

C.A.No.121/2023
Date : 24.03.2026

Additional District Court
Virudhunagar

TNVR080006772023



**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE
VIRUDHUNAGAR**

**Present : Tmt.S.K.ANGALAESWARI, B.A., B.L.,
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
VIRUDHUNAGAR**

Tuesday, the 24th day of March, 2026

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.121/2023
(CNR No.TNVR080006772023)

From which court the appeal is preferred	The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar
Number of the case in trial court	C.C.No.136/2016
Name and description of the Appellant/Accused	Babu, Age 58/2023 S/o.Veeranan, 8/802/1, Ayyanar Nagar, Virudhunagar (T.K)
Name and description of the Respondent/Prosecution	Inspector of Police, CSCID, Virudhunagar in Crime No.342/2015
To what offence the Trial court passed the order	u/s. 6 (4) of TNSC (RDSCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955
Sentence and law under it was imposed in the trial court	Convicting the Appellant/Accused is found guilty of the commission of the offence under Section 6 (4) of TNSC (RDSCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955. Hence the Accused is convicted under section 248(2)

	Cr.P.C. and sentenced to undergo Simple Imprisonment for One year under Section 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a (II) of EC Act 1955 and also imposed a fine of Rs.1000/- failing which with default sentence of two months Simple Imprisonment.
Findings of this court	In the result, This Criminal Appeal is allowed. The conviction and sentence passed in C.C.No.136/2016 by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar dated 16.08.2023 is set aside and the Appellant/Accused is acquitted. Bails bonds, if any executed by them shall stand cancelled.
Whether the judgment of the trial court has been confirmed or modified or set-aside ?	Set aside
Date of taken on the file of Principal Sessions Court	11.09.2023 and numbered as C.A.121/2023
Date of receipt of the Appeal by this court	04.12.2023
Trial court Judgment date	16.08.2023
Date of Judgment of this court	24.03.2026

This Criminal Appeal came on 09.03.2026 before this court for final hearing in the presence of Thiru.R.Rajendhran, Counsel for the Appellant/Accused and Thiru.P.Kannan, Additional Public Prosecutor for the Respondent/Prosecution and upon hearing the argument of both sides and on

perusing the entire case records, and having stood over for my consideration till this day, this court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

This Criminal Appeal is filed by the Appellant u/s.374 (3) of Cr.P.C. to call for the records and judgment in C.C.No.136/2016 dated 16.08.2023 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Court Virudhunagar and to set aside the same.

2. Brief case of the prosecution is as follows:

It is the case of the prosecution that, on 25.12.2015 at around 17 hours, while the Inspector of Police of the Virudhunagar Civil Supplies Criminal Investigation Department and his party were conducting surveillance regarding the smuggling and hoarding of essential commodities, the Accused committed an offense by hoarding approximately 1,050 kilograms comprising 30 bags each weighing approximately 35 kilograms of boiled rice intended for the Public Distribution System within a room located on the eastern side of his residence and this stock had been procured from ration cardholders and was being hoarded for the purpose of illegally selling it in the black market at an exorbitant profit. The Accused committed offence and the Inspector of Police CSCID registered the Final Report for the offence punishable u/s.6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a (II) of EC Act 1955.

3. The Respondent/prosecution filed the Charge sheet before the learned Judicial Magistrate Court No.I, Virudhunagar on 19.07.2016 and the same was taken on file on 22.07.2016. After taking cognizance of the offence, the Judicial Magistrate Court No.I, Virudhunagar furnished copies of the documents relied by the complainant to the Accused under Section 207 of Cr.PC. After perusing the material records and on hearing the counsels the learned Judicial Magistrate

No.I, Virudhunagar had framed charge under clause 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955 against the Accused and he denied the said charge and pleaded not guilty, and opted to be tried, and the case was proceeded for trial.

4. During trial before the trial court examined PW1 to PW8 and Ex.P1 to Ex.P6 were marked. On the side of Appellant/Accused no one was examined and no documents were marked before the trial court.

5. On completion of prosecution witnesses the Accused was questioned under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. for the incriminating material appeared against him. The Accused totally denied the case of Prosecution/Complainant and no witness has been examined and no documents has been marked on behalf of him. While pronouncing the judgment the trial court formulated the following points for determination.

(i) Whether the prosecution has proved that the Accused has committed the offence of punishable clause 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955 beyond all reasonable doubt?

6. The trial court after considering the evidence on record and the arguments of the counsel, convicted the Accused for the offence clause 6(4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7 (1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955 and sentenced them as stated above.

7. Grounds of Appeal:

Aggrieved it, the Appellant/Accused filed the following grounds of appeal by challenging the trial court conviction and sentence

(i) The judgment rendered by the lower court is invalid, both in law and in equity. The list of prosecution witnesses appearing on the final page of the lower court's judgment copy contains discrepancies. While witnesses P.W.1 to P.W.8

were examined on behalf of the prosecution, the judgment copy lists only P.W.1 to P.W.7. Consequently, it is evident that the lower court failed to exercise due diligence. The judgment delivered by the lower court is unsustainable in law. It remains unclear who the actual complainant in this case is. The First Information Report identifies Mr. Rajeskannan - PW8 as the informant. It was PW8 who registered the First Information Report. Furthermore, he arrested the Accused at the scene of occurrence, Athachi, recorded the confessional statement, and conducted the initial investigation. In this case, every procedural step was executed by PW8. The act of PW8 who served as the initial Investigating Officer personally undertaking every single procedural formality in the case runs contrary to the rulings of the Hon'ble High Court. Furthermore, the lower court failed to properly take into account that no materials of any kind were seized from the Accused in this case, and that other Accused persons were not implicated in this case based on the confessional statement provided by the Accused herein. Moreover, the lower court failed to properly note that Witness P.W.7 who was present at the time of the accused's arrest and served as a witness to the confessional statement turned hostile during the trial. While P.W.7 - Nagarajan and Manikandan were present, the lower court failed to properly observe that Manikandan was not examined as a witness. Therefore, the judgment rendered by the said lower court is not sustainable in law. PW-2 Srinivasan, a Special Sub-Inspector, testified during the chief examination that there were 35 bundles weighing 35 kilograms in this case. However, other witnesses testified that 30 bundles of ration rice were seized. Since the lower court failed to properly take cognizance of the fact that the prosecution witness himself gave contradictory testimony, the judgment rendered by it is not sustainable in law.

(ii) P.W.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and P.W.8 who testified during the filing of the complaint, the police investigation, and the chief examination of lower court are all official witnesses, they are the only persons examined as witnesses in this case. P.W.7 and Manikandan were cited as prosecution witnesses on the grounds that they had signed to the confession statement made by the Accused. However, P.W.7 turned hostile. Furthermore, Manikandan who was present at the time the confession statement was recorded was not examined as a witness. Moreover, apart from P.W.7, the prosecution did not examine any other independent witness in this case. Witnesses from whom a confession statement is alleged to have been obtained in a case involving theft or smuggling constitute key witnesses. In the instant case, this very witness has turned hostile. Therefore, the conviction of the Accused in the said case is erroneous. Furthermore, the prosecution's case in this matter is that the Accused had hoarded rice. However, neither the Accused's immediate neighbors nor those residing nearby were examined as witnesses. It is alleged that a flour-grinding machine was seized; yet, this machine was not marked as a material object in this case. Furthermore, despite having tendered evidence regarding the aforementioned incidents, the respondent filed mere photocopies rather than the proper original documents before the lower court; consequently, it is truly farcical to assert that the respondent failed to produce even a single shred of evidence in the lower court to substantiate the case against the appellant/defendant. In light of these glaring inconsistencies, the intent behind seeking to penalize the appellant/defendant must be deemed to be malicious.

(iii) Furthermore, the judgment rendered by the lower court without properly scrutinizing the fact that every single procedural step in this case from the filing of the complaint and the registration of the First Information Report, to the examination of witnesses and recording of statements under Section 161(3),

the arrest of the Accused, the recording of the confessional statement, the collection of evidence, and the initial investigation was executed solely by Inspector PW8, is not sustainable in law. Furthermore, the prosecution has stated that a confessional statement was obtained in the presence of witnesses P.W.7 and Manikandan. However, witness P.W.5 has turned hostile. Thus, the witnesses to the confession have given hostile testimony. Consequently, the judgment rendered by the lower court which failed to properly scrutinize the facts and appears to have been delivered with a preconceived intent to convict the appellant/accused is one-sided.

(iv) Furthermore, during his cross-examination, PW-7 Anbazhagan an Assistant Manager working at the Virudhunagar Quality Control Office conceded that it would be correct to state that the Quality Inspector did not affix his signature to Document Ex. P-2. He further acknowledged that if there were deficiencies in the said documents, the accused ought to have been afforded an opportunity to file an appeal; however, the Investigating Officer in this case failed to do so. Moreover, he admitted that Document Ex. P-2 was merely a photocopy which was nevertheless marked as an exhibit and that the concerned ration shopkeepers were not examined during the investigation. Since the prosecution suppressed all these facts, and given that this false case was instituted solely for statistical purposes at the behest of higher officials, the judgment rendered by the lower court without properly scrutinizing these aspects is legally unsustainable.

(v) Furthermore, no eyewitnesses to the incident were examined in this case. P.W.1 to P.W.6 as well as P.W.8, are all witnesses for the prosecution. Thus, a verdict rendered solely on the basis of the prosecution's witnesses without examining any independent witnesses and relying exclusively on the testimony

provided by government officials, is one-sided and cannot be sustained in law or in equity.

(vi) The Investigating Officer failed to examine individuals residing in the vicinity of the crime scene during the investigation. In his evidence, the Investigating Officer himself noted the presence of numerous houses and government buildings situated near the scene of the incident. Yet, in this case, no one present at the scene was subjected to examination. Although it was argued that this failure rendered the prosecution's case open to doubt, the lower court failed to take this into consideration.

(vii) The judgment rendered by the lower court is unsustainable in law and in equity, as it was delivered in a one-sided manner without taking into consideration the circumstances of the case and the contradictions in the evidence despite these points having been highlighted on behalf of the Appellant/Defendant during both cross-examination and arguments.

(viii) The judgment rendered by the lower court without giving the slightest consideration to the documents submitted by the prosecution, nor to the mutually contradictory statements of the witnesses, and without recognizing that this was a false case instituted merely for statistical purposes is erroneous. Hence this appeal.

8. The points to be determined in the appeal:

1. Whether the complainant had proved that the accused had committed the offence and complied the ingredients of clause 6(4) of TNSC (RDSCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a(ii) of EC Act 1955 ?
2. Whether the judgment by the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar in C.C.No.136/2016 dated 16.08.2023 is sustainable or any interference warranted?

9. Point No. 1, 2 :

For sake of convenience the rank of the parties in this Criminal Appeal has been referred hereinafter as per their rank before the trial court.

9.1) This Criminal Appeal has been preferred by the Accused challenging the judgment of conviction and sentence passed against them on 16.08.2023 in C.C.No.136/2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar and sentenced under clause 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7 (1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955 with Simple Imprisonment for one year and also imposed a fine of Rs.1000/- failing which with default sentence of two months Simple Imprisonment. Being aggrieved over by the Judgment of the Trial Court, Accused have preferred this Criminal Appeal.

9.2) On behalf of the prosecution PW1 to PW8 were examined and Ex.P1 to Ex.P6 were marked. On behalf of the Accused no witnesses were examined and no documents were marked before the trial court. On a consideration of the oral and documentary evidence, the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar convicted the Accused.

9.3) It is the contention of the learned counsel for the Accused that no eyewitnesses to the incident were examined in this case. P.W.1 to P.W.6 as well as P.W.8, are all witnesses for the prosecution. Thus, a verdict rendered solely on the basis of the prosecution's witnesses without examining any independent witnesses and relying exclusively on the testimony provided by government officials the Investigating Officer failed to examine individuals residing in the vicinity of the crime scene during the investigation. In his evidence, the Investigating Officer himself noted the presence of numerous houses and government buildings situated near the scene of the occurrence. Yet, in this case, no one present at the scene was subjected to examination. Although it was

argued that this failure rendered the prosecution's case open to doubt, the lower court failed to take this into consideration

9.4) The learned counsel appearing for the state contented that on 25.12.2015 at 7 hrs, when Virudhunagar Civil Supplies Inspector and their police party were conducting surveillance regarding the smuggling and hoarding of essential commodities, the Accused committed an offence by hoarding approximately 1,050 kilograms comprising 30 bags each weighing approximately 35 kilograms of boiled rice intended for the Public Distribution System within a room located on the eastern side of his residence and this stock had been procured from ration cardholders. The trial court after considering the available evidence and records has found Accused guilty.

9.5) The crux of the question involved in this matter is to the effect that whether the prosecution has established the first and foremost ingredient to attract the contravention of Clause 6(4) of the Order to the effect that the seized Rice bags are meant for Public Distribution System and whether the prosecution has proved that the said Rice bags have been procured by utilizing the family cards.

9.6) In other words the question that arises for consideration is whether the accused committed the offence under clause 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a(ii) of EC Act 1955. Before going to the Merit of this case the law namely clause 6(4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a(ii) of EC Act 1955 is extracted hereunder for better reference,

“Clause 6(4) of the TNSC (RDCS) Oder, 1982, prohibits the purchase of any scheduled commodities obtained through a family card (PDS rice). The TNSC (RDCS) Order, 1982, along with the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, regulates the control and distribution of

scheduled commodities, including food grains, to ensure fair distribution and prevent misuse.”

“Section 7(1)(a)(ii) of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 - outlines the penalty for contravening any order made under Section 3 of the Act, except for specific orders mentioned in 7(1)(a)(i). This provision states that a person who violates such an order shall face imprisonment for a term not less than three months and not more than seven years, and also a fine. However, the court can impose a lesser sentence if there are adequate and special reasons to justify it, which must be recorded in the judgment.”

9.7) A reading of the above said provision makes it crystal clear that in order to attract the said provision, it is the burden of the prosecution to establish that the Accused purchased or procured the seized Rice bags on the basis of family cards.

9.8) The sum and substance of the prosecution version is that the Accused was hidden the PDS Boiled Rice in the Accused residence and sell for the higher price while the Civil Supplies CID Police were intercepted resulting in the seizure of the Rice bags.

9.9) The Sub Inspector of Police CSCID Virudhunagar namely Chitrakala in order to sustain prosecution case examined as PW1. PW2 – Seenivasan, Special Sub Inspector of Police CSCID Virudhunagar examined in chief and cross. PW3 – Ramachandran, Assistant Quality Inspector, TNCSC Virudhunagar examined in chief and through him Ex.P1 was marked. PW4 – Subburaj, Assistant Manager, TNCSC Virudhunagar examined in chief and through him Ex.P2 was marked. PW5 – Geetha, Sub Inspector of Police CSCID Virudhunagar and PW6 – Baskar, Special Sub Inspector of Police CSCID

Virudhunagar examined in chief and cross. PW1, PW2, PW5, PW6 categorically stated that on 25.12.2015 the PDS Rice intent to sale in black market was seized by them and a case registered in crime no.342/2015 by the Inspector of Police, CSCID for the controventions under clause 6(4) of TNSC (RDSCS) order 1982 r/w 7(1) a(ii) of EC Act 1955 by alleging that the rice suspected to be PDS rice and they seized the rice and prepare the Seizure Mahazar the same was marked as Ex.P4 before the trial court subsequently they handover the stocks at TNCSC godown Virudhunagar and samples were drawn from the Rice seized and the receipt of seized stocks obtained from the Assistant Quality Inspector TNCSC limited, Virudhunagar the same was marked as Ex.P1 before the trial court.

9.10) The argument of learned counsel for the Accused is that the trial Court has committed a grave error in law in not appreciating the evidence in proper perspective. The learned magistrate failed to see that the samples were taken without Athachi. The samples were not lifted in the presence of the person from whom the goods were seized. When, were at whose presence the samples in which goods, the sample were lifted absolutely no evidence on the side of the prosecution. There was a suspicious in lifting of samples, further copy of the Report of the examination of the samples were not furnished to the Accused. Hence the opportunity of the lifting the 2 samples available to the Accused was not given.

9.11) For ascertaining the above said facts this court finds that as per the manual samples have to be taken should be immediately sent to the Laboratory, which is nearby and the quality certificate issued by the Quality Inspector with signature should be sent immediately to the Accused and in case of any difference, the Accused is entitled to have a second opinion from the Quality Manager of the neighbouring District at his cost and only thereafter a further

decision to be taken. But in this case the samples were not taken in the presence of the Accused or in the presence of their representatives. There is no explanation offered by the prosecution for not taking samples in their presence. Mere production of certificate stating that the seized rice is PDS rice is not sufficient proof. Prosecution has not proved that the rice seized from the two wheeler is the selling rice allocated for public Distribution System. One cannot be prosecuted for smuggling the rice meant solely on the basis of the certificate issued by the Quality Inspector or Authority stating that the rice seized from the accused was PDS Rice. Eventhough the Rice seized from the Accused, the samples were collected in the TNCSS godown. In the absence of the materials to show that the seized rice under examination was purchased from the card holders, the materials by way of production of a certificate that it is a PDS rice has no evidentiary value.

9.12) PW5 and PW8 in their cross-examination admitted that they did not investigate to find out the source of the rice, seized from the Accused residence, and in the absence of any such evidence by the officer to find out the source, this Court cannot convict the accused for violation of Clause 6(4) of the Order on the ground that the rice that was seized was actually purchased from a person who obtained it on a family card.

9.13) As far as the case on hand is concerned, it is seen that the prosecution has miserably failed to establish the said first and foremost requirement to attract the provision of Clause 6 (4) of the Order and there is absolutely no material or evidence available on record to indicate or to establish that the purchased the said Rice bags on the basis of family cards.

9.14) Next the learned counsel for the accused contented that the confession statement of Accused under Ex.P5 inadmissible in evidence under section 27 of Indian Evidence Act. Because before obtaining the confession

statement from Accused the properties were seized. As such it is not leading to any recovery. Hence on the basis of confession statement under Ex.P5 the Accused ought not arrived as an accused and he committed the offence. A Plea was raised before this court was clearly evident that FIR under Ex.P6 came into existence even before the confession statement under Ex.P5 of Accused. Moreover, confession statement of the Accused cannot be considered because the properties were already seized and handed over to the PW3.

9.15) In this regard this court finds that under section 25 and 26 Indian Evidence Act against the confession made to the police officer is that the fact discovered affords the guarantee of truth of that part. The admissibility of such part of confession is based on the doctrine of confirmation by subsequent events. This doctrine is founded on the principle that if any fact is discovered on the strength of any information obtained from an accused, such discovery is a guarantee that the information supplied by the accused is true. In other words, if an accused in his confession discloses a fact, which is not in the knowledge of police earlier or from a prior source, but subsequently gets confirmed, so much of such information as relates distinctly to the fact thereby discovered, may be proved against the accused and can therefore be safely allowed to be admitted in evidence as an incriminating fact against the accused. The information given by the accused, which is not known to the police earlier, exhibits the knowledge or mental awareness of the accused, as to its existence.

9.16) With respect to section 27 Indian Evidence Act, the ratio which has become locus classicus and has well stood the test of time for over eight decades now is laid down in the celebrated decision by the Privacy Council in **Pulukuri Kotayya vs Emperor**, wherein it has been held that it is fallacious to treat the “fact discovered” within the section on equivalent to the object produced; the “fact discovered” embraces the place from the which object is produced and the

knowledge of the accused as to this and the information given must relate distinctly to this fact. It was explained that information supplied by a person in custody that “I will produce a knife concealed in the roof of my house” does not lead to the discovery of a knife; knives were discovered many years ago. It leads to the discovery of the fact that a knife is concealed in the house of the informant to his knowledge, and if the knife is proved to have been used in the commission of the offence, the fact discovered is very relevant.

9.17) Thus going by the above facts and the law declared on the aspect of the permissibility of looking into the confession recorded under Section 25 of the Indian Evidence Act to decide on the nature of the offence committed by the accused, this court have no hesitation in accepting the plea of the accused.

9.18) Next contention of the learned counsel for the accused that the witnesses cited were only the official witnesses. No independent witnesses were examined on the side of the prosecution.

9.19) In this regard it is a settled proposition of law that the witnesses from the department of police cannot be said to be untruthful or unreliable. It would depend upon the veracity, credibility and unimpeachability of their testimony. Hon'ble apex court, after referring to State of U.P. v. Anil Singh, State, Govt. of NCT of Delhi v. Sunil and another and Ramjee Rai and others v. State of Bihar, has laid down recently in Kashmiri Lal v. State of Haryana that there is no absolute command of law that the police officers cannot be cited as witnesses and their testimony should always be treated with suspicion. Ordinarily, the public at large show their disinclination to come forward to become witnesses. If the testimony of the police officer is found to be reliable and trustworthy, the court can definitely act upon the same. If, in the course of scrutinising the evidence, the court finds the evidence of the police officer as unreliable and untrustworthy, the court may disbelieve him but it should not do

so solely on the presumption that a witness from the department of police should be viewed with distrust. This is also based on the principle that quality of the evidence weighs over the quantity of evidence. Thus the submission that the whole case should be thrown overboard because of non-examination of independent witness and reliance on the official witnesses cannot be accepted. In this case non citing independent witnesses not give any impact. But from the above said discussion the prosecution not proved their case.

9.20) Further it is not the case of the prosecution that the Accused not produced any document has been shown that the rice was procured by the owner in open market.

9.21) It is clear from the evidence that the Analysis Report under Ex.P2 reveals that the Transported Rice confirmed PDS Rice. But there is no explanation offered by the prosecution that whether the bills were not produced at the time of seizure and the owner of the Rice has not produced any document that the rice was procured in the open market. All the circumstances would goes to show that the case of the prosecution has not been contravention of the provisions of TNSC (RDS) order 1982 and Accused has been transported the PDS rice. Therefore this court held that the ingredients of clause 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7 (1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955 were not satisfy and hence in the absence of any document to show the owner of the two wheeler and the owner of the rice had committed the alleged offence and the prosecution not discharged their duty about the ingredients of the clause 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7 (1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955 before the trial court.

9.22) It is pertinent to note in this case that Ex.P6/First Information Report does not came into existence after recording the Confession statement of Accused. That fact has not been considering by the trial court. Hence taking

note of the above discussion this court held that the order passed by the learned trial judge said to be unsustainable. The trial court has not properly appreciated the evidence of prosecution as well as the arguments advanced by both sides and not arrived at a correct conclusion and recorded the conviction. Hence there is perverse in the finding of trial court which leads to conviction and there is interference is warranted. Therefore this criminal appeal is allowed and thereby the conviction under clause 6 (4) of TNSC (RDCS) order 1982 r/w 7 (1) a (ii) of EC Act 1955 and sentence thereon against the Accused is hereby set aside. Thus the points No.1, 2 are answered accordingly.

9.23) In the result, This Criminal Appeal is allowed. The conviction and sentence passed in C.C.No.136/2016 by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhunagar dated 16.08.2023 are set aside and the Appellant/Accused is acquitted. Bails bonds, if any executed by him shall stand cancelled.

Dictated to the Steno Typist, directly typed by her in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 24th day of March 2026.

Additional District Judge,
Virudhunagar.

No oral or documentary evidence on either side

Additional District Judge,
Virudhunagar.

Copy to:
The Learned Judicial Magistrate No.I
Virudhunagar.