

**BEFORE THE SESSIONS DIVISION OF  
VELLORE DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU**

**Present:- Thiru.M.Elavarasan**  
Principal Sessions Judge, Vellore

Saturday, the 07<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

**Sessions Case No. 87 of 2025**  
CNR.No.TNVL01-003776-2025

Name of the complainant		State Rep. by Inspector of Police Vellore South L& O Police Station Vellore District Tamil Nadu Cr. No.294 of 2015
Name of the Accused With Address	(i)	A1. Vinoth Kumar, (M-25/2015) Son of Shanmugam, No.15, Ramachari Street, Kosapet, Vellore. Tamil Nadu.
	(ii)	A2. Mani @ Kolakkaramani @ Manikandan, (M-26/2015), Son of Moorthy, No.57/8, Thiruppur Kumaran Street, Salavanpet, Vellore. Tamil Nadu.
Charges of Prosecution	:	u/s 294(b), 342, 307 r/w 34 IPC
Charges Framed by Court	:	A1 - U/s 341, 294(b) and 307 of IPC A2 – U/s 341 and 307 of IPC

Plea of the accused		Not Guilty
Finding of the Judge		Found Not Guilty
Result	:	In the result, the 1 <sup>st</sup> Accused found not guilty of the charges u/s 341, 294(b) and 307 of IPC, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Accused found not guilty of the charges u/s 341 and 307 of IPC and both the accused are acquitted from the charges U/s 235(1) of Cr.P.C.,
Date of Judgment	:	<b>07.03.2026</b>

#### **DETAILS OF CASE SUMMARY :**

The date of filing of the complaint	06.05.2015
The period of Remand of the Accused	A1- Remanded at Judicial Custody on 08.05.2015. A2- PDJ Court Anticipatory Bail Order in Crl.M.P.No.1901/2015, dated 21.05.2015.
The date of filing of the police report in the court	22.07.2025.
The date of committal of the case	24.07.2025.
The date of questioning of the accused under section 228 of Cr.P.C.	16.09.2025.
The filing of all miscellaneous petitions and their result including the results on challenge before superior courts : except routine petitions like petitions under Section 317 of the code	-

Date of examination of the accused U/s.313 of Cr.P.C	26.02.2026.
Details of abscondence of the accused	-
Grant of stay	-

**Date of Examination in – chief and cross examination of witness :-**

Examination of Witnesses		Date of Chief Examination	Date of Cross Examination
PW1	Sarathkumar	16.02.2026	16.02.2026
PW2	Suresh	16.02.2026	16.02.2026
PW3	Srinivasan	16.02.2026	-
PW4	Vijayakumar	16.02.2026	16.02.2026
PW5	Soundar	16.02.2026	16.02.2026
PW6	Prakash	24.02.2026	24.02.2026
PW7	Venkatesan	24.02.2026	24.02.2026
PW8	Chandrukumar	24.02.2026	24.02.2026
PW9	Nagarajan	24.02.2026	24.02.2026

**(Committed by Tr.G. Sathiyakumar, Judicial Magistrate I, Vellore in P.R.C.No.79 of 2025, dated 24.07.2025)**

This case having listed on 02.03.2026 for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru. M.M.Parthiban, Public Prosecutor of this court and, of Thiru.S. Balaji, counsel for the accused 1 and 2 and, upon hearing the arguments of both sides and, upon perusing the material records and, having stood over till this day, this court deliver the following:-

## J U D G M E N T

### **Police Report:-**

#### **1) The case of Prosecution in brief, as set out in the Final Report is as follows :-**

The defacto complainant, Manikandan, is an auto driver. Earlier, he was driving an auto on a hire basis for the 1st accused, and there was already a money dispute between them. Due to the said previous enmity, on 05.05.2015 at about 17.00 hours, while the defacto complainant along with his friend Sarathkumar was proceeding on a two-wheeler towards Murugan Chettiyar General Store near Dinakaran Down, the accused 1 and 2, in furtherance of their common intention, wrongfully restrained him and prevented him from proceeding further beyond the place where he had a right to move.

During the course of the same occurrence, on the said date, time, and place, the accused 1 and 2, in furtherance of their common intention, uttered obscene words against the defacto complainant in a public place by saying, “தேவிடியா பையா, என்னுடைய ஆட்டோவை ஓட்டாமல் வேறு ஒரு ஆட்டோவை ஓட்டுவியா?”, thereby causing annoyance to the defacto complainant and others present there.

Further, during the course of the same transaction, the 2nd accused caught hold of the defacto complainant, while the 1st accused went to the Murugan Chettiyar shop, took a cool drink bottle, broke it, and assaulted the defacto complainant on his left cheek saying, “இதோடு ஒழிந்து போடா”. At the same time, the 2nd accused took the broken bottle from the 1st accused and assaulted the defacto complainant on the right side of his back saying, “இதோடு ஒழிந்து போடா”. Thereby, both the accused voluntarily caused simple injuries to the defacto complainant with such intention and knowledge that, under such circumstances, if by that act they had caused the death of the defacto complainant, they would have been guilty of murder. Hence, the charge.

**Committal :--**

2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Vellore, on receipt of the police report, had taken the case on file as P.R.C.No. 79 of 2025. On appearance of the accused, furnished copies of the relevant records and documents relied on by the prosecution u/s 209 of Cr.P.C. Thereafter, upon perusal of records, the said Judicial Magistrate came to a conclusion that the offences involved in this case is exclusively

triable by the Court of Session and committed the case before this court.

**Charges Framed:-**

3. After committal, the case was taken on file in S.C. No.87 of 2025 on 12.08.2025 by this Court for offences under Sections 294(b), 342 and 307 of the Indian Penal Code. Upon receipt of summons, all the accused appeared before this Court and engaged counsels of their choice. After hearing the learned Public Prosecutor and the learned counsels for the accused, this Court framed charges as follows:-

U/s 341, 294(b) and 307 of IPC	Against A1
U/s 341 and 307 of IPC	Against A2

The charges were read over and explained to the accused persons in Tamil. When the contents of the charges were so read over and explained, the accused denied the same and claimed to be tried.

**Evidence:-**

4. To substantiate the case of the prosecution, PW1 to PW5 witnesses were examined and Ex.P1 to Ex.P7 were marked. Material Object M.O.1 was also marked.

**5. The Evidence let in by in brief by the Prosecution Witnesses:-****a. Evidence of PW1 (Eye witness)**

PW1 Tr.Sarathkumar, deposed evidence stating that he did not know the accused. That about 10 years ago, there existed enmity between the defacto complainant and the 1<sup>st</sup> Accused. But he did not know the subsequent events and he did not know how Manikandan got injured and he did not know anything about the case.

Since PW1 resiled from his earlier statement, she was declared hostile, and at the request of the learned Public Prosecutor, he was cross-examined on the side of the prosecution.

**b. Evidence of PW2 (Hearsay Witness)**

PW2 Tr.Suresh, deposed evidence stating that the defacto complainant / injured Manikandan is his brother in law. He did not know how he got injured. That about 10 years ago, while he was returning to house after completion of his work, group of men were standing and when he went near the place, police enquired him and obtained his name and address and he did not know anything about the case. Since PW2 resiled from his earlier statement, she was declared hostile, and at the request of the learned Public Prosecutor, he was cross-examined on the side of the prosecution.

**c. Evidence of PW3 (Hearsay Witness)**

PW3 Tr.Srinivasan, deposed evidence stating that the defacto complainant / injured Manikandan is his Son. He knows PW1 and PW2. That about 10 years ago, he came to know that his son was assaulted by some persons and he went to the hospital and saw his injured son who was in treatment.

**d. Evidence of PW4 (Hearsay Witness)**

PW4 Tr.Vijayakumar, deposed evidence stating that he knows the accused, but he did not know the defacto complainant and that he did not know anything about the case and the police did not enquire him. Since PW4 also resiled from his earlier statement, she was declared hostile, and at the request of the learned Public Prosecutor, he was cross-examined on the side of the prosecution.

**e. Evidence of PW5 ( Eye Witness)**

PW5 Tr.Soundar, deposed evidence stating that he did not know the accused and he did not know anything about the case. As per the request of the Police, he put signatures.

Since PW5 also resiled from his earlier statement, she was declared hostile, and at the request of the learned Public Prosecutor, he was cross-examined on the side of the prosecution.

**(f). Evidence of Doctor :**

PW6 Dr.Prakash, deposed evidence stating that on 05.05.2015, while he was on duty at Govt. Pentland Hospital, Vellore, at about 5.30 PM, one Manigandan, aged about 24 years, Son of Srinivasan, came for treatment and on enquiry, he stated that he was assaulted by two persons with Glasses at Dinakaran Theatre Road, and on examination, he found a cut injury 10 x 5 cm on his face. He was referred to further treatment to Adukkambarai Govt. Hospital, Vellore. After taking X Ray, CT Scan, he came to know that the injury is simple in nature and in this regard, Accident Register was issued by him and the same is marked as **Ex.P1**.

**(g). Evidence of Mahazar witness :-**

PW7 Tr.Venkatesan, deposed evidence stating that in the year 2015, when he along with one Chandra went through South Police Station, Police called them and obtained their signatures. That the 1<sup>st</sup> signature in the Observation mahazar belongs to him.

Since PW7 also resiled from his earlier statement, she was declared hostile, and at the request of the learned Public Prosecutor, he was cross-examined on the side of the prosecution.

**(h). Evidence of Mahazar witness :-**

PW Tr.Chandru Kumar, deposed evidence stating that he knows PW3, he did not know the accused, he did not know anything about the case. Since PW8 also resiled from his earlier statement, she was declared hostile, and at the request of the learned Public Prosecutor, he was cross-examined on the side of the prosecution.

**(i). Evidence of Investigating Officer**

PW9 Tr.Nagarajan, Inspector of Police, deposed evidence stating that when he was working at Vellore South L&O PS, Special Sub Inspector, Tmt.Varalakshmi, went to Govt. Medical College Hospital, Adukkambarai, obtained complaint statement from the injured Manikandan and the Complaint Statement is **Ex.P2**. Based on the said complaint statement, she registered a case in Cr.No.294 of 2015 U/s 294(b), 342, 307 of IPC and the FIR is marked as **Ex.P3**. Then she placed the records to him and he took the said case for investigation, went to the scene of occurrence and prepared Observation mahazar **Ex.P4** and Rough Sketch **Ex.P6** in front of witnesses. He also seized broken glass pieces from SOC by way of preparing seizure Mahazar **Ex.P5**. Then he enquired the witnesses

Suresh, Manikandan, Sarathkumar, Murugan, Salim, Viji, Soundar, Venkatesan, Chandrukumar and recorded their statements. He submitted the case records to the Court through Form 91. That he arrested the accused on 08.05.2015 at Govt. Vellore Medical College Hospital and subjected him to judicial custody. Then he enquired the Doctor who gave treatment to the injured and obtained Wound Certificate. Then he altered the sections as per Alteration Report **Ex.P7** and filed the final report. He further deposed that the defacto complainant died during the course of investigation. He further deposed that after investigation, he filed the Final Report.

**Point:-**

6. The point for consideration is as to whether the prosecution has able to prove the charges framed against Accused 1 and 2 are proved beyond all reasonable doubts?

7. Heard both sides. Perused material records. Considered the submissions raised by both sides.

**8. Discussion on Evidence Adduced**

In support of its case, the prosecution had cited fifteen witnesses, but examined only nine witnesses. The defacto complainant died pending

investigation. PW1 is the eye witness to the incident. PW2 to PW5 are the hearsay witnesses. PW6 is the Doctor who treated the injured. PW7 and PW8 are the witnesses to the Observation Mahazar, Rough Sketch and Seizure Mahazar. PW9 is the Investigating Officer.

### **9. Submissions of the Prosecution**

The learned Public Prosecutor would submit that the prosecution has clearly established the occurrence through the medical and documentary evidence placed on record. Though some of the witnesses have turned hostile during trial, the evidence of hostile witnesses cannot be rejected in toto and the Court can rely upon the portion of their testimony which supports the prosecution case. It is further contended that the evidence of PW6, the Doctor, coupled with the Accident Register marked as Ex.P1, clearly proves that the injured Manikandan sustained injuries due to an assault. The prosecution would further submit that the complaint statement of the injured marked as Ex.P2 and the FIR marked as Ex.P3 clearly narrate the occurrence and disclose the involvement of the accused in the commission of the offence. The learned Public Prosecutor would also contend that the investigation conducted by PW9 is proper and the

materials collected during the course of investigation, such as Observation Mahazar (Ex.P4), Seizure Mahazar (Ex.P5), Rough Sketch (Ex.P6) and Alteration Report (Ex.P7), corroborate the prosecution case regarding the place of occurrence and the manner in which the offence was committed. It is further argued that merely because some witnesses have turned hostile, the entire prosecution case cannot be discarded, particularly when the medical evidence supports the fact that the injured sustained injuries due to an assault. Therefore, the prosecution would submit that the evidence on record is sufficient to hold that the accused had attacked the injured Manikandan with broken glass pieces and thereby caused injuries to him and hence the accused are liable to be convicted for the offences charged.

#### **10. Submissions of the Defense**

The learned counsel appearing for the accused would contend that the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the charges against the accused beyond reasonable doubt. It is submitted that the alleged occurrence is not supported by any reliable ocular evidence. The prime witness PW1, who was cited as an eye witness to the

occurrence, has not supported the case of the prosecution and has clearly deposed that he does not know the accused and that he does not know how the injured Manikandan sustained injuries. Likewise, PW5, who was also projected as an eye witness, has not supported the prosecution case and has categorically stated that he does not know anything about the occurrence. Therefore, the very foundation of the prosecution case, namely the direct evidence regarding the occurrence, has completely collapsed.

The learned counsel would further submit that several other witnesses including PW2, PW4, PW7 and PW8 have also turned hostile and have not supported the prosecution version in any manner. PW3 is only a hearsay witness who came to know about the incident after the occurrence and his evidence does not advance the prosecution case. It is also contended that the alleged complaint said to have been given by the injured has not been proved in accordance with law and there is no substantive evidence connecting the accused with the alleged offence. The medical evidence of PW6 only proves that the injured sustained a simple injury, but it does not in any way establish that the said injury was caused by the accused. In the absence

of trustworthy ocular evidence and in view of the material witnesses turning hostile, the prosecution has failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Hence, the learned counsel for the accused prayed that the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt and are liable to be acquitted of all the charges.

### **11. Appreciation of Prosecution Case**

The defacto complainant Manikandan was working as an auto driver and he had previously driven an auto on hire basis for the 1st accused. Due to a prior money dispute between them, enmity arose. On 05.05.2015 at about 17.00 hours, while the defacto complainant along with his friend Sarathkumar was proceeding on a two-wheeler towards Murugan Chettiyar General Store near Dinakaran Down, the accused 1 and 2, in furtherance of their common intention, wrongfully restrained the defacto complainant and prevented him from proceeding further. During the course of the occurrence, both the accused abused the defacto complainant in obscene language in a public place by uttering the words “தேவிடியா பையா, என்னுடைய ஆட்டோவை ஒட்டாமல் வேறு ஒரு ஆட்டோவை ஒட்டுவியா?” thereby causing annoyance to him and others present there. It is further alleged

that the 2nd accused caught hold of the defacto complainant while the 1st accused went to Murugan Chettiyar's shop, took a cool drink bottle, broke it and assaulted the defacto complainant on his left cheek uttering the words “இதோடு ஒழிந்து போடா”. Thereafter, the 2nd accused took the broken bottle from the 1st accused and assaulted the defacto complainant on the right side of his back saying “இதோடு ஒழிந்து போடா”. By the said acts, both the accused allegedly caused simple injuries to the defacto complainant with knowledge and intention that, under such circumstances, if death had been caused, they would have been guilty of murder, thereby giving rise to the present charge.

**12. Contents of Complaint (Ex.P1)** The defacto complainant / injured Manikandan died pending investigation. Hence, the eye witness alone has been examined as PW1. The complaint statement given by the defacto complainant is marked as Ex.P3. In the complaint, the recitals runs as follows:

05.05.2015-ந் தேதி மாலை சுமார் 05.00 மணிக்கு நான் வீட்டிலிருந்து கடைக்குப் போக தினகரன் டவுனில் உள்ள முருகன் செட்டியார் பங்க் கடை அருகே சரக்குமார் என்பவர் இருசக்கர வண்டியில் சரக்குமார் ஓட்ட நான் பின்னால்

உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டு போகும்போது எங்களை வழிமடக்கி வினோக்குமார் மற்றும் அவனது நண்பர்கள் கோலக்கார மணி மற்றும் வினோத்தின் நண்பன் மூவரும் சேர்ந்து என்னைப் பார்த்து தெவிடியா பையா என் ஆட்டாவை ஓட்டாமல் வேறொரு ஆட்டோ ஓட்டுவியா என்று திட்டி, கோலக்கார மணி மற்றும் அவனுடன் இருந்தவர் என்னை பிடித்து கொள்ள அப்போது வினோக்குமார் முருகன் பங்க் கடையில் இருந்த கூல்டிரிங்ஸ் பாட்டிலை எடுத்து கீழே தட்டி உடைத்து இத்தோடு ஒழிந்து போடா என்று சொல்லி என் இடது பக்க கன்னத்தில் குத்தினான். நான் கூச்சல் போடவே அதே பாட்டிலால் என் உதடு, கீழ் தாடை, நெற்றியின் நடுவே குத்தி இரத்த காயம் ஏற்படுத்தினான். அவனுடன் இருந்த அவனது நண்பன் அதே உடைந்த பாட்டிலை வாங்கி இத்தோடு ஒழிந்து போடா என்று சொல்லி என் வலது பக்க முதுகில் குத்தினான். அக்கம் பக்கம் உள்ளவர்கள் வரவே மூவரும் அங்கிருந்து ஓடிவிட்டனர். காயம் ஏற்பட்ட என்னை என் மாமா சுரேஷ் தகவல் தெரிந்து வந்து என்னை வேலூர் GPH மருத்துவமனையில் சிகிச்சைக்காக சேர்த்தார். டாக்டர் சிகிச்சை அளித்து மேல்சிகிச்சைக்காக வேலூர் GVMCHக்கு அனுப்பி வைத்தார். அங்கு நான் சிகிச்சையில் இருந்த போது வேலூர் தெற்கு போலிசார் என்னை விசாரிக்க நடந்ததை சொன்னேன் படிக்க கேட்டேன்..

13. Since the defacto complainant himself died, the Complaint has been marked through the Investigating Officer. The Investigating officer had stated that one Special Sub Inspector of Police, namely Varalakshmi went to the Hospital and recorded the said Complaint statement. But she has not been examined as witness. Further, in the Complaint, there is no seal of the hospital and no sign of the Doctor to show that the Complaint statement was obtained in the hospital. Since

the defacto complainant / injured who gave the complaint statement itself died, the prosecution failed to prove the said complaint averments. So, the case has to be relied only upon the remaining witnesses.

#### **14. Burden on the Prosecution**

It is the bounden duty of the prosecution to clearly prove that the accused abused the injured in filthy language and assaulted him using a glass bottle, with the intention and knowledge that such act would result in his death, thereby constituting an offence of attempt to murder him and also criminally intimidated him and that the PW1 eye witnessed the accident. The first charge against the accused 1 and 2 is u/s 294(b) of IPC. PW1 being the eye witness did not spoke anything about the verbal abuse made by the accused . Even though the incident occurred in a public place, the prosecution had examined only one eye witness i.e., PW1. PW1 did not say anything about the fact that the accused abused the injured PW1 in filthy language in public place. In the absence of any specific evidence attracting the ingredients of u/s 294(b) of IPC against the accused, the case of prosecution is not at all made out and the said charge stands unproved.

**15.** As far as the charges u/s 342 and 307 IPC are concerned, the eye witness to the incident Sarathkumar is examined as PW1. PW1 who was cited as an eye witness, has not supported the case of the prosecution. Though he admitted that there was prior enmity between the defacto complainant Manikandan and the first accused about ten years prior to the occurrence, he has categorically deposed that he does not know the accused and that he does not know how the injured Manikandan sustained injuries. Since the injured defacto complainant died, the evidence of eye witness is the main does not help the prosecution to establish the charges.

**16.** Further, as per the evidence of Doctor, he had deposed evidence stating that 05.05.2015 at about 5.30 p.m., the injured Manikandan came for treatment at the Government Pentland Hospital, Vellore, with a cut injury measuring about 10 x 5 cm on his face. The injured informed him that he had been assaulted by two persons with glass pieces at Dinakaran Theatre Road. PW6 has further deposed that the injured was referred to the Government Hospital at Adukkambarai for further treatment and after examination through X-ray and CT Scan, the injury was found to be simple in nature. To speak about the said

facts, the injured died and the only eye witness not supported the case of prosecution. PW2 to PW5 are the hearsay witnesses and even they also not supported the prosecution case. PW6 and PW7 are the witnesses to Observation Mahazar, Rough Sketch and Seizure Mahazar. Both of them have stated that the police obtained their signatures and that they do not know anything about the occurrence.

**17.** PW9 is the Investigating Officer. He has spoken about the registration of the case, investigation conducted by him, preparation of Observation Mahazar (Ex.P4) and Rough Sketch (Ex.P6), seizure of broken glass pieces under Seizure Mahazar (Ex.P5), examination of witnesses and filing of the final report. He has further stated that during the course of investigation the defacto complainant died.

**18.** On a careful consideration of the entire oral and documentary evidence placed on record, this Court finds that the prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. The material witnesses, namely PW1, who was cited as eye witnesses to the occurrence, not supported the prosecution case and clearly stated that he do not know the accused and are unaware of the circumstances under which the injured sustained the injuries.

Likewise, PW2 to PW5, PW7 and PW8 who are the hearsay witness have also turned hostile and have not supported the prosecution version in any manner. Thus, there is no reliable ocular evidence available before this Court to connect the accused with the alleged occurrence. The evidence of the Investigating Officer also does not independently establish the participation of the accused in the commission of the offence. The burden lies heavily on the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt, and the accused are entitled to the benefit of every reasonable doubt. In the present case, in view of the hostile testimony of the material witnesses and the absence of reliable evidence connecting the accused with the alleged offence, this Court is of the considered view that the prosecution has not proved the remaining charges u/s 341 and 307 of IPC against the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Hence, the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt and are liable to be acquitted of the charges leveled against them and thus the Point is answered by holding that the prosecution failed to establish its charges against the accused resulting in the acquittal of the accused from the charges on the ground of benefit of doubt.

**19. In the result,**

- (i) The prosecution has failed to prove the charges against the accused 1 and 2 ;
- (ii) Accordingly, the 1<sup>st</sup> accused found not guilty of the charges U/s.294(b), 341 and 307 of IPC, 2<sup>nd</sup> Accused found not guilty of the charges U/s 341 and 307 of IPC and both the accused are acquitted u/s 235(1) of Cr.P.C. on the ground of benefit of doubt,
- (iii) That the bail bonds executed by the accused 1 and 2 shall stand canceled.
- (iv) That the M.O.1 – Broken Glass Bottle in CP No.11 of 2026 is ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of appeal time.

Dictated to the Steno typist, directly typed by him in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court, on this day the 07<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

**Principal Sessions Judge  
Vellore District**

**ANNEXURE:****1. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON THE SIDE OF THE PROSECUTION:**

PW1	Sarathkumar
PW2	Suresh
PW3	Srinivasan
PW4	Vijayakumar
PW5	Soundar
PW6	Prakash
PW7	Venkatesan
PW8	Chandrukumar
PW9	Nagarajan

**2. For Defence Side:-**

-NIL-
-------

**3. EXHIBITS MARKED ON THE SIDE OF THE PROSECUTION:**

Exh.P1/PW6	05.05.2015.	Accident Register
Exh.P2/PW9	06.05.2015	Complaint
Exh.P3/PW9	06.05.2015	FIR
Exh.P4/PW9	06.05.2015	Observation Mahazar
Exh.P5/PW9	06.05.2015	Seizure Mahazar
Exh.P6/PW9	06.05.2015	Rough Sketch
Exh.P7/PW9	16.10.2015	Alteration Report

**4. Defence Documents :-**

Nil
-----

**5. Material Objects:-**

M.O.1/PW9	Broken Bottle Pieces.
-----------	-----------------------

P S J  
Vlr

Copy to : **(Rules 108 and 115 of Cr.R.P. - 2019)**

1. The Registrar General, High Court of Madras, Chennai – 104.
2. The District Collector, Vellore.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Vellore.
4. The Judicial Magistrate No.1, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police, South L& O PS Station – Through The Public Prosecutor, Principal Sessions Court, Vellore.
6. Spare Copies