) 9 SCC 618. A three-Judge bench of this Court had an occasion to deal with a case of a similar nature. In a dispute between the husband and wife, the appellant husband uttered "your are free to do whatever you wish and go wherever you like". Thereafter, the wife of the appellant Ramesh Kumar committed suicide. The Court in paragraph-20 has examined different shades of the meaning of "instigation". Para 20 reads as under:

"20. Instigation is to goad, urge forward, provoke, incite or encourage to do "an act". To satisfy the requirement of instigation though it is not necessary that actual words must be used to that effect or what constitutes instigation must necessarily and specifically be suggestive of the consequence. Yet a reasonable certainty to incite the consequence must be capable of being spelt out, the present one is not a case where the accused had by his acts or omission or by a continued course of conduct created such circumstances that the deceased was left with no other option except to commit suicide in which case an instigation may have been inferred. A word uttered in the fit of anger or emotion without intending the consequences to actually follow cannot be said to be instigation."

14. Added further, in the aforesaid decision in paragraph-16, it

is observed as follows:-

“16. In State of West Bengal v. Orilal Jaiswal & Another . (1994) 1 SCC 73, this Court has cautioned that the Court should be extremely careful in assessing the facts and circumstances of each case and the evidence adduced in the trial for the purpose of finding whether the cruelty meted out to the victim had in fact induced her to end the life by committing suicide. If it appears to the Court that a victim committing suicide was hypersensitive to ordinary petulance, discord and difference in domestic life quite common to the society to which the victim belonged and such petulance, discord and difference were not expected to induce a similarly circumstanced individual in a given society to commit suicide, the conscience of the Court

should not be satisfied for basing a finding that the accused charged of abetting the offence of suicide should be found guilty.

The Respondent's/Prosecution's Contention:

15. In response, the Learned Additional Public Prosecutor supported the judgment of the trial Court and contends that the trial Court had rightly convicted the Appellant in respect of the offence under Section 306 of IPC and awarded necessary punishment, which may not be displaced by this Court, at this distant point of time, sitting in Appellate Jurisdiction.

16. At this stage, for a fuller and better appreciation of the merits of the case, this Court makes useful reference to the evidence of PW.1 to PW.11, adduced on behalf of the Prosecution.

Summation of Evidence of Prosecution Witnesses:

17. PW.1 (father of the deceased Suseela) in his evidence

(before the trial Court) had deposed that his daughter Suseela was given in marriage two years before occurrence to the Appellant/Accused and his daughter Suseela gave birth to a female child Dharshini and on 04.07.2006 at 4.30 p.m. a phone call came to the nearby house and he was informed that his daughter had fallen down and when he went to the house of the Appellant, he found that his daughter Suseela was lying in Verandah and when he touched her, he found that there was no life on her body and when enquired the Appellant/Accused as to what had happened, he informed that nothing had happened.

18. PW.1 in his evidence had also stated that his son Shankar came after attending the duty at Salem Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Hospital, where he was working as a trainee Doctor, and when he called and enquired with him, he informed him that the Appellant/Accused after returning from his work came to the house in the Afternoon and both the Appellant and his daughter took lunch and the child was given bath. That apart, he had also stated that the Appellant/Accused informed that the house was not cleaned and for

that his daughter informed that after finishing the tailoring work, she would clean the house, for which the Appellant had given two blows to his daughter and later, he had given Ex.P1-Complaint before the police.

19. PW.2 (PW.1's wife and mother of the deceased Suseela) in his evidence had stated that her son, herself and her husband asked the Appellant/Accused as to what had happened and for that, the Appellant/Accused informed that he came to the house for taking his food and at that time when he enquired his wife (Suseela) as to why she had not cleaned the house, she informed that she would clean the house after finishing her tailoring work and when she informed that the tailoring work would have to be done in an urgent manner for which, the Appellant/Accused had beaten her daughter (Suseela) and later, at the time of RDO enquiry, she informed that her daughter Suseela was frequently beat by the Appellant/Accused and her daughter had informed her that instead of living, it was better to die, for which she consoled her.

20. PW.3 (brother of the deceased) in his evidence had stated that on 04.07.2006, when he was on duty at Government Hospital, his father (PW.1) informed him that his sister (Suseela) had died and brought him and he went along with his father to Maniyanoor to the house of his sister, where they went and saw the body of Suseela kept lying and when they asked for the reason, they were informed that she had committed suicide. Further, it is the evidence of PW.3 that subsequently, when they enquired the Appellant/Accused, the Appellant/Accused informed that when he came for the house for taking lunch, he asked his wife Suseela to clean the house, for which his sister replied that after finishing the tailoring work, she will do the work, for which the Appellant/Accused got angry and in anger, he beat his sister. Moreover, he along with his father (PW.1), mother (PW.2), went to police station and gave a police complaint.

21. It is the evidence of PW.4 that his brother's wife name was Suseela and that she was residing near the house of her brother and three years before, she heard a noise during evening in her brother's

house and came out and at that time, there was a group of people, who assembled there and she found that his brother's wife was found hanging in the kitchen.

22. PW.5 (neighbour) in his evidence had stated that the Appellant/Accused was residing opposite to his house and three years before one evening on hearing the noise, he went and saw that the Appellant's wife was found hanging.

23. PW.6 (witness in Ex.P2-Observation Mahazar and Ex.P4-Recovery Mahazar) was treated as "Hostile witness" and he had also stated in his cross examination that it was correct to state that on the day of occurrence he was not in the village.

24. PW.7 (neighbour) in his evidence had deposed that the police had come to the place of occurrence and in Ex.P2-Observation Mahazar, he had signed and the police had seized one Sari in Ex.P4 (Recovery Mahazar) and that two sari pieces were marked as M.O.2

series.

25. PW.8 (Doctor) in his evidence had stated that on 05.07.2006, when he was on duty at Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College Hospital, he received requisition letter at 12.35 p.m., from the Revenue Divisional Officer, Salem, to conduct postmortem on Suseela, aged about 20 years and he along with one Dr.Meera conducted postmortem and the requisition letter was Ex.P5, Postmortem Certificate was Ex.P6 and the final opinion with Forensic Science Report was Ex.P7.

26. PW.8 (Doctor) in Ex.P6-Postmortem Certificate had *inter alia* stated the following in respect of the injuries:-

“An incomplete oblique, ligature mark 3-4 cms width, 20 cms total length over upper part of front and sides of neck above the level of Thyroid Cartilage.

On the Rt side of neck upper border of the

ligature mark was found to be 6 cms below the Rt Mastoid process and on the Lt side of neck the same was found to be 4 cms below the Lt Mastoid Process.

Multiple minute marginal abrasions and echymoses seen scattered over whole length of both upper and lower borders of ligature mark Salivary stain from Rt angle of mouth.

O/d Tissue beneath was pale dry and parchment like

Hyoid bone was found intact. Thyroid Cartilage intact. No any neck contusion. All other neck structures intact. (Antemortem)”

and reserved his opinion pending Chemical Analysis Reports.

27. Also PW.8 (Doctor) in Ex.P6-Postmortem Certificate had observed the following:-

“Multiple incisions made all over the

body. No underlying contusion or fractures.”

28. In fact, PW.8 (Doctor) in his evidence had categorically stated that he had given his final opinion in Ex.P7-Forensic Science Report that Suseela died of asphyxia due to hanging. Furthermore, it is to be noted in Ex.P7-Forensic Science Report it was stated that

- (1) Stomach and its contents
- (2) Intestine and its contents
- (3) Liver and Kidney
- (4) Preservative

articles were examined. But poison was not deducted in any of them.

29. PW.9 (Revenue Divisional Officer) in his evidence had deposed that on 05.07.2006, owing to the death of Suseela, wife of Appellant, he made enquiry with PW.1, PW.2, deceased's mother-in-law Menaka and her husband Obuliraj and Panchayatdars Rajamanickam, Chinnathambi, Vijayakumar and Mohanraj and came to the conclusion that jointly and independently there was no dowry harassment in regard

to the death of the deceased and the Inquest Report submitted by him was Ex.P8 dated 05.07.2006 and the Sub-Divisional Administrative Magistrate cum Revenue Divisional Officer, Salem, Report was Ex.P9.

30. In Ex.P9 Report, it was mentioned that for the death of Suseela, dowry harassment was not the reason.

31. PW.10 (then Assistant Commissioner of Police, Salem Town South) in his evidence had stated that when he was serving as Assistant Commissioner of Police, Salem City South, on 04.07.2006 at about 20 hours, he received the First Information Report in Crime No.1340 of 2006 of Annathanapatty Police Station and took up the investigation and at about 21.00 hours, he went to the scene of occurrence and after inspecting the place of occurrence, examined witnesses Balasubramani, and Sridhar and prepared Ex.P2-Observation Mahazar and Ex.P10-Rough Sketch and later at about 21.45 hours in the presence of Mahazar witnesses, he seized green colour white blue colour, brown colour designed two sari pieces and the same was marked as M.O.1 series and

the Mahazar was also marked as Ex.P4 and later, he examined PW.1, PW.2 and PW.3 and obtained their statements. He examined Sukumar, Jayalakshmi, Mani, Selvam, Balasubramani and Sridhar on 05.07.2006 and recorded their statements.

32. It is significant to note that PW.10 in his evidence had crystal clearly stated that his investigation reveals that the deceased Suseela had not committed suicide because of dowry harassment and only because of the Appellant/Accused scolded, he came to know that she committed suicide and for conducting further investigation he sent the file to the Inspector of Police. Indeed witness Balasubramani had signed in regard to the seizure of two pieces of Sari, which was used by the deceased Suseela.

33. PW.11 (then Inspector of Police) in his evidence had deposed that he had received the written complaint of PW.1 on 04.07.2006 at about 19.30 hours, while he was serving as Inspector of Police at Annathanapatty police station, and registered Ex.P11 - First

Information Report in Crime No.1340 of 2006 under Section 174 of Cr.P.C. Later, he sent the First Information Report to the Assistant Commissioner and Revenue Divisional Officer and also he was assisting the Assistant Commissioner of Police aiding him in investigation. He took up further investigation of the case based on the report of the Assistant Commissioner of Police and on 06.07.2006, he altered the Section to 306 IPC (from Section 174 Cr.P.C) and sent Ex.P12 - Alteration Report to the Court. Furthermore, he arrested the Appellant/Accused on 06.07.2006 at 16.30 hours at Maniyanoor Gandhi Nagar and brought him to the Police Station at 17.00 hours and after conducting physical search on her body, he sent him to judicial custody. Finally he enquired the Doctor, who conducted postmortem on 04.10.2006 and recorded his statement and after obtaining rough Charge Sheet from the Joint Director on 18.07.2007, he lodged the charge sheet before the Court under Section 306 of IPC.

Discussions:

34. It is to be borne in mind that in respect of offence under

Section 306 of IPC, abetment must attract the definition thereof in Section 107 of IPC. As a matter of fact, attempt to commit suicide and abetment to commit suicide are two different offences, which stand on different footings in the considered opinion of this Court. It is to be remembered that before holding an Accused guilty of offence under Section 306 of IPC, the Court of Law is to examine the facts and circumstances of the case and also to assess the evidence adduced before it in order to find out whether cruelty or harassment meted out to the victim (Suseela), wife of the Appellant, had left the latter with no other alternative, but put an end to her life. In cases of alleged abetment of suicide, there must be proof of direct or indirect acts of incitement to the commission of suicide. Only on the allegation of harassment, without there being any positive action proximate to the time of occurrence on the part of the Appellant/Accused which led or compelled the deceased Suseela to commit suicide, conviction in terms of Section 306 of IPC is not sustainable, in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Amalendu Pal ..vs.. State of West Bengal* reported in **2010 (1) SCC 707, 712 (para-12)**.

35. It cannot be forgotten that in order to bring home a case within the four corners of ingredients of Section 306 of IPC, there must be a case of suicide and in the commission of said offence, the person, who is said to have abetted the commission of suicide should have played an active role by an act of instigation or by doing certain act to facilitate the commission of suicide. As such, the act of abetment by the Appellant/Accused charged with the said offence must be proved and established by the Respondent/Prosecution before he could be convicted under Section 306 of IPC.

36. Indeed even the words employed by an Accused or his conduct in public are enough to humiliate the unfortunate deceased and even to drive him/her to commit suicide cannot tantamount to instigation or abetment of commission of suicide, unless it is established that the Accused intended by his acts consequence of a suicide. It is not what the deceased felt. But what is vital is what the Accused 'intended' by his act/conduct, as opined by this Court.

37. At this stage, this Court aptly points out that it is not relevant for Section 306 of IPC whether the cruelty or harassment was caused "soon prior to her death or earlier'. If it was caused 'soon before her death', then Section 304-B of IPC will apply, in the considered opinion of this Court.

38. In order to attract the ingredients of Section 306 of IPC, it is just and necessary to prove that (i) the deceased committed suicide; and (ii) she was subjected to cruelty within the meaning of Section 498 of IPC.

39. Also that the 'abetment of suicide' is confined to the case of individuals, who aid and abet the commission of suicide by the hand of person himself, who commits the suicide.

40. Continuing further, this Court worth recalls and recollects the decision "*A.K.Chaudhary and another ..vs.. State of Gujarat*"

reported in (2006 *Cri.L.J.* 726), wherein it is held that if on account of any abnormal reaction of an employer, the employee committed suicide, it cannot be said as abetment or incitement to commit suicide unless there is direct action by the Accused leaving no option, but to commit suicide.

41. Moreover, the words uttered in a "fit of anger or emotion" without intending the resultant consequences to follow cannot be construed to be an act of instigation, in the considered opinion of this Court.

42. Apart from the above, the abetment of suicide is limited to the case of person, who aid and abet the commission of suicide by the hand of person himself, who commits the suicide. When another person, at the request of or with the consent of the person, who wants to commit the suicide, has killed that person, is guilty of homicide by consent, which is one of the forms of culpable homicide. As to the offence of abetment to commit suicide, Section 113-A of Indian Evidence

Act specifies that '(1) if a married lady commits suicide within seven years of her marriage; (2) if her husband or his relatives had subjected her during her coverture to cruelty within the meaning of the term as defined under Section 498-A of IPC, then the Court may raise presumption that the husband or such relatives of the husband abetted the suicide.

43. At this juncture, this Court extracts Section 113-A of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, which runs as follows:-

“113-A. Presumption as to abetment of suicide by a married woman. -

When the question is whether the commission of suicide by a woman had been abetted by her husband or any relative of her husband and it is shown that she had committed suicide within a period of seven years from the date of her marriage and that her husband or such relative of her husband and subjected her to cruelty,

the Court may presume, having regard to all the other circumstances of the case, that such suicide had been abetted by her husband or by such relative of her husband.

44. In this connection, this Court pertinently points out as to the presumption of abetment to commit suicide dealt with in Section 113-A of Indian Evidence Act, it is applicable when the husband or any relative is guilty of cruelty to the wife, he/she is punishable under Section 498-A of IPC. Suffice it for this Court to point out that the first requisite for attracting the presumption under Section 113-A of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, is that it must be established that the wife was subjected to cruelty as defined in Section 498-A of IPC.

45. As far as the present case is concerned, there was no evidence that the deceased Suseela (wife of the Appellant) was subjected to cruelty as defined in terms of Section 498-A of IPC. In fact, Ex.P9-Revenue Divisional Officer's Report was clearly in favour of the

Appellant/Accused in regard to the fact that he had clearly mentioned that the deceased Suseela had not died due to dowry harassment.

46. In fact a perusal of Ex.P9 - Inquest Report of the Revenue Divisional Officer (under Section 174 Cr.P.C) dated 05.07.2006, unerringly points out that there was no dowry harassment for the death of Suseela and because of the Appellant/Accused on beating and because of his scolding the deceased Suseela had changed her mind and hanged herself and died.

47. Inasmuch as the Appellant/Accused had only scolded the deceased Suseela on the day of occurrence on 04.07.2006 during lunch time, when he came to the house for taking lunch, as to why she had not cleaned the house, for which she replied that she would clean the house only after completing the tailoring work and later in the evening at 4.00 p.m, she had committed suicide by tying the Sari on the hook of the fan, this would show that actually the Appellant/Accused had scolded the deceased Suseela (wife) and beat her without intending the

consequence to actually follow and the act of mere scolding etc., by no stretch of imagination, could not be termed to be instigation, in the considered opinion of this Court. It appears that the deceased Suseela, viz., the wife of the Appellant because of her hypersensitiveness had committed suicide by hanging, as opined by this Court. Also that, merely on the allegation of harassment, conviction in terms of Section 306 of IPC is clearly unsustainable. The word 'abetted' in Section 109 of IPC means the specific offence abetted, as such the offence for abetment, of which a person is charged with the abetment is normally linked with the proved offence. To put it succinctly, in respect of alleged abetment of suicide, there should be a direct proof or evidence or indirect acts of incitement to the commission of suicide. Moreover, the mere fact that the Appellant/ Accused scolded the deceased wife in regard to her non-cleaning of the house and thereby treated her cruelly/harassment was not enough. In fact, she was only disturbed because of the scolding and beating by the Appellant/Accused.

Result:

48. In the light of aforesaid qualitative and quantitative discussions and on an overall assessment of the attendant facts and circumstances of the case in an integral manner, this Court comes to an inevitable conclusion that the Respondent/Prosecution had failed to establish its case and in this regard the contra views taken by the trial Court in holding the Appellant/Accused guilty under Section 306 of the IPC and finding him guilty and resultantly imposing the punishment of three years of Rigorous Imprisonment and also levying the fine of Rs.5,000/- are all clearly unsustainable in the eye of law and consequently, the Criminal Appeal succeeds.

49. In fine, the Criminal Appeal is allowed. Consequently, the conviction and sentence imposed by the trial Court dated 22.06.2009 in S.C.No.174 of 2008 on the file of the Learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Salem, is hereby set aside by this Court for the reasons ascribed in this Appeal. The Appellant/Accused is acquitted in respect of the charge levelled against him under Section 306 of IPC. The bail bond, if any, executed by the Appellant/Accused shall stand cancelled. The trial

Court is directed to refund the fine amount of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees five thousand only) paid by the Appellant.

27.08.2014

Index :Yes/No
Internet :Yes/No
mra

To

1. The Sessions Judge,
Mahila Court,
Salem.
2. Inspector of Police
Annathanapatty Police Station
Salem.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court,
Madras.

M.VENUGOPAL,J

Crl.A.No.412 of 2009

27.08.2014