

TNVR020051442024

Judgement Reserved on : 02.03.2026

Judgement Pronounced on : 09.03.2026



**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, FAST TRACK COURT,
SRIVILLIPUTTUR.**

**Present: Thiru. R. Sundara Kamesh Marthandan, M.L.,
Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Srivilliputtur.**

Monday, on the 9th day of March 2026

S.T.C. No. 1380 of 2024

K. Sivakumar

...Complainant

-vs-

K. Rajendran

... Accused

1.	S.T.C.No. 1380 of 2024	
2.	Offence	Under Section 138 of Negotiable Instrument Act
Description of the Accused		
3.	Name	K. Rajendran
4.	Accused's Father's name	Koneri Chettiyar
5.	Occupation	Business
6.	Address	No. 23A/174, Velmurugan Nadar Street, Mamsapuram, Srivilliputhur Taluk, Virudhunagar District.
7.	Age	65/2026
Date of		
8.	Occurrence	06.12.2024
9.	Complaint	16.12.2024
10.	Apprehension	Nil
11.	Released on Bail	Not Applicable

12.	Commitment	Not Applicable		
13.	Commencement of Trial	27.05.2025		
14.	Closure of Trial	12.02.2026		
15.	Sentence or Order	Conviction		
16.	Service of Copy of Judgement or Finding on Accused	Yes		
17.	Period of Remand of the Accused	Nil		
18.	Date of Filing of the Final Report/ Complaint	16.12.2024 (Complaint)		
19.	Date of Questioning under Sections 240, 246 & 251 Cr.P.C.	22.05.2025		
20.	Miscellaneous Petitions and their Results	M.P.No. 3 of 2025 U/s. 70(2) Cr.P.C., was allowed on 08.04.2025. Crl.M.P.No.1260 of 2025 U/s. 315 of Cr.P.C., was allowed on 25.09.2025. Crl.M.P.No. 1552 of 2025, U/s. 254 (2) of Cr.P.C., was allowed on 15.12.2025.		
21.	Date of Examination in Chief and Cross:	P.W's	Chief	Cross
		PW1	27.05.2025	01.07.2025
		D.W's	Chief	Cross
		DW1	15.10.2025	06.11.2025
		DW2	12.02.2026	12.02.2026
22.	Date of Examination of Accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C.	21.08.2025		
23.	Details of Abscondence of Accused and his Appearance/ Production	From 13.02.2025 to 08.04.2025, Bailable Warrant Pending		
24.	Grant of Stay by Superior Court and the results thereof.	Nil		
25.	Explanation of Delay	The above Complaint was filed on 16.12.2024 on the file of this Court. The		

Affidavit filed along with the Complaint was treated as Sworn and Cognizance of the offence was taken on 19.12.2024 and numbered as S.T.C. No. 1380 of 2024 and summons was issued to the Accused. Upon receipt of summons, the Accused had not appeared, hence Bailable Warrant was issued. Thereafter upon the surrender of Accused, the Warrant issued against him was Cancelled. Upon appearance of Accused and Upon furnishing copies to the Accused, Preliminary Questioning was done on 22.05.2025. PW1 was examined in Chief on 27.05.2025 and Cross examined on 01.07.2025. The Accused was Questioned under Section 313 Code of Criminal Procedure. The Accused examined himself as DW1 in Chief on 15.10.2025 and Cross examined on 06.11.2025. The Accused examined the Superintendent, Agricultural Products Marketing and Regulatory Authority Watrap Mrs. Subbulakshmi as DW2 in Chief and Cross on 12.02.2026. After Closure of Defence Evidence and upon hearing the Arguments on both sides, the Judgement is pronounced today.

This Case came up before this Court on 02.03.2026. Advocates M/s. S. Duraisaravanan, N. Palanivelrajan & K. Vijayalakshmi, for the Complainant. Advocates M/s. P. Kannan & V. Ganesan, for the Accused. Upon hearing both side Arguments and Upon perusing the case records and stood over for consideration, till date, this Court delivers the following:

JUDGEMENT

1. The Complainant had filed the above Complaint under Section 200 of Code of Criminal Procedure Read with Section 142 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 for offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, seeking Judgement

to Punish the Accused and to award the Cheque Amount as Compensation, to the Complainant, under Section 357 of Code of Criminal Procedure.

2. The Complainant had stated that the Complainant is doing Paddy Cultivation and Harvest, as his Prime work and that one Manoharan son of Muthaiah of Maharajapuram, was doing paddy business. Because of that, the Accused had several times, purchased Paddy, from the Complainant and had been paying the amount. In such circumstances, on 10.10.2024, the Accused approached the Complainant and wanted Hundred bags of Paddy. On the same day, the Sale Price per Bag of Paddy was fixed at Rs.2,000/- (Rupees Two Thousand Only). On the same day, in the vehicle and through the men, brought by the Accused, the Paddy was weighed and One Hundred Paddy bags were taken by the Accused.

3. While purchase, instead of Cash, the Accused issued Cheque dated 30.10.2024 bearing No. 360519 drawn on Canara Bank, Rajapalayam Branch. When the Complainant told that, he will sell Paddy, only for Cash and that he will not sell Paddy on credit and that he will not collect the Cheque, the Accused told that there is money receivable by him and that he will get that amount on 29.10.2024 and wanted the Complainant to present the Cheque after 30.10.2024. The Complainant believed the same and in view of the Trust, the Complainant had, he received Cheque from the Accused and sold Paddy to the Accused. On 02.11.2024, the Complainant presented the said Cheque in his bank namely, State Bank of India, Watrap Branch. The said Cheque

got returned dishonoured for the reason "Funds Insufficient". The same caused shock and mental agony to the Complainant. The Accused had issued the Cheque, with malafide intent, to defraud the Complainant.

4. On 18.11.2024, the Complainant issued Legal Notice, calling upon the Accused to pay the Cheque amount of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only). The Accused had received the same on 20.11.2024, till the date of filing of the Complaint, the Accused had not issued any Reply and had not paid the said sum of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only). The Accused knowing well that, he do not have sufficient funds in his bank account, had issued the Cheque and thereby the Accused had committed, offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act. Hence the above Complaint.

5. Upon taking the Affidavit, filed along with the Complaint, as Sworn Statement and Cognizance of Offence under Section 138 of Negotiable Instrument Act 1881 was taken and the case was taken on file and summons was issued to the Accused. Upon the appearance of Accused, Copy of Complaint was furnished. Preliminary Questioning was done. As the Accused denied the accusation, the Complainant was called upon to prove his case.

6. The Point for consideration is whether the Complainant had proved the accusation, made against the Accused, beyond all reasonable doubts?.

7. The Complainant examined himself as PW1 and exhibited Ex.P1 to P4. The Accused was questioned under Section 313 Cr.P.C. The Accused examined himself as DW1. Through him Ex.D1 was marked. The Accused examined the Superintendent, Agricultural Products Marketing and Regulatory Authority, Watrap, Mrs. Subbulakshmi as DW2. Through her Ex.X1 was marked.

8. Ex.P1 is the Photocopy of Complainant's Aadhaar Card bearing No.3980 1208 9427. Ex.P2 is the Cheque dated 30.10.2024 bearing No.360519 drawn on Canara Bank, Rajapalayam Branch, Savings Account bearing No. 0957101023998, for Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) in favour of the Complainant. Ex.P3 is the Return Memo dated 02.11.2024 issued by State Bank of India, Watrap Branch, informing that Ex.P2 Cheque got returned dishonoured for the reason "Funds Insufficient". Ex.P4 is the Legal Notice dated 14.11.2024 issued by the Complainant to the Accused, calling upon the Accused to pay the dishonoured Cheque amount of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) within fifteen days, from the date of receipt of the said notice, along with postal receipt dated 18.11.2024 and Acknowledgment Card dated 22.11.2024.

9. During Cross Examination of Complainant/PW1 the Learned Counsel for the Accused had elicited that the Complainant is a farmer and he do not, do Paddy Trade for commission. It was elicited that PW1 do not have Paddy field, in his name. However PW1 had deposed that he is Cultivating the Paddy fields at Thambipatti Village and Maharajapuram Village, which are standing in the name of his father. PW1 had also

deposed that, he is also cultivating nearby lands, on oral Tenancy. PW1 had admitted that during the year 2024, the price of Pal Vettu Paddy bag was Rs.1,500/- (Rupees One Thousand and Five Hundred Only) and the price of Deluxe Paddy bag was Rs.1,700/- (Rupees One Thousand and Seven Hundred Only). Though such questions were asked to PW1, there was no specific question to PW1, as to the variety of Paddy, said to be sold by the Complainant to the Accused. PW1 had deposed that that he will Sell Paddy to those who gives higher price. In the case on hand, the transaction is said to be credit sale as such, it is common trade practice that the person purchasing products on credit will be charged more, than the person, who purchase products, for cash.

10. PW1 had admitted that he also deposed that though he do not have godown to store Paddy, there is space in his house for storing Paddy. When PW1 was questioned that in his Village, farmers will sell Paddy to one Manoharan son of Muthaiah, who is related to the Complainant as brother relation, PW1 had answered that his villagers will sell Paddy to Mill through the said Manoharan as well as to the other traders. PW1 had also deposed that he do not know whether the said Manoharan and Accused had good contact in Paddy Trade. The Learned Counsel for the Accused had argued that the Complainant had stated that he came to know the Accused, through the said Manoharan, however during his Cross Examination, he had deposed that he do not know the Paddy Trade between the Accused and the said Manoharan. In reply the Learned Counsel for the Accused had submitted that the answer given by PW1 is with regard to the alleged

Paddy Trade Relationship in between the said Manoharan and the Accused herein. The Learned Counsel also argued that merely as because the Accused is known to the Complainant, through the said Manoharan, there is no necessity for the Complainant to know the alleged Paddy Trade inbetween the said Manoharan and the Accused. The said submissions made by the Learned Counsel for the Complainant is acceptable to this Court. When PW1 was questioned that he will not sell Paddy to any other person except Manoharan, who happens to be his cousin brother, PW1 had answered that he will sell Paddy to the Trader, who gives higher price.

11. PW1 had also answered that, in his Village, there are two harvesting periods in a year, i.e. one month prior or subsequent to January and June. PW1 had also deposed that during such time, in one acre about Twenty to Twenty Five Paddy bags, would have been harvested. He had also deposed that, during such time, One Hundred and Five bags of Paddy were harvested and that the Complainant retained five Paddy bags and Sold Hundred Paddy bags to the Accused. Though it was suggested that there is no possibility for harvesting such quantity, the PW1 had denied the said suggestion as false.

12. During his Cross Examination PW1, had deposed that in Survey No.29/1,Thambipatti Village 96 cents and in Survey Nos. 253/1 & 253/3A Maharajapuram Village, 2.25 Acres of Land are there, in his father's name and that he had also doing Cultivation in Adjoining Lands. The Complainant had also deposed that he is the only son of his father and he has two sisters. Such deposition of PW1, need not

be disbelieved for the mere reason that the properties do not stand in his name, it is common that son cultivates his father's property and manage the same. PW1 had also denied the suggestion that when the Accused did business with the said Manoharan, there was dispute inbetween the Accused and the said Manoharan and that the security Cheque given by the Accused to the said Manoharan was misused and the above Complaint, is filed through the Complainant herein.

13. During PW1's Cross Examination, it was questioned that the Sale Transaction said to have taken place, is not known to any other person, in the village, except the Complainant. The relevant portion of PW1's Cross Examination is extracted:- "நான் எதிரிக்கு நெல் கொடுத்ததாக சொல்வது எங்கள் ஊரில் என்னை தவிர்ந்து வேறு யாருக்கும் தெரியாது என்றால் சரிதான். என் வீடு தோப்பிற்குள் உள்ளது".

14. The Accused had examined the Superintendent, Agricultural Products Marketing and Regulatory Authority Watrap Mrs. Subbulakshmi as DW2. Through DW2, the Register covering the period from 01.10.2024 to 26.10.2024 maintained in their office was marked as Ex.X1. DW2 had deposed that, her duty is to collect charges for marketing sixteen Agricultural products, in the region. Upon perusal of Ex. X1, there is no entry for the Accused, to have obtained permission for Transporting Paddy by paying necessary Charges, within her territorial limits, during such period. During her Cross Examination, DW2 had deposed that her office timing is from 10.00 am to 5.45 pm. She had also admitted that there is no necessity for the Farmers to report Paddy

Cultivation, to their office. Even for stocking and sale of Paddy, the Farmers have no legal obligation, to Report the same to that authority.

15. DW1 had deposed that the purchaser of Paddy has the legal obligation to Report purchase of Paddy and Pay Charges and then to Transport Paddy from their Territorial Limit. She had also deposed that in case of any omission in such reporting and such transportation is found out, in Check post, apart from Charges the Purchaser is also liable to pay Fine. DW2 had deposed that there could be Paddy Trade, without paying Charges to them and without getting deducted, in the Check Post. Those Trade may happen, without their knowledge. The Accused examined DW2 and exhibited Ex.X1, in order to establish that the Accused had not purchased Paddy from the Complainant as claimed by the Complainant on 10.10.2024 and that only because of the same, it is not reflected in Ex.X1 Register.

16. By examining DW2, the Accused had attempted to prove that the Trade alleged by the Complainant had not happened. in product during his Examination in Chief the Accused had deposed that on the It is pertinent to note that the Accused, who examined himself as DW1 had deposed that on the date of alleged Sale of Paddy, he was in Kalveli near Alanganallur. The Accused had not stated for what purpose, he was there and how he remembered that date. The Accused had deposed about a particular fact on a Particular date. Apart from his Oral Deposition, the Accused had not produced any Oral or Documentary Evidence to Corroborate the same. The Accused without producing any

evidence to Prove his Claim of being in Kalveli on that day i.e. a positive fact, the Accused had ventured into proving a negative fact i.e. the non happening of a thing or action.

17. From the evidence of DW2, it could be seen that the entry pass has to be collected by the Trader himself for purchasing Paddy from the farmer and that without their knowledge, there is possibility for purchasing Paddy within their territorial limits. As such, in case, if the Accused had omitted to report such Paddy transaction to the Authority, he could not take advantage of his omission/default. Moreover as extracted above, PW1 was specifically questioned that the sale of Paddy, is not known to Villagers. In case if Paddy is purchased, the same could not have gone, unnoticed by the Persons Nearby, as because either harvesting through man power or machine power and loading the Paddy that too One Hundred bags, requires weighing transporting in Vehicles. In a Village, such activity could not had been done in secrecy, to the ignorance of others much less to the neighbours or adjoining property owner. From the question put to PW1, the Accused had suggested that Paddy was purchased and transported to the ignorance of others and as such there is also probability for such Sale. Such question is also Counter Productive, for the reason, if such Sale, could take place i.e. unnotices by others, there is all probability, that such Sale Could have taken Place, escaping the Statutory Levy.

18. At this juncture, it would be appropriate to rely on the Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sanjabij Tari vs Kishore S.Borcar and another, reported in 2025 INSC 1158, wherein it was contended that cash transaction exceeding Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only) is hit by Section 271(d) of the Income Tax Act and such transaction in breach thereof, will be illegal, invalid or statutorily void. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had held that for violation of Section 269SS of Income Tax Act penalty could be imposed under Section 271(d) of the Income Tax Act, 1961. As such, the same by itself, will not invalidate or make a transaction Void. Similarly in this case also the non payment of Marketing Charges and if later found out, the Trader is liable to pay fine. As such merely as because the sale dated 10.10.2024 was not Reported, it cannot be said that the transaction is void. It cannot also be inferred that the Complainant had sold Paddy to the Accused.

19. The Accused/DW1 had deposed that, he is doing Rice Trade business for Fourty Five years and that he had not purchased Paddy from the Complainant and that he purchased Paddy from Manoharan and that he had paid Rs.4,30,000/- (Rupees Four Lakhs and Thirty Thousand Only) to the said Manoharan through bank transactions and paid Rs. 40,000/- (Rupees Fourty Thousand Only) to him in Cash. DW1 had exhibited his Canara Bank Account bearing No.125003172124 Statement pertaining to the account for the period covering from 02.01.2024 to 27.02.2024 as Ex. D1. He had also deposed that the balance payable by the Accused to the said Manoharan is only Rs.80,000/-

(Rupees Eighty Thousand Only). He had also deposed that he had issued blank signed Cheque to the said Manoharan and that the said Manoharan requested the Police to recover the balance amount. In Police Station, they gave three months time. He had also deposed that the Cheque that was available in the hands of Manoharan, was given to other person and the case has been filed.

20. DW1/Accused had also deposed that on 10.10.2024 the date on which DW1 is said to have lent money to the Complainant, the Accused was out of station i.e. he was in Kalveli near Alanganallur. He had deposed that he do not know, who the Complainant is. During his Cross Examination, DW1 had stated that he do not know the Complainant at all. However DW1 had deposed that the said Manoharan is Complainant's relative and he know the said Manoharan for fifteen years. DW1 had also deposed that he will do Paddy Trade, almost for cash and at times, he do, will purchase Paddy for credit. He had further deposed that, he gave two Cheques to Manoharan, asking him for purchase One Thousand Paddy bags and that Manoharan had returned one Cheque.

21. During Cross Examination of PW1, the Learned Counsel for the Complainant had elicited that he had not stated the date on which he gave Cheques to the said Manoharan and the date on which, one Cheque was returned by the said Manoharan. DW1 had also admitted that, he had not initiated any action against the said Manoharan for not returning one Cheque. DW1 had admitted that the signature in Ex.P2 Cheque is his signature. DW1 had admitted that there is no nexus inbetween Ex.D1 and the

Complainant. DW1 had also admitted that he had received Ex.P4 notice on 22.11.2024 and read over the same and the signature available in the postal Acknowledgement Card is his signature.

22. Though DW1 had admitted that he had received the legal notice, he claimed that after receipt of Ex.P4 Legal Notice, within ten days, he had met the said Manoharan and asked about the Legal Notice. However DW1 had not deposed anything as to what traversed inbetween him and the said Manoharan. DW1 had admitted that he had not issued reply to Ex. P4 Legal Notice. DW1 had also admitted that for his claimed that on 10.10.2024, he was in Kalveli near Alanganallur, he had not submitted any documents.

23. The Learned Counsel for the Complainant relied on the Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rajesh Jain -vs- Ajay Singh, reported in 2024 (1) CTC 637 wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held as follows:- *“31 Presumption, on the other hand, literally means “taking as true without examination of proof. In Kumar Exports –vs- Sharma Exports, 2009 (2) SCC 513, this Court referred to Presumption as “devices by use of which Courts are enabled and entitled to pronounce on an issue notwithstanding that there is no evidence or insufficient evidence”*. In that citation, it is also held as follows:- *“29. There are two sense in which the phrase ‘burden of proof’ is used in the Indian Evidence Act, 1872(Evidence Act, hereinafter). One is the burden of proof arising as a matter of pleading and the other is the one which deals with the question as to who has first to prove a Particular Fact. The former is called the ‘legal*

burden' and it never shifts, the latter is called the 'evidential burden' and it shifts from one side to the other. [See Kundalal v. Custodian Evacuee Property, AIR 1961 SC 1316]." The statutory provisions under Section 118 and 139 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, will be applicable once the Payee namely the Complainant proves that the Accused had drawn the Cheque.

24. DW1 during his Chief Examination had deposed that he gave Cheque to one Manoharan. However he had not deposed the number and bank, in which the said Cheque was drawn. During his Cross Examination, he had deposed that he gave two Cheques and on the same date, the said Manoharan returned one Cheque. DW1 had deposed as if the said Manoharan gave Police Complaint, seeking for recovery of the Paddy Price Money and that the Police gave three months time for the Accused to pay the Money. However the Accused had not produced the alleged Police Complaint or any statement recorded by the Police, by obtaining the same under Right to Information Act 2005 or by summoning the Police Authority to produce those documents. The Accused claimed that he gave two Cheques to Manoharan for purchase of Hundred bags of Paddy and that the said Manoharan had returned one Cheque on the same day. The same is not corroborated by the Accused by producing any material records. The Accused had not come up with any probable explanation, as to why the said Manoharan, to whom the Accused himself admits that he owe money, had not prosecuted the case himself and as to why he utilize the Complainant to prosecute, case for the alleged due to Manoharan.

Hence this Court is of the Considered view that the Accused's Defence is not probable to believe.

25. The statutory provisions namely Section 118 and 139 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, will be applicable once the Payee namely the Complainant proves that the Accused had drawn the Cheque. In the case on hand, Ex. P2 Cheque has been returned dishonoured by Ex. P3 Return Memo, for the reason "Funds Insufficient" and the Complainant had issued Statutory Notice, within Statutory Period and the Accused having received the Legal Notice, had not issued any Reply or not paid the Cheque Amount, within Fifteen days and that the Accused had not made his defence, Probable and that the Defence, raised by the Accused, were considered above and held not acceptable, to this Court, this Court holds that the Complainant had proved Foundational facts and that the Accused had not made his Defence Probable and had not rebutted the Statutory Presumptions under Section 118 and 139 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. Hence, this Court is of the Considered view that the Complainant had proved the Complaint i.e. the Accused had committed offences punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. The Accused is guilty of the said Offence. In view of the Dishonour of the Cheque, the natural loss or damage, that the Complainant would have suffered, would be the Cheque Amount. Hence this Court is of the Considered view that the Complainant would be sufficiently compensated, if the Cheque amount is ordered to be paid as damages.

In the result,

(i) the Accused is found guilty of Offence under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, for dishonour of Ex. P2 Cheque and a Judgement of Conviction is passed under Section 278(2) of Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and the Accused is convicted and sentenced to undergo One Year Simple Imprisonment and

(ii) the Accused is also directed to pay Compensation of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only), to the Complainant under Section 395 of Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, within One Month from today, in default, the Accused shall undergo One Month Simple Imprisonment.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, Transcribed and Typed by her, in Computer corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court this, the 9th day of March 2026.

Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court
Srivilliputtur.

Complainant Side Witnesses:

1. PW1 - K. Sivakumar

Complainant Side Documents:

Ex. P1	--	Complainant's Aadhaar Card No. 3980 1208 9427
Ex. P2	30.10.2024	Cheque bearing No.360519 drawn on Canara Bank, Rajapalayam Branch for Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only), in favour of the Complainant
Ex. P3	02.11.2024	Return Memo issued by the Complainant bank
Ex. P4	15.11.2024, 18.11.2024, 20.11.2024	Legal Notice along with Postal Receipt issued by the Complainant to the Accused & Acknowledgement Card

Defence Side Witnesses :-

1. DW1 - K. Rajendran
2. DW2 - S. Subbulakshmi

Witness Side Documents :-

Ex. X1	01.10.2024 to 26.10.2024	Register for Marketing Charges Receipt
--------	-----------------------------	--

Defence side Documents :-

Ex. D1	02.01.2024 to 27.02.2024	Accused's Canara Bank Account Statement
--------	-----------------------------	---

Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court
Srivilliputtur.

Cover Sheet Annexed to Judgement / Order

1.	Name of the Court	Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Srivilliputtur
2.	Case Number	S.T.C.No. 1380 of 2024
3.	Date of Judgment of Conviction / Dismissal / Reversal of Acquittal / Dismissal of Bail Application	09.03.2026
4.	Name of Person Convicted // Acquittal Reversed / Bail Denied / Bail Cancelled	K. Rajendran
5.	Contact Address of Legal Aid Committee of Court Complex in which the above Court is Situated.	The Chairman/ Principal District Judge, District Legal Services, Virudhunagar District Authority at Srivilliputtur
5a.	Designation of the Person to be Contacted	The Chairman/ Principal District Judge, District Legal Services, Virudhunagar District Authority at Srivilliputtur
6.	Phone No of above Legal Aid Committee (between 10am to 5.45pm)	04563260310, 04563260311
7.	Alternative Mobile No. of Legal Aid Committee.	6380110028

Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court
Srivilliputtur.