

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

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

Monday, the 01st day of June, 2026.

Sessions Case No. 210 of 2025
CNR.No.TNVL-01-006045-2025

Name of the complainant	The State Represented by Inspector of Police Vellore South L & O P.S., Tamil Nadu Cr. No. 11 of 2018.
Name of the Accused With Address	Narasimman, (M-30/2018) S/o Chellamuthu, No.75, S.S.K. Maniyam, Arasamara Steet, Salavanpet, Vellore District, Tamil Nadu.
Charges Framed	U/s 294(b) and 307 of IPC
Plea of the accused	Not Guilty
Finding of the Judge	Found Not Guilty
Court Order	Vide docket Sheet Attached.

DETAILS OF CASE SUMMARY :

The date of filing of the complaint	15.01.2018
The period of Remand of the Accused	Anticipatory Bail Order in Crl.M.P.No.313/2018, dt 28.01.2018
The date of filing of the police report in the court	29.09.2025
The date of committal of the case	13.11.2025

The date of questioning of the accused under section 228 of Cr.P.C.	02.04.2026
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	-NIL-
Date of examination of the accused U/s.313 of Cr.P.C	30.04.2026
Details of abscondence of the accused	--
Grant of stay	Nil

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

Examination of Witnesses		Date of Chief Examination	Date of Cross Examination
PW1	Chellamuthu	29.04.2026	29.04.2026
PW2	Meni Ezhilan	29.04.2026	29.04.2026
PW3	Sagaya Mary	29.04.2026	29.04.2026
PW4	Tamilselvan	29.04.2026	29.04.2026
PW5	Harikrishnan	29.04.2026	29.04.2026
PW6	Loganathan	29.04.2026	29.04.2026

(Committed by Thiru.G.Sathiakumar, Judicial Magistrate-I, Vellore in P.R.C.No.245 of 2025, dated 13.11.2025).

This case having listed on 30.04.2026 for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru M.M.Parthiban, Public Prosecutor of this court and, of Tr. M.Karunagaran, Counsels for the accused, 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 as follows :-

The Accused Narasimman S/o Sellamuthu is residing at Lakshmipuram, Salavanpettai, Vellore. The defacto complainant Sellamuthu is residing at 1st Sadhukaramada Street, Salavanpettai, Vellore. The accused is the Son Sellamuthu. That on 13.01.2018, witness Sellamuthu went of the house to the accused due to the financial crises requested some money for him. The accused who refused to give money to his father Sellamuthu warned him, for not to ask money thereafter. At this juncture, on 14.01.2018, at about 10.30 PM, at S.S.K Maniyam Street, Salavanpettai, opposite to paul Hospital, the accused with an intention to cause the death of his father Sellamuthu came with the knife, uttered an obscene words against him, by saying "ங்கோத்தா, தேவிடியா பையா, நீ எப்பொழுதும் என்னிடம் பணம் கேட்பதால், எனக்கும் என் பொன்டாட்டிக்கும் சண்டை வருகிறது, நீ இருந்தால் எனக்கு தொல்லை தான், நீ இத்தோடு ஒழிந்துப்போடா " and forcibly stabbed on his lower abdomen left leg and left hand with a knife and Voluntarily caused grievous hurt

to him prolapsed bowel perforation over left lumbar region "கத்தியால் குத்தியதால் குடல் ஓட்டை குடல் வெளியே வந்திருந்தது." If he had caused the death of his father Sellamuthu, he would have been guilty of murder. Thereby the accused has committed the offence punishable u/s. 294(b) and 307 of Indian Penal Code.

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. 245 of 2025. On appearance of both 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.210 of 2025 by this Court for offences under Section 294(b) and 307 of IPC of the Indian Penal Code. Upon receipt of summons, 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 against the accused U/s 294(b) and 307 of IPC. The charges were read over and explained to the accused in Tamil. When the contents of the charges were so read over and explained, the accused denied the same and claimed to be tried.

4. Evidence:-

In order to substantiate the case of the prosecution, **PW1 to PW6** were examined and **Ex.P1 to Ex.P7** were marked. **Material Object M.O.1** was also produced before the Court.

5. The evidence adduced by the prosecution witnesses, in brief, is as follows:

(a) Evidence of PW1 – Defacto Complainant

P.W.1 Sellamuthu, the defacto complainant and father of the accused, deposed that he was residing at Salavanpettai, Vellore and was working as a painter. During the Pongal festival he had gone to the house of the accused and requested money for his expenses. Though a quarrel took place, he was under the influence of alcohol and was not aware of the subsequent events. He further deposed that he did not know how he sustained injuries and denied the accused stabbed him with a knife. He admitted his thumb impression in the

complaint marked under Ex.P1 but he did not aware of the contents of the complaint. The police had not examined him. Since he resiled from his earlier statement, he was treated as hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution.

(b) Evidence of PW2 – Hearsay Witness

P.W.2, Meni Ezhilan, the son of P.W.1 and elder brother of the accused. He deposed that he was unaware of any quarrel between the accused and P.W.1 and did not know how P.W.1 sustained injuries. On hearing that his father had suffered injuries, he visited him in the hospital and further deposed that did not know anything regarding the occurrence. Since he resiled from his earlier statement, he was treated as hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution.

(c) Evidence of PW3 – Hearsay Witness

P.W.3 Sagayam Mary, is the wife of P.W.1 and mother of the accused. She deposed that did not know anything regarding the occurrence. According to her, she was informed that her husband had fallen down and sustained injuries and was therefore taken to the hospital. She denied that the accused had stabbed P.W.1 with a knife. As she did not

support the prosecution case, she was treated as hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution.

(d) Evidence of PW4 – Eye Witness

P.W.4 Tamil Selvan, auto driver, deposed that he did not know the accused or the other witnesses examined before him and did not anything with regard to the occurrence. He denied having been examined by the police. He was treated as hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution.

(e) Evidence of PW5 – Eye witness

P.W.5 Harikrishnan, deposed evidence stating that engaged in *pandal* erection work. He deposed that he did not know the accused, his family members or the other witnesses examined in the case. He did not know anything with regard to the occurrence and denied having been examined by the police. Since he resiled from his earlier statement, he was treated as hostile.

(f) Evidence of PW6 – Investigating Officer

P.W.6 Loganathan, the Investigating Officer, was examined. He deposed that while he was serving as Inspector of Police, Vellore

South Police Station, the then Sub-Inspector of Police Selvaraj received information from the Government Hospital and recorded the complaint of Sellamuthu. On the basis of the said complaint, a case in Crime No.11 of 2018 under Sections 294(b) and 307 IPC was registered. P.W.6 further deposed that the said Sub-Inspector Selvaraj had subsequently died. The complaint statement recorded by him was marked as Ex.P2 and the First Information Report registered by him was marked as Ex.P3. Upon registration of the case, the investigation was entrusted to him. In continuation of the investigation, on 15.01.2018 at about 6.45 a.m., he proceeded to the scene of occurrence situated at Salavanpettai and, in the presence of witnesses Manohar and Kiran Kumar, inspected the place of occurrence and prepared an Observation Mahazar and Rough Sketch. The Observation Mahazar was marked as Ex.P4 and the Rough Sketch was marked as Ex.P5. On the same day at about 7.00 a.m., in the presence of the very same witnesses, he recovered a knife found near the EB Transformer situated at Sadhukaramada Street under a Seizure Mahazar. The Seizure Mahazar was marked as Ex.P6 and the knife recovered thereunder was marked as M.O.1.

Thereafter, he examined the witnesses connected with the case, namely Sellamuthu, Meni Ezhilan, Sagayam Mary, Bhaskar, Tamilselvan, Velu, Harikrishnan, Manohar and Kiran Kumar, and recorded their statements separately. Since the accused had obtained anticipatory bail, he was not arrested during the course of investigation. P.W.6 examined Dr. Karimulla, who had treated the injured victim, recorded his statement and obtained the Accident Register relating to the treatment of Sellamuthu. The Accident Register along with the medical opinion issued by the doctor was marked as Ex.P7. According to the doctor, the injuries sustained by Sellamuthu were grievous in nature. He also examined the Sub-Inspector of Police who had registered the case and recorded his statement. Upon completion of investigation P.W.6 concluded that the accused had committed the offences punishable under Sections 294(b) and 307 IPC. Accordingly, he laid the final report before the Court against the accused.

Questioning the Accused under section 315(1)(b) of B.N.S.S. :-

6. After completion of the prosecution side evidence, the incriminating materials available from the records against the accused

was put on him on 30.04.2026 u/s 313(1)(b) of CrPC and explained in Tamil. The accused answer is total denial as false evidence and his answers was recorded. When a question was posed to him as to whether he want to say anything about the case, he replied as “false case”. They further stated that he has no defense evidence.

Point:-

7. The point for consideration is as to whether the prosecution has able to prove the charges framed against the **accused under Sections 294(b) and 307 of IPC are** proved beyond all reasonable doubts?

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

9. Discussion on Evidence Adduced

In support of its case, the prosecution had cited twelve witnesses, but ultimately examined only six witnesses. PW1 is the injured/de facto complainant. PW2 is the son of PW1 and brother of the accused. PW3 is the wife of PW1 and mother of the accused. PW4 and PW5 are the witnesses cited by the prosecution to speak about the occurrence. PW6 is the Inspector of Police who conducted the investigation and filed the Final Report before the Court.

10. Submissions of the Prosecution

The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the accused is the son of PW1 Sellamuthu. On 13.01.2018, due to financial difficulties, PW1 approached the accused seeking money for his expenses. The accused refused to provide money and warned PW1 not to seek money from him thereafter. On account of the said incident, ill-feelings arose between them. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that on 14.01.2018 at about 10.30 p.m., near Paul Hospital, S.S.K. Maniyam Street, Salavanpettai, the accused abused PW1 in filthy language and attacked him with a knife. The accused stabbed PW1 on the abdomen, left leg and left hand causing grievous injuries, including bowel perforation and protrusion of intestine. Based on the complaint given by PW1, a case was registered and after completion of investigation, final report was laid against the accused.

The learned Public Prosecutor would further submit that though PW1 to PW5 did not support the prosecution case, the prosecution has established its case through documentary evidence, medical records and the evidence of PW6, the Investigating Officer. Hence, he prayed that the accused be convicted and punished in accordance with law.

11. Submissions of the Defence:

Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the accused would submit that PW1, who is the injured witness and author of the complaint, has completely disowned the prosecution case. PW1 has categorically stated that the accused did not stab him and that he does not know how he sustained injuries. PW2, PW3, PW4 and PW5 have also not supported the prosecution case and were treated as hostile.

It is further contended that PW6 is only the Investigating Officer and his evidence is purely procedural in nature. When all the material witnesses have turned hostile and there is no substantive evidence connecting the accused with the alleged offence, the prosecution has failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt. Therefore, the accused is entitled to acquittal.

12. Appreciation of Prosecution Case:

It is the case of the prosecution that PW1 Sellamuthu, who is the father of the accused Narasimman and that on 13.01.2018, he approached the accused seeking money for his expenses. The accused refused to provide money and warned PW1 not to ask him for money

thereafter. The further case of prosecution is that on 14.01.2018 at about 10.30 p.m., opposite to Paul Hospital, S.S.K. Maniyam Street, Salavanpettai, the accused abused PW1 in filthy language and attacked him with a knife. That the further case of prosecution is that the accused stabbed PW1 on the lower abdomen, left leg and left hand causing grievous injuries including bowel perforation and protrusion of intestine. It is the further case of prosecution that the accused committed the act with such intention and knowledge that, had death occurred, he would have been guilty of murder. Hence, the accused is liable for offences under Sections 294(b) and 307 IPC.

13. Contents of Complaint

PW1 is the injured witness and the author of the complaint. The complaint is marked as Ex.P1.

In the complaint, PW1 has stated as follows:

நானும் என் மனைவியும் சலவன்பேட்டை பால் ஆஸ்பத்திரி
எதிரில் வாடகை வீட்டில் வசித்து வருகிறோம் எனக்கு
கிடைக்கும் வருமானம் குடும்ப நடத்த முடியாமல் கஷ்டப்பட்டு
வந்தேன் பொங்கல் செலவிற்கு பணம் தேவைப்பட்டதால் நான்
எனது இரண்டாவது மகன் நரசிம்மனிடம் பணம் கேட்க
சலவன்பேட்டை லட்சுமிபுரத்தில் அவரது வீட்டிற்கு சென்று

பணம் கேட்டேன் அப்போது அவள் செலவிற்கு எப்போதும் எங்கிட்டயே பணம் கேட்கிறாய் அண்ணகிட்ட கேட்க வேண்டியது தானே என்று கூறினார் அப்போது எங்கள் இருவருக்கும் வாய் தகராறு ஏற்பட்டது அப்போது நீயும் உன் பொண்டாட்டியும் என்னிடம் பணம் கேட்க கூடாது என்று திட்டி அனுப்பிவிட்டார் நான் வீட்டிற்கு வந்து விட்டேன் நேற்று 14.01.2018 ஆம் தேதி இரவு சுமார் 10.30 மணிக்கு என் வீட்டின் எதிரே உள்ள பால் ஆஸ்பத்திரியிடம் நின்று கொண்டிருந்தேன் அப்போது வந்த என் மகன் நரசிம்மன் கோத்தா தேவிடியா பையா எப்போதும் என்னிடம் பணம் கேட்பதால் எனுக்கும் என் பொண்டாட்டிக்கும் சண்டை வருது நீ இருந்தால் எனக்கு தொல்லை தான் என்று திட்டிக் கொண்டு மறைத்து வைத்திருந்த கத்தியால் இத்தோடு ஒழிந்து போட என்று சொல்லி அடி வயிற்றிலும், இடது கால் மற்றும் இடது கை ஆகிய இடங்களில் குத்தினான், இதில் எனக்கு பலத்த இரத்தகாயம் ஏற்பட்டது அப்போது அங்கு இருந்தவர்கள் சண்டையை விலக்கிவிட்டு 108 ஆம்புலன்ஸிற்கு தகவல் சொல்லி ஆம்புலன்ஸில் ஏற்றுவிட்டார்கள் நான் வேலூர் அடுக்கம்பாறை மருத்துவமனையில் அட்மிட் ஆனேன் சிகிச்சையில் இருந்த என்னை வேலூர் தெற்கு காவல் நிலைய உதவி ஆய்வாளராகிய தாங்கள் என்னை விசாரித்து வாக்குமூலம் பெற்றனர் படித்து காட்ட நான் சொன்னது போல் சரியாக இருந்தது.

14. Evidence of PW1 – Contradictions

Though PW1 had stated in his complaint that the accused abused him in filthy language and stabbed him with a knife causing grievous

injuries, during the course of chief examination, PW1 deposed contrary to the contents of Ex.P1. The relevant portion of his evidence reads as follows:-

"நான் வேலூர் சலவன்பேட்டையில் வசிக்கிறேன். பெயின்டர் தொழில் செய்கிறேன். ஆஜர் எதிரி எனது 2 வது மகன். எதிரியிடம் பொங்கல் சமயத்தில் செலவுக்கு பணம் கேட்டு அவரின் வீட்டுக்கு போயிருந்தேன். அவர் பணம் எதுவும் கொடுக்கவில்லை. சண்டை நடந்தது. ஆனால் நான் போதையில் இருந்ததால் என்ன நடந்தது என்று தெரியவில்லை.

சுமார் 8 வருடங்களுக்கு முன்பு பொங்கல் பண்டிகை அன்று இரவு சுமார் 11.00 மணி அளவில் சலவன்பேட்டை பால் ஹாஸ்பத்திரியிடம் இருந்தபோது எதிரி என்னிடம் சண்டை போடவில்லை. எனக்கு என்ன நடந்தது என்று தெரியவில்லை. நான் மது அருந்தியிருந்தேன். என்னை ஆம்புலன்ஸில் கொண்டு சென்றார்கள். ஆஜர் எதிரி என்னை கத்தியால் குத்தவில்லை."

Thus, PW1 has categorically denied the prosecution allegation that the accused stabbed him. Though he admitted his thumb impression in Ex.P1 complaint, he pleaded ignorance regarding the contents thereof. Therefore, the evidence of PW1 is totally contrary to the contents of Ex.P1 and does not support the prosecution case and hence the

evidence of the injured person / defacto complainant is not helpful to decide the prosecution case.

15. Burden on the Prosecution

Generally, in a criminal case, the burden is always upon the prosecution to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. In the present case, the prosecution alleges that the accused abused PW1 in filthy language and attempted to commit his murder by stabbing him with a knife. Therefore, the burden lies entirely upon the prosecution to establish the identity of the assailant and the overt acts attributed to him.

16. Evidence of PW2

In the present case on hand, PW2 is hearsay witness. Moreover, PW2 is the son of PW1 and brother of the accused. Even though PW2 in his statement had deposed stating that the accused assaulted his father, However, during the course of evidence, PW2 has not supported the prosecution case. His evidence during chief examination runs as follows:-

"என் அப்பாவிடம் எதிரி சண்டை போட்டது தெரியாது. என் அப்பாவுக்கு காயம் எப்படி ஏற்பட்டது என்றும் தெரியாது. என் அப்பாவுக்கு அடிபட்டதாக கேள்விபட்டு மருத்துவமனையில் போய் பார்த்தேன். வேறு எதுவும் வழக்கு பற்றி தெரியாது."

PW2 has expressed complete ignorance regarding the occurrence. Therefore, his evidence is of no assistance to the prosecution.

17. Evidence of PW3

PW3 is the wife of PW1 and mother of the accused. She is also an hearsay witness. Even though PW3 stated in her statement supporting the prosecution case, during chief examination, she deposed as follows:-

"வழக்கு பற்றி எனக்கு எதுவும் தெரியாது. என் கணவர் கீழே விழுந்து அடிபட்டுவிட்டார். அதனால் மருத்துவமனைக்கு அழைத்து சென்றதாக சொன்னார்கள். என் மகன் கத்தியால் குத்தினார் என்று சொல்வது தவறு."

Thus, PW3 has completely disowned the prosecution version and has specifically denied that the accused stabbed PW1.

18. Evidence of PW4 and PW5 : PW4 and PW5 are cited by the prosecution as ocular witnesses. According to the prosecution, they were present near the place of occurrence and had witnessed the

incident. Therefore, they are material witnesses whose evidence would have been crucial in establishing the manner of occurrence and the involvement of the accused. However, during the course of chief examination, PW4 has deposed as follows:-

PW4

"நான் தற்போது சலவன்பேட்டையில் வசிக்கிறேன். ஆட்டோ டிரைவர். ஆஜர் எதிரியை தெரியாது, எனக்கு முன்பு சாட்சி சொன்ன நபர்களையும் தெரியாது. இந்த வழக்கைப்பற்றி தெரியாது. போலீசார் என்னை விசாரிக்கவில்லை."

Likewise, PW5 has deposed as follows:-

"நான் தற்போது வேலபாடியில் வசிக்கிறேன். பந்தல் அமைக்கும் வேலை செய்கிறேன். ஆஜர் எதிரியை தெரியாது. அவர் குடும்பத்தாரையும் தெரியாது. எனக்கு முன்பு சாட்சி சொன்னவர்களையும் தெரியாது. வழக்குபற்றியும் தெரியாது. போலீசார் என்னை விசாரிக்கவில்லை."

Both PW4 and PW5 have expressed complete ignorance regarding the occurrence. They have not identified the accused before the Court. They have further denied having any knowledge regarding the alleged incident and also denied having been examined by the police. Since

their evidence was contrary to their earlier statements, they were treated as hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution.

19. Evidence of PW6

PW6 is the Investigating Officer. He deposed that based upon the complaint recorded from PW1 in the Government Hospital, a case in Crime No.11 of 2018 was registered under Sections 294(b) and 307 IPC. He further spoke about visiting the scene of occurrence, preparation of Observation Mahazar and Rough Sketch, recovery of M.O.1 knife under Ex.P6, examination of witnesses, collection of medical records and filing of final report against the accused. Upon careful consideration of the oral and documentary evidence, this Court finds that the testimonies of PW1 to PW5 do not establish or corroborate the prosecution case. PW1, the injured witness himself, has categorically stated that the accused did not stab him. PW2 and PW3, who are natural witnesses being close family members, have also not supported the prosecution case. PW4 and PW5 have likewise expressed complete ignorance regarding the occurrence.

20. It is true that PW6 has spoken about the investigation and recovery of M.O.1 knife. However, PW6 is not an eyewitness to the

occurrence. His evidence is only procedural in nature. The recovery of M.O.1 cannot by itself establish the guilt of the accused in the absence of substantive evidence connecting the accused with the offence.

21. The medical records may establish that PW1 sustained injuries. However, medical evidence by itself cannot establish the identity of the assailant. Though the doctor is stated to have opined that the injuries are grievous in nature, the prosecution has failed to prove that the said injuries were inflicted by the accused.

22. It is significant to note that the injured witness himself has completely exonerated the accused. Though hostile evidence need not be rejected in toto, there is absolutely no portion of the evidence of PW1 to PW5 which supports the prosecution case. On the contrary, their evidence completely demolishes the prosecution version.

23. In light of the above discussion, this Court concludes that the prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. The essential ingredients of the offences under Sections 294(b) and 307 IPC have not been proved. No incriminating circumstance has been established against the accused and the evidence available on record does not inspire confidence. Therefore,

this Court is constrained to extend the benefit of doubt to the accused. Consequently, the prosecution having failed to prove the charges beyond reasonable doubt, the accused is entitled to acquittal.

24. In the result, this Court holds that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt.

(i) Accordingly, the accused is found not guilty of the offences punishable under Sections 294(b) and 307 IPC and is acquitted under Section 235(1) Cr.P.C.

(ii) The case property in C.P.No.29 of 2026 Knife marked as M.O.1 is ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of the appeal period.

(iii) The bail bond, if any, executed by the accused shall stand cancelled.

Dictated to the Steno typist, directly typed by him in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court, on this day the 01st day of June, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge
Vellore District

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

Prosecution Witness No.	Name of witness Tr/Tmt	Description
1	Chellamuthu	Complainant
2	Meni Ezhilan	Hearsay witness
3	Sagaya Mary	Hearsay witness
4	Tamilselvan	Eye Witness
5	Harikrishnan	Eye Witness
6	Loganathan	Investigating Officer

2. For Defence Side:- Nil**3. EXHIBITS MARKED ON THE SIDE OF THE PROSECUTION:**

Exhibit No.	Date	Description of Exhibit	Proved/ Attested by
1	15.01.2018	Left Thumb impression in complaint	PW1
2	15.01.2018	Complaint	PW6
3	15.01.2018	F.I.R.	PW6
4	15.01.2018	Observation Mahazar	PW6
5	—	Rough Sketch	PW6
6	15.01.2018	Seizure Mahazar	PW6
7	14.01.2018	Accident Register	PW6

4. Defence Documents :-

Nil

5. Material Objects:-

Material Object No.	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by / Attested by
1	Knife	PW6

P S J
Vellore

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.I, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police, Vellore South L & O Police Station
Through The Public Prosecutor, Principal Sessions Court,
Vellore.
6. Spare Copies.