

**IN THE COURT OF I ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE (TADA) AT
CHENNAI**

Present: **Dr.R.Sathya, M.L., Ph., D.,**
I Additional Sessions Judge

Friday, the 10th day of July 2026

Criminal Appeal No.1498/2025
(CNR.No.THCH01-012631-2025)

From which court this appeal is : The X Metropolitan Magistrate,
preferred Egmore, Chennai-8.

Case Number of that Court : C.C.No.2190/2024

Name and Description of the Appellant/ Accused : Anjalai, F/50 years,
W/o.Muthu,
No.21/42, 5th Street, Narasima
Nagar, Puliyanthope, Chennai-12.

Name and address of the Respondent/ Complainant : The State,
Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-1, Puliyanthope Police Station,
Chennai District.

Charge framed against the accused : Under section 294(b), 386, 506(i) of
IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu
Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant
Interest Act 2003.

Order passed by the Trial Court : The trial court found the accused
guilty under section 294(b), 386,
506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil
Nadu Prohibition of Charging
Exorbitant Interest Act 2003 and
sentenced him to undergo 3 months
Simple Imprisonment and to pay a
fine of Rs.1000/-, i/d., to undergo one
month Simple Imprisonment for the
offence u/s.294(b) of IPC; to undergo

2 years Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.2000/-, i/d., to undergo two months Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.386 of IPC; to undergo 2 years Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.506(ii) of IPC and to undergo 2 years Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/-, i/d., to undergo three months Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003.

Findings in the Appellate Court. : In the result, (i) This Criminal Appeal Whether modified, confirmed or Reversed and if modified, the Modification is allowed. (ii) The Judgment of conviction and sentence passed by the Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in C.C. No.2190/2024 dated 09.12.2025 is set aside. (iii) The Appellant/accused is found not guilty under Section 294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003 and set at liberty. (iv) The bail bond executed by the appellant/accused shall stand cancelled.

Date of Final Hearing : 08.07.2026

Date of Judgment : 10.07.2026

This criminal appeal came up before me for final hearing on 08.07.2026 in the presence of M/s.P.Muthamizh Selvakumar, A.Esakupandy, V.G.Nishok and A.Aravindraj, Counsel for the appellant and of Mr.A.Govindarajan, Additional City Public Prosecutor for the state, upon hearing both side arguments and upon perusing the grounds of appeals, Judgment of the trial court, other connected materials, evidence, documents on record and the written arguments filed by the appellant and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivered the following:

J U D G M E N T

This Criminal Appeal has been preferred by the appellant/accused against the Judgment of conviction and sentence passed by the Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in C.C.No.2190/2024 dated 09.12.2025.

2. The accused before the trial court is the Appellant and the complainant is the Respondent in the appeal. The Trial court after full-fledged trial has found the accused guilty for the offences under section 294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003 and sentenced him to undergo 3 months Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/-, i/d., to undergo one month Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.294(b) of IPC; to undergo 2 years Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.2000/-, i/d., to undergo two months Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.386 of IPC; to undergo 2 years Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.506(ii) of IPC and to

undergo 2 years Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/-, i/d., to undergo three months Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003.

3. The gist of the prosecution case is as follows :-

The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant borrowed a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- on 10.11.2023 and a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- on 18.12.2023, totally a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- from the accused with interest at the rate of 40% per month. The defacto complainant had paid a sum of Rs.1,60,000/- per month as interest upto five months and due to his family situation, the defacto complainant could not pay the interest and hence on 14.05.2024 at 8.00 p.m. the accused had engaged three rowdy elements and they had come to the defacto complainant's house armed with knife and they had abused the defacto complainant with filthy words and also threatened the defaco complainant showing the knife and assaulted using hands and subsequently on 18.05.2024 morning around 10.00 a.m., the accused had called the wife of the defacto complainant through phone and had abused her using filthy language and had criminal intimidated her and the accused has obtained exorbitant interest at 40% and thereby the accused had committed an offence punishable under Section 294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003.

4. During trial, on the side of the complainant, PW1 to PW6 were examined and Ex.P1 to P6, M.O1 were marked. On the side of the accused, no oral and

documentary evidence produced. After hearing the arguments on both sides and upon perusing the material records, the Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai has found the accused guilty for the offence u/s. 294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003 vide his Judgment dated 09.12.2025 convicted and sentenced him and directed the accused to pay the fine as mentioned above. Aggrieved over the said order, the appellant/accused has preferred this appeal on the following grounds.

5. Grounds of appeal :-

That the trial court failed to appreciate the defence raised by the appellant and not given the weight to the defence raised by the appellants. That the trial court mechanically came to the conclusion that the prosecution proved the offence beyond reasonable doubt and not given the benefit of doubt to the appellants. That the trial court ought to have noted that the foundation of criminal justice system should not shifted on the shoulder of defence. That the trial court failed to note that PW1, PW2 are interested witnesses and supported the version of the prosecution obviously PW1 is the complainant and PW2 is the wife of the complainant and therefore there is probable chance to give similar evidences before this court. That the trial court ought to have noted that PW6 is a official witness and except PW1, PW2 no other independent witness were examined and produced. That the trial court had considered the discrepancy in the witnesses of PW1, PW2. That the trial court failed to note that the voice analysis has not been marked but the trial court had come to a conclusion that on the sole testimony of

the voice records it is sustainable in the eye of law. The standard of proof in a criminal trial is proof beyond reasonable doubt because the right to personal liberty of a citizen can never be taken away by the standard of preponderance of probability. Therefore prays to set aside the Judgment of conviction and sentence passed by the trial court in C.C.No.2190 of 2024 dated 09.12.2025.

6. Now, the **point for consideration** in this appeal is

Whether the trial court is right in convicting the appellant/ accused u/s.294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003?

7. **On point:**

The unsuccessful accused before the trial court in C.C.No.2190/2024 is the appellant herein. The respondent is the complainant before the trial court. The parties are hereinafter referred according to their status in the trial court. Heard the appellant/accused oral arguments. Written arguments filed by appellant/accused perused. Heard the CPP arguments.

8. The accused/appellant herein was facing charges u/s.294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003. After full fledged trial, the trial court convicted the accused for the offences punishable u/s.294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003 and convicted and sentenced to undergo 3 months Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/-, i/d., to undergo one month Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.294(b) of IPC; to undergo 2 years

Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.2000/-, i/d., to undergo two months Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.386 of IPC; to undergo 2 years Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.506(ii) of IPC and to undergo 2 years Simple Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/-, i/d., to undergo three months Simple Imprisonment for the offence u/s.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003.

9. Aggrieved over the above said Judgment, the accused has preferred the present appeal. It is the case of the prosecution that the defacto complainant/PW1 had on 10.11.2023 and on 18.12.2023 had borrowed a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- each totalling Rs.4,00,000/- from the appellant/accused and the accused had taken interest at 40% p.m. for five months to the tune totalling Rs.8,00,000/- and further had on 14.05.2024 alleging that the defaco complainant has to repay a sum of Rs.9,50,000/- had come along with 3 rowdy elements nearby the house of the defacto complainant at around 8.00 p.m. in the night armed with knives and had abused PW1 using obscene language and assaulted the defacto complainant and subsequently on 18.05.2024 morning at around 10.00 a.m the appellant/accused had called the defacto complainant wife PW2 through phone and scolded her using obscene language and also criminally intimidated her with dire consequences. Thus, the accused has committed the offences punishable u/s.294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003.

10. The trial court had taken cognizance of the case on its file and issued summons to the accused. Thereafter the accused had appeared before the trial court

on 10.07.2025 and free copies were furnished to her and the substance of accusation was read over to her and explained and questioned on 16.07.2025 and she denied the same as false and not guilty and hence trial was ordered. During the trial, the prosecution had examined PW1 to PW6 witnesses and marked Ex.P1 to P6 to substantiate the charge against the accused.

11. PW1 is the defacto complainant/victim. PW2 is the wife of PW1 and victim and PW3 is the witness to the Observation Mahazar and PW4 and PW5 are the witnesses to the confession and PW6 is the Inspector of Police who had received the complaint, registered FIR., conducted investigation and laid charge sheet against the accused. Among the above said witnesses, PW4 and PW5 turned hostile.

12. The bone of contention of the appellant/accused is that the trial court had miserably failed to appreciate, consider the serious discrepancy in the evidences of PW1, PW2 and PW6 with regard to the occurrence on 14.05.2024, 15.05.2024 and that the trial court had not appreciated with regard to the delay in lodging the complaint, and PW1 and PW2 had not deposed with regard to any specific obscene words uttered by the accused and the pendrive marked as MO1 had been relied upon by the trial court without a 65B of Indian Evidence Act Certificate and no independent witnesses were examined to prove the occurrence on 14.05.2024.

13. Firstly, according to the prosecution case, PW1 had borrowed a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- in total from the appellant/accused on two different dates and though had paid interest at 40% per month for 5 months at the rate of Rs.1,60,000/-

totalling Rs.8,00,000/- the appellant/accused had along with rowdy elements on 14.05.2024 come nearby the house of PW1 and scolded PW1 using obscene language and criminally intimidated him using a knife and subsequently on 18.05.2024 the appellant/accused had through phone had scolded PW2 using obscene language and had criminally intimidated her with dire consequences and that the complaint was lodged by PW1 on 22.05.2024 before the respondent police. On perusal of Ex.P1 the complaint lodged by PW1, the same has been lodged before the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Pulianthope Range on 22.05.2024 and the same has been forwarded to the Inspector of Police, Pulianthope on 23.05.2024. On perusal of the evidence of PW1 it is his evidence that he had lodged the complaint before the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Pulianthope. In this regard, PW6 Investigating Officer has been cross examined and it is his evidence is that for the occurrence dated 14.05.2024 and 18.05.2024 the complaint has been lodged only on 23.05.2024 and the delay in lodging the complaint has not been explained in the FIR. PW1 the defacto complainant had also not stated any reason for the delay in lodging the complaint and the trial court had not made observation with regard to the non explanation by the prosecution regarding the inordinate delay in lodging the complaint and the reason as to why PW1 had not lodged complaint before the jurisdiction police station.

14. Secondly, according to the prosecution case on 14.05.2024 the appellant/accused along with three rowdy elements had come nearby the house of PW1 and scolded PW1 using obscene language showing the knife had threatened

PW1 the defaco complainant with dire consequences and that on 18.05.2024 morning at around 8.00 p.m the appellant/accused had called PW2 through phone and had scolded her using obscene languages and had criminally intimidated her, thereby committed the offence u/s.506(ii) of IPC. So far as the first incident on 14.05.2024 is concerned PW1 the complainant during his chief examination had stated that the accused had come along with rowdy elements and showing a knife had criminally intimidated him apart from threatening him that his son would be changed as a third gender and that had also beaten his wife and torn her clothes and it is the evidence of PW2 the wife during her chief examination had stated that the appellant/accused had twice beaten her husband and had brought rowdy elements and threatened her husband and her child apart from threatening that her son would be changed as a third gender but per contra, it is the evidence of PW2 during her cross examination that the accused had beaten her twice and she had not lodged any complaint regarding the same. With regard to the appellant/accused along with rowdy elements threatening PW1 and his son and beating his wife PW2. PW6 the Investigating Officer had been questioned during cross-examination and his evidence is that with regard to the alleged threat by the rowdy elements on 14.05.2024 during his investigation he was not able to find out the said persons. The prosecution had neither identified the rowdy elements nor seized any weapons and it is the evidence of PW2 that no complaint was lodged with regard to the same and no eyewitnesses/neighbours of PW1 were examined. Hence considering the evidence of PW1, PW2 and PW6 this court is of the considered view that the

occurrence nearby the house of PW1 on 14.05.2024 has not been proved by the prosecution. With regard to the charge as against the appellant/accused u/s.506(ii) of IPC on perusal of the evidence of PW1 during chief examination he had not deposed anything with regard to the appellant/accused criminally intimidating PW2 over phone on 18.05.2024. Further PW2 had also during her chief examination only stated that the appellant/accused had called her over phone and scolded her using obscene language and had not stated anything with regard to the criminal intimidation by the appellant/accused. PW1 and PW2 having not deposed regarding the criminal intimidation by the appellant/accused. This court is of the considered view that the prosecution has not proved that the appellant/accused had on 18.05.2024 criminally intimidated PW2 through phone with dire consequences.

15. Thirdly, according to the prosecution on 14.05.2024 the appellant/accused along with three rowdy elements at around 8.00 p.m near the house of PW1 had used obscene languages and scolded PW1 apart from criminally intimidating him using a knife thereby committing an offence punishable u/s.294(b) of IPC. In this regard, on perusal of Ex.P1 the complaint it reads as follows:-

“ கடந்த 14.05.2024 அன்று 3 ரவுடிகள் இரவு சுமார் 8.00 மணி அளவில் எனது வீட்டிற்கு வந்து பெரிய, பெரிய பட்டாக்கத்திகளை காட்டி ஒத்தா தேவிடியா பையா பணத்தை தர மாட்டாயா என மிரட்டி கத்தியை எடுத்து என்னை குத்தவது போல் பாவல செய்தனர்.”

On perusal of the evidence of PW1 and PW2, they have not deposed anything with regard to the use of obscene language by the appellant/accused in a public place to the annoyance of others. No other evidence has been let in by the prosecution to prove that the appellant/accused had come along with 3 rowdy elements and scolded PW1 using obscene language on 14.05.2024. The prosecution must prove all the essential ingredients of u/s.294(b) of IPC (i.e.,) the actual words should be proved through witness testimony; the words were uttered in a public place and the act caused annoyance to others and prosecution must establish that the words satisfy the legal test of obscenity rather than merely being offensive. In the absence of the evidence of PW1, PW2 with regard to the exact words uttered and no independent witnesses being examined and no evidence to show that the public were actually annoyed by the conduct of the appellant/accused. This court is of the considered view that the charge u/s.294(b) of IPC as against the appellant/accused has not been proved by the prosecution.

16. Fourthly, according to the prosecution the appellant/accused had apart from receiving a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- from PW1 had further threatened PW1 to pay a sum of Rs.9,50,000/- and had claimed 40% interest per month to the tune of Rs.1,60,000/- and had grabbed a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- totally thereby committing the offence u/s.386 of IPC and Sec.4 of the Exorbitant Interest Act. On perusal of the evidence of PW1 it is the evidence in chief that the appellant/accused had threatened the complainant to repay the principal amount also and during his cross examination it is his evidence as follows:

“ எதிரி இந்த புகாருக்கு முன்பாக இரண்டு மூன்று முறை என்னிடம் கந்து வட்டி கேட்டு மிரட்டிய நபர் என்பது சம்பந்தமாக புகார் ஏதுவும் கொடுத்தேனா என்றால் இல்லை. எதிரியிடம் பணம் வாங்கும்போது வட்டி எவ்வளவு என்று தெரிந்து கொண்டு தான் பணம் வாங்கினேன் என்றால் சரிதான். பணம் வாங்கும்போது வட்டி அதிகமாக உள்ளது என்று பணம் வேண்டாம் என நான் மறுத்தது இல்லை என்றால் அடுத்த மாதம் தான் வட்டி எவ்வளவு என்று சொன்னார். பணம் வாங்கி அடுத்த மாதம் வட்டி அதிகம் என தெரிந்த பின்னர் புகார் ஏதுவும் கொடுத்தேனா என்றால் இல்லை. போனில் மிரட்டியதால் நான் பணம் கொடுத்துக்கொண்டிருந்தேன்.”

PW2 the wife of PW1 had also stated that the appellant/accused had threatened them to repay the principal eventhough the interest at 40% was paid to the appellant/accused but PW2 during her cross examination had stated as follows:

“ எனது கணவர் பெரியமேட்டில் தோல் வியாபாரம் செய்து வருகிறார். அவர் கம்பெனியாக நடத்தி வருகிறார். மாதம் எவ்வளவு வருமானம் என்று தெரியாது. வட்டி கொடுத்ததற்கு ரசீது ஏதுவும் வைத்துள்ளேனா என்றால் இல்லை. தொகையை கையில் தான் கொடுத்தார்.”

17. In this regard, on perusal of the trial court's records, with regard to the money transaction no proof has been filed and it is the evidence of PW1 and PW2 also that there is no proof to show that they had paid an interest at 40% for five months. Further it is the admission of PW1 that he had not lodged any complaint earlier regarding the appellant/accused claiming exorbitant interest. The trial Judge

had mainly relied on the CD marked as MO1 produced by the prosecution. According to the prosecution PW1 had recorded the audio call made by the appellant/accused in PW2 phone and same was handed over to the Investigating Officer which has been marked as MO1 through PW6. It is the evidence of PW1 the complainant in chief that he had not handed over the phone (or) copied the contents in PW2 phone and handed over to the Investigating Officer whereas PW2 had stated that PW1 had copied the voice from her phone and handed over to Investigating Officer. When such is the case the prosecution had failed to mark the C.D. through Pw1 (or) PW2 and the court had also omitted to take note of Sec.59 and 65A of Indian Evidence Act dealing with the admissibility of Electronic Record. As per Sec.59 of Indian Evidence Act, the contents of a document or electronic record cannot ordinarily be proved by oral statements. They must be proved by producing the document itself or by admissible secondary evidence as permitted by the Act and as per Sec.65A of Indian Evidence Act the contents of electronic records may be proved in accordance with the provisions of Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act. In this regard, the counsel for the appellant/accused relied upon the citation in **2014(10) SCC 473** in the case of **Anvar P.V. Vs. P.K.Basheer and others**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held that

“ 22. An electronic record by way of secondary evidence shall not be admitted in evidence unless the requirements under Section 65B are satisfied. Thus, in the case of CD, VCD, chip, etc., the same shall be accompanied by the certificate in terms of Section 65-B obtained at the

time of taking the document, without which the secondary evidence pertaining to that electronic record, is inadmissible.”

18. Further the counsel had relied on the Judgment in **2026 SCC online SC 344** in the case of **Pooranmal Vs. State of Rajasthan and another**, wherein it has been held that

" 52. Admittedly, in the present case, the certificate under Section 65-B of the Evidence Act (Section 63 of the BSA) was not proved by the prosecution. In the absence of the certificate, mandatorily required under Section 65-B of the Evidence Act (Section 63 of the BSA), the call detail records become inadmissible in evidence and cannot be relied upon to support the prosecution's case."

19. The voice copied through CD has not been sent to the forensic lab for voice test and in the absence of 65B Certificate accompanying MOI it is inadmissible in evidence and cannot be relied upon to support the prosecution case. Further the call details and C.D.R has not been obtained to prove from which number the call was made to which number and to whom the said cell number belonged to.

20. Further the trial court had relied on the confession of the accused to convict the accused and as per Sec.26 of the Indian Evidence Act confession to police while in custody unless made in the immediate presence of the Magistrate shall not be proved as against such person and an extra judicial confession is always surrounded by suspicious circumstances. In this regard, the counsel for the

appellant/accused relied on the Judgments in (2010) 3 Supreme Court Cases 56 and 1995 Supp (4) Supreme Court Cases 259.

In **(2010) 3 Supreme Court Cases 56**, in the case of **Vikram Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab**, wherein it has been held that

" 26. Confession by accused while in custody of police not to be proved against him - No confession made by any person whilst he is in the custody of a police officer, unless it be made in the immediate presence of a Magistrate, shall be proved as against such person."

By this section, a confession made by a person who is in custody is declared not provable unless it is made in the immediate presence of a Magistrate. Whereas Section 25 prohibits proof of a confession made by a person to a police officer whether or not at the time of making the confession, he was in custody, Section 26 prohibits proof of a confession by a person in custody made to any person unless the confession is made in the immediate presence of a Magistrate."

In **1995 Supp (4) Supreme Court Cases 259**, in the case of **Balwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab**, wherein it has been held that

" (ii). Extrajudicial confession

10. An extrajudicial confession by its very nature is rather a weak type of evidence and requires appreciation with a great deal of care and caution. Where an extrajudicial confession is surrounded by suspicious circumstances, its credibility becomes doubtful and it loses its importance. The courts generally look for independent reliable corroboration before placing any reliance upon an extrajudicial confession."

21. Further PW4 and PW5 the witness to the confession statement have turned hostile and in the absence of independent reliable witnesses the confession cannot be taken to convict the accused. Hence this court is of the considered view that the prosecution has not proved the charge u/s.386 of IPC and Sec.4 of Exorbitant Interest Act as against the accused.

22. Therefore, in view of the discussion earlier, this court finds that there are sufficient and valid grounds to interfere with the findings of the trial court. The prosecution has failed to prove the charges framed against the accused beyond reasonable doubts. Therefore this court holds that the accused is entitled to the benefit of doubt and point is answered accordingly.

23. From the above analysis, the Judgment of conviction passed by the trial court in C.C.No.2190/2024 dated 09.12.2025 warrants interference by this court. Therefore, the appeal preferred by the accused is liable to be allowed and resultantly, the Judgment of conviction and sentence passed against the appellant/accused in C.C.No.2190/2024 dated 09.12.2025 is liable to be set aside and the appellant/accused is entitled for acquittal from the charges levelled against him under Section 294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003.

In the result,

- (i) This Criminal Appeal is allowed.
- (ii) The Judgment of conviction and sentence passed by the Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in C.C.No.2190/2024 dated 09.12.2025 is set aside.
- (iii) The Appellant/accused is found not guilty under Section 294(b), 386, 506(i) of IPC r/w. Sec.4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act 2003 and set at liberty.
- (iv) The bail bond executed by the appellant/accused shall stand cancelled.

This Judgment has been directly dictated by me to the stenographer, transcribed and computerized by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court this the 10th day of July 2026.

Sd/- (Dr.R.SATHYA)
I Additional Sessions Judge,
City Civil Court, Chennai.

Copy to:

The X Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore, Chennai (with trial Court's bundle).

Fair copy of
Judgment
in
C.A.No.1498/2025
Dated: 10.07.2026
I Additional Sessions Court, City
Civil Court, Chennai.