

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.622 OF 2007

Between:

State, rep. by Inspector of Police, Anti-Corruption
Bureau, Prakasam District, Ongole.
(Through the Standing Counsel-cum-Spl. Public
Prosecutor for ACB Cases).

.... Appellant/Complainant.

Versus

E. Venkateswara Rao, Formerly Sr. Assistant,

... Respondent/Accused Officer.

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 14.12.2023

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V.RAVINDRA BABU

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgment? Yes/No
2. Whether the copy of Judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? Yes/No
3. Whether His Lordship wish to see the
Fair copy of the Judgment? Yes/No

A.V.RAVINDRA BABU, J

*** HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V.RAVINDRA BABU**

+ CRIMINAL APPEAL No.622 OF 2007

% 14.12.2023

Between:

State, rep. by Inspector of Police, Anti-Corruption
Bureau, Prakasam District, Ongole.
(Through the Standing Counsel-cum-Spl. Public
Prosecutor for ACB Cases).

.... Appellant/Complainant.

Versus

E. Venkateswara Rao, Formerly Sr. Assistant,

... Respondent/Accused Officer.

! Counsel for the Appellant : Sri S.M. Subhani.

^ Counsel for the Respondents : Sri A. Hari Prasad Reddy.

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

2021 (1) Supreme 609

This Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V. RAVINDRA BABU**CRIMINAL APPEAL No.622 OF 2007****JUDGMENT:-**

Challenge in this Criminal Appeal is made by the State, represented by the Inspector of Police, Anti-Corruption Bureau ("A.C.B." for short), Prakasam District, Ongole, to the judgment, dated 25.01.2007 in C.C.No.19 of 2001, on the file of Special Judge for SPE & ACB Cases, Nellore ("Special Judge" for short) whereunder the learned Special Judge found the Accused Officer ("A.O." for short) not guilty of the charges under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act ("P.C. Act" for short) and acquitted him under Section 248(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("Cr.P.C." for short).

2) The parties to this Criminal Appeal will hereinafter be referred to as described before the learned Special Judge for the sake of convenience.

3) The State, represented by the Inspector of Police, A.C.B., Prakasam District, Ongole, laid a charge sheet pertaining to Crime No.9/ACB-NPK/2000 of A.C.B., Nellore Range, alleging in substance as follows:

(a) Edara Venakteswara Rao (A.O.) worked as Senior Assistant in the office of Mandal Revenue Officer, Jarugumalli from 18.02.1999 to 01.09.2000 and he is a public servant within

the meaning of Section 2(c) of P.C. Act. L.W.1-Mallavarapu Brahma Reddy is resident of Jayavaram Village, Tangutur Mandal, Prakasam District, who presented a report against A.O. One Mallavarapu Venakta Subba Reddy (L.W.6), father of Mallavarapu Brahma Reddy (L.W.1) owns an extent of Ac.5-75 cents of dry land in Paletipadu Village, Jarugumalli Mandal. In the month of December, 1999, their family members partitioned the land under registered deeds and they got their respective extents. Accordingly, on 04.02.2000 L.W.1 and L.W.6-Mallavarapu Venakta Subba Reddy, L.W.7-Mallavarapu Ramana Reddy and L.W.8-Mallavarapu Jayarami Reddy submitted a joint representation to M.R.O., Jarugumalli for issuance of pattadar passbooks and title deeds in respect of the lands. The M.R.O., Jarugumalli after giving notice to them conducted necessary enquiry with the help of V.A.O. Ultimately, recommendations were made in issuance of pattadar passbooks and title deeds on 31.05.2000. L.W.1 approached A.O. several times and requested him for issuance of pattadar passbooks and title deeds. He used to postpone the same on some pretext or the other. On 11.08.2000 at about 11-00 am., when he approached A.O. at his office, A.O. demanded Rs.1,200/- as illegal gratification to issue pattadar passbooks and title deeds. He asked him to pay the amount within two or three days and

unless that amount was paid, their request cannot be considered. Therefore, L.W.1 who had no intention to pay the bribe, approached L.W.13-Inspector of Police, ACB on 11.08.2000 evening and presented a report. L.W.13 caused preliminary enquiries into the report and accordingly DSP, ACB, Nellore, registered the report as a case in Crime No.9/ACB-NPK/2000. The D.S.P. conducted pre-trap proceedings on 14.08.2000 in the office of Inspector of ACB, Ongole between 9-00 a.m. and 10-00 a.m., in the presence of mediators. Later, all of them proceeded to M.R.O. office, Jarugumalli at about 11-00 a.m. on 14.08.2000. L.W.1 approached the A.O. and enquired about their work. A.O. told him that passbooks and title deed books are ready for signatures of M.R.O. and asked him as to whether he brought the demanded bribe. L.W.1 replied in positive. On further demand, L.W.1 paid the tainted amount to A.O. A.O. received the same with his left hand and kept it in the left pocket of shirt. Then A.O. took out patadar passbooks and title deed books belong to them from Almarah and signed on the books and took them to MRO and obtained his signatures. Then L.W.1 came out from the office and relayed a pre-arranged signal. The D.S.P. and other trap party rushed to the MRO office and conducted post-trap proceedings. The chemical test that was conducted to the left hand fingers of A.O.

yielded positive result and the tainted currency notes of Rs.1,200/- was recovered from his possession. The inner linings of the shirt pocket of A.O. also yielded positive result. The D.S.P. seized pattadar passbooks and title deeds and other relevant documents from M.R.O's office.

(b) The Government of Andhra Pradesh vide G.O.Ms.No.442, Revenue (VIG-II) Department, dated 03.07.2001 accorded sanction to prosecute the A.O. Hence, the case.

4) The learned Special Judge took cognizance of the case under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of P.C. Act. The learned Special Judge on appearance of A.O. and on compliance of Section 207 of Cr.P.C., framed charges under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of P.C. Act against A.O. and explained the same to him in Telugu for which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5) In order to establish the guilt against A.O., the prosecution examined P.W.1 to P.W.8 and got marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.25 and M.O.1 to M.O.7. After closure of the evidence of prosecution, A.O. was examined under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. with reference to the incriminating circumstances appearing in the evidence let in for which he denied the same. He filed his written statement putting forth his defence. In furtherance of

the defence, he examined D.W.1 to D.W.4 and got marked Ex.D.1 to Ex.D.3.

6) The learned Special Judge on hearing both sides and on considering the oral as well as documentary evidence, found A.O. not guilty of the charges under Sections 7 and 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of P.C. Act and accordingly acquitted him under Section 248(1) of Cr.P.C. Felt aggrieved of the judgment of acquittal, the unsuccessful State filed the present Criminal Appeal.

7) Now, in deciding this Criminal Appeal, the points that arise for consideration are as follows:

(1) Whether the prosecution proved that A.O. was a public servant within the meaning of Section 2(c) of P.C. Act and that prosecution obtained a valid sanction in terms of Section 19 of the P.C. Act so as to prosecute A.O. for the charges leveled against him?

(2) Whether the prosecution proved the chargers beyond reasonable doubt that A.O. demanded for bribe of Rs.1,200/- prior to the date of trap and on the date of trap and pursuant thereto accepted bribe amount which also amounts criminal misconduct within the meaning of Section 13(2) of the P.C. Act?

(3) Whether the judgment, dated 25.01.2007 in C.C.No.19 of 2001 is sustainable under law and facts and whether there are any grounds to interfere with the same?

Point No.1:-

8) A perusal of the evidence of P.W.7 coupled with the sanction order under Ex.P.25 means that the sanctioning authority having regard to the allegations of the prosecution accorded sanction to prosecute the A.O. Ex.P.25 shows the application of the mind by the sanctioning authority. The learned Special Judge found favour with the case of the prosecution in this regard. During the course of hearing of the appeal, this finding of fact is not sought to be disturbed on behalf of the respondent/A.O. Having regard to the above, I am of the considered view that the prosecution proved that A.O. was a public servant within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the P.C. Act and further a valid sanction to prosecute the A.O. for the charges leveled against him.

Point Nos.2 and 3:-

9) Sri S.M. Subhani, learned Standing Counsel for ACB and Special Public Prosecutor, appearing for the appellant/State, would contend that the evidence of P.W.1 is in accordance with the report lodged by him under Ex.P.7 and further reflecting in accordance with the post-trap proceedings. He supported the case of the prosecution. The evidence on record proves the pendency of the official favour. Pendency of the official favour was spoken to by the witnesses examined on behalf of the

prosecution. The tainted amount was recovered from the possession of A.O. On account of certain discrepancies as to whether the file reached to A.O. on 11.08.2000 or not and on 14.08.2000 whether V.A.O. brought pattadar passbooks and title deeds or A.O. brought them, the learned Special Judge with erroneous reasons disbelieved the case of the prosecution. When the amount was recovered from the physical possession of A.O. and further when P.W.1 supported the case of the prosecution fully, the prosecution had a benefit of presumption under Section 20 of the P.C. Act and the A.O. failed to prove contrary. The A.O. raised defence that P.W.1 thrust the amount into his left side trouser pocket. This thrusting theory is not at all believable. The A.O. claimed that he was a physically handicapped. The defence set forth by A.O. during cross examination is not at all tenable. The A.O. deliberately in the post-trap proceedings put forth the theory that P.W.1 thrust the wad of currency notes into his left side shirt pocket. This theory is not believable. The evidence on record proves the guilt against the A.O., as such, the appeal is liable to be allowed.

10) Sri A. Hari Prasad Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the respondent, would contend that it is bounden duty of the prosecution to prove the pendency of the official favour in the manner as alleged. According to Ex.P.1 and the evidence of

P.W.1, A.O. was dodging the issue for about 2 months and ultimately demanded bribe of Rs.1,200/- on 11.08.2000. The evidence on record proves that by 11.08.2000 A.O. was not in the custody of the passbooks. On the other hand, on account of the action initiative taken by the A.O. in June, 2000 itself, M.R.o. issued the proceedings recommending passbooks in favour of P.W.1 and his family members, but even according to MRO who was examined as P.W.4, as V.A.O. made certain mistakes in preparing the entries, he asked him to rectify and also directed the V.A.O. to get the verification done by A.O. The A.O. was entrusted with the above work off the record. There was Superintendent who was bound to make initials in the passbooks. Apart from this, according to the evidence of P.W.4, V.A.O. brought the passbooks to him on the date of trap of A.O. So, virtually the prosecution failed to prove the pendency of the official favour in the manner as claimed by them. A.O. was a physically handicapped person. If the case of the prosecution that A.O. after obtaining signatures of P.W.1 after making initials went into the MRO room so as to get the signatures is accepted, A.O. should have been in the MRO room by the time of trap party rushed there. There was a probability for presence of Phenolphthalein powder on the passbooks as A.O. was alleged to have dealt with passbooks and no chemical test was

conducted on the passbooks to prove that A.O. dealt with the same. A.O. had set forth his defence in the earliest point of time in the post-trap that complainant thrust the tainted amount into his left side trouser pocket and within no time ACB caught hold of him. According to the defence, A.O. was physically handicapped who fell down when P.W.1 thrust the tainted amount. The reasons for false implication were that there was no good relation between the V.A.O. and A.O. P.W.1 admitted that once V.A.O. and A.O. cried against each other. The learned Special Judge on thorough appreciation of evidence on record rightly extended an order of acquittal. The learned counsel for the respondent would rely upon a decision in **N. Vijayakumar vs. State of Tamil Nadu**¹ and contended that so long as view of trial court can be reasonably formed, regardless of whether High Court agrees with same or not, verdict of trial court cannot be interdicted and High Court cannot supplant over view of trial Court. With the above said contentions, he seeks to dismiss the appeal.

11) P.W.1 was the defacto-complainant, who presented Ex.P.1. P.W.2 was the mediator for the pre-trap and post-trap proceedings. P.W.3 was Superintendent in the office of M.R.O., Jarugumalli. P.W.4 was no other than the M.R.O. P.W.5 was

¹ 2021(1) Supreme 609

concerned V.A.O. P.W.6 was the Trap Laying Officer. P.W.7 was the Section Officer relating to prosecution sanction orders. P.W.8 was the Inspector, ACB, who assisted the Trap Laying Officer.

12) A.O. examined D.W.1, who was the owner of the building to show that A.O. was of a person who was carrying good reputation. He further examined D.W.2, D.W.3 and D.W.4 in support of his defence.

13) As seen from Ex.P.7, the substance of the allegations against A.O. were that though there was a recommendation to issue pattadar passbooks in favour of P.W.1 and his family members since about two months, A.O. was dodging the issue and ultimately demanded bribe of Rs.1,200/- so as to issue pattadar passbooks. This is the substance of allegations in Ex.P.7.

14) P.W.1 in his chief examination deposed about the factum of the lands in the name of his father and partition of the said lands in his favour and other family members and further their representation under Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.2. He spoke of about the enquiry conducted by the revenue officials to issue pattadar passbooks. He further spoke that V.A.O. recommended to M.R.O. to issue pattadar passbooks. Then he came to know that file was entrusted to A.O. He approached A.O. for 20 times and

requested for issuance of pattadar passbooks and title deeds. The A.O. has to put his side initial in the pattadar passbooks and title deeds and to obtain the signatures of M.R.O. The A.O. used to postpone the issue. On 11.08.2000 at 11-00 a.m., he approached the A.O. at his office and made a request for passbooks. He demanded bribe of Rs.1,200/- for issuance of passbooks and bring the amount within two or three days. He expressed his inability to do so. As he was not willing to do so, he approached the ACB on 11.08.2000 and presented Ex.P.7 report.

15) He further spoke about events in the pre-trap. With regard to post-trap events, his evidence is that on 14.08.2000 they proceeded to M.R.O. office, Jarugumalli. S.I. of Police, ACB, followed him at some distance on his back. When he approached A.O. and requested him to issue pattadar passbooks and title deeds. A.O. asked him whether he brought the bribe amount. Then he picked out the currency notes and gave the same to A.O. A.O. received it with his left hand and kept in his left side upper shirt pocket. After receipt of the amount, A.O. took out four pattadar passbooks and four title deeds from Almarah, put his side initials on all the books and went to M.R.O. who is in another room to obtain the signatures. Then, he came

out and relayed pre-arranged signal. This is the substance of evidence of P.W.1.

16) In the light of the above, firstly, I would like to deal with as to whether the evidence on record would prove the pendency of the official favour as on 11.08.2000 and 14.08.2000 in the manner as alleged by the prosecution. During cross examination P.W.1 admitted that he took the V.A.O. to M.R.O. whenever he visits office of M.R.O. V.A.O. prepared Ex.P.4, Ex.P.5 and Ex.P.6. V.A.O. told him that file was sent to A.O. Out of 20 times four or five times he took the VAO along with him to A.O. He deposed that in his presence A.O. and the V.A.O. quarreled with each other in one occasion, but he does not know the reason. He presented Ex.P.1 to M.R.O. on 04.02.2000. M.R.O. sent their application to the Superintendent and Superintendent sent notice to them. Superintendent sent the file to A.O. for preparing note file. It is true that V.A.O. sent his recommendations on 31.05.2000 to M.R.O. Superintendent sent the file to A.O. after receipt of recommendations to prepare note file. He does not whether A.O. put up note file on 12.06.2000 recommending for issuance of pattadar passbooks and title deeds and M.R.O. issued proceedings on 13.06.2000 directing the V.A.O. to prepare passbooks and present before him. He denied that he knows everything about the same and

he is suppressing it. He denied that on 11.08.2000 he went to the M.R.O. Office along with V.A.O., met the M.R.O. at about 3-00 p.m. He denied that M.R.O. verified their passbooks and title deeds on 11.08.2000 and noticed entries were not tallied with the proceedings and also noticed that V.A.O. did not sign in the passbooks and title deeds and did not make entries, as such, instructed A.O. to verify the entries in the pass books after V.A.O. brought them back. So, the defence of A.O. before P.W.1 was that on 13.06.2000 itself M.R.O. issued proceedings recommending for issuance of passbooks and directed V.A.O. to make necessary entries and to bring the passbooks and on 11.08.2000 when the V.A.O. brought the passbooks to him he found some discrepancies and directed for its rectification and directed V.A.O. to get it verified by A.O. This is the substance of the defence of A.O. before P.W.1.

17) Coming to the evidence of P.W.3, the Superintendent, he admitted about the issuance of proceedings on 13.06.2000 basing on the preparation of office note made by A.O. on the subject. The defence that was put forth before P.W.1 that A.O. taken initiative for issuance of the proceedings, dated 13.06.2000 had support from the evidence of P.W.3.

18) Coming to the evidence of P.W.4, the M.R.O., he deposed that at about 9-00 a.m., on 14.08.2000 he came to the

office. At about 10-00 a.m., the file and record i.e., ROR register, passbooks and title deeds four in number were placed before him by V.A.O. He asked him to wait in due course. He signed them at 11-00 a.m. He signed in Ex.P.11 to Ex.P.19. The Attender taken back the file. He sent Ex.P.11 to Ex.P.19 to the office Superintendent through the Attender. The Attender brought back the record and placed on his table. The ACB officials followed the Attender and informed him that there was a trap occurred and he was asked not to move. He further spoke about the enquiry conducted basing on Ex.P.1 and the report by V.A.O. He admitted that on 13.06.2000 he issued Ex.P.10-D proceedings. He marked copy to implement changes to V.A.O. The proceedings were prepared by A.O. V.A.O. has to prepare the passbooks and title deeds. The Senior Assistant and Superintendent have to put their initials. The A.O. put his side initial in Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.14 with date on 14.08.2000. Ex.P.11 to Ex.P.19 were processed through A.O. on 14.08.2000 and were brought to his table.

19) It is to be noted that the very allegations in the case of the prosecution that since two months prior to Ex.P.7, A.O. was dodging the issue was not at all proved. On the other hand, on 13.06.2000 basing on the note file made by A.O., M.R.O. issued the proceedings to V.A.O. to prepare the passbooks and

title deeds. The specific evidence of P.W.4 is that at about 10-00 a.m. on 14.08.2000 the entire file came before him by the V.A.O. and he signed it at 11-00 a.m. His evidence further that file was processed by A.O. and A.O. put his initials in Ex.P.11 to Ex.P.19 does not mean that A.O. brought the file physically before him. There was an office Superintendent who has superintending authority over A.O. If the evidence of P.W.4 is considered carefully, file reached before him at 10-00 a.m. on 14.08.2000 itself. Here the time of trap was after 11-00 a.m. It is not the evidence of P.W.4 that after 11-00 a.m., A.O. brought the file before him. All these circumstances goes to negative the very case of the prosecution that on 14.08.2000 after 11-00 a.m., there was a demand for bribe and after payment of bribe only, A.O. made initials.

20) It is to be noted that if the evidence of P.W.1 is taken into consideration, the ACB trap party would have found the presence of A.O. in the M.R.O. room. On the other hand, the case of the prosecution is that A.O. was sitting leisurely in his chair when the trap party rushed into the office. It is borne out by the record that A.O. was physically handicapped person. So, within no time, he would not have come out from the room of M.R.O. There was no admission on the part of the M.R.O. (P.W.4) that A.O. brought the file before him. Though the

prosecution at later point time got declared him as hostile but P.W.4 did not say that A.O. physically brought the file after 11-00 a.m. before him. The prosecution did not cross examine P.W.4, though he specifically stated that at 11-00 a.m., V.A.O. brought the passbooks and title deeds. It was only on account of certain answers elicited by the learned defence counsel, the prosecution sought to cross examine P.W.4. Nothing could be elicited even during cross examination by the learned Special Public Prosecutor that A.O. brought the file physically before him on 14.08.2000.

21) It is to be noted that the very allegations of P.W.1 in the evidence is that after accepting the bribe amount, A.O. kept the amount through his left hand into the left side shirt pocket and after that he dealt with the passbooks and title deeds and put his initials and entered into the M.R.O. room so as to obtain the signatures of M.R.O. This is has no support from the evidence of P.W.4. Apart from this, according to the post-trap version also P.W.1 was alleged to have told to D.S.P. about this issue. So, there was a probability and possibility for contacting of Phenolphthalein powder to the passbooks and title deeds from the hands of A.O. To test this veracity of version of P.W.1, the investigating officer did not choose to conduct chemical test to the pattadar passbooks and title deeds. Had there been a

chemical test, there would have been an occasion for the investigating officer to deal with as to whether A.O. physically handled pattadar passbooks and title deeds. That was not done.

22) On the other hand, during cross examination of P.W.1, A.O. got suggested to him that at 11-00 a.m., on that day, he approached the A.O. and enquired about the passbooks and title deeds and that A.O. replied that he verified the pattadar passbooks and title deeds, put his initials on them and forwarded to the M.R.O. and asked him to approach M.R.O. to receive the same. He denied that he offered bunch of currency notes to the A.O., as a formality and A.O. refused to receive the same and that he suddenly thrust the said currency notes into the shirt pocket of the A.O. by saying that it is only a formality and A.O. suddenly tried to pick out the currency notes from his shirt pocket with left hand in a hurry and fell on the ground as he is a handicapped person affected with Polio to his legs and that with great difficulty he stood up and in the meanwhile the ACB people came and caught hold of the hand of A.O.

23) It is to be noted that the evidence of P.W.4 only means that passbooks were processed by the A.O. with his initials, etc. He did not testify that A.O. physically brought the file to him. Apart from this, there was a spontaneous version by A.O. during post-trap when he was questioned by D.S.P. that

P.W.1 thrust the currency notes into the left side shirt pocket of A.O. and he tried to pick up the same and in the meantime ACB people came. In my considered view, this version of A.O. was not tested by the D.S.P. in a proper manner by conducting chemical test to the pattadar passbooks and title deeds. These are all the infirmities in the case of the prosecution which are evident from the record. In view of the above reasons, this Court is of the considered view that the prosecution failed to prove the pendency of the official favour in the manner as alleged. The evidence of P.W.1 is not at all believable. There was a categorical admission from P.W.1 that A.O. and V.A.O. had in one occasion quarreled with each other. This part of evidence shows that V.A.O. was accompanying P.W.1 all through in most of times.

24) Though it is the evidence of P.W.4 in cross examination that on noticing certain mistakes, he directed the V.A.O. to rectify the mistakes, but the prosecution did not elicit these facts from the mouth of P.W.5, the V.A.O. It was not elicited from the mouth of P.W.4 that A.O. brought the file relating to passbooks and title deeds before him at 11-00 a.m., on 14.08.2000. Having regard to the overall facts and circumstances, I am of the considered view that it is unsafe to believe the evidence let in by the prosecution.

25) It is to be noted that the prosecution should stand at its own legs. Admittedly, the evidence of D.W.1 was of no consequence to come to a conclusion that character of A.O. was of good person. D.W.2 was the Attender in the M.R.O. Office and A.O. examined him in tune with the defence relating to 14.08.2000. The evidence of D.W.3 is relating to the fact that he came to know about the trap, etc. Even D.W.4 is not throwing light as to the incident happened on 11.08.2000 but A.O. examined him relating to certain procedural aspects. However, the prosecution shall prove the case by standing at its own feet. The evidence adduced by the prosecution is not at all convincing. The learned Special Judge rightly disbelieved the case of the prosecution. The learned Special Judge considered the evidence of P.W.4 to negative the case of the prosecution.

26) In *N. Vijayakumar's case (supra)* dealing with the judgment against an order of acquittal, the Hon'ble Supreme Court categorically held that only in cases where conclusion recorded by the trial Court is not a possible view, then only High Court can interfere and reverse acquittal to that of conviction. If view taken by trial court is a possible view, High Court cannot reverse acquittal to that of conviction. So long as view of trial court can be reasonably formed, regardless of whether High Court agrees with same or not, verdict of trial court cannot be

interdicted and High Court cannot supplant over view of trial Court.

27) In the light of the above, I do not find any tenable reasons to interfere with the judgment of acquittal. The learned Special Judge on thorough appreciation of the evidence on record extended an order of acquittal. As it is an appeal against an order acquittal, the Appellate Court cannot interfere unless the judgment suffered with unreasonable findings. Hence, the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

28) In the result, the Criminal Appeal is dismissed.

29) The Registry is directed to forward the record along with copy of the judgment to the trial Court, on or before 21.12.2023.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE A.V. RAVINDRA BABU

Dt. 14.12.2023.

PGR

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V. RAVINDRA BABU

CRL. APPEAL NO.622 OF 2007

Note:

The Registry is directed to forward the record along with copy of the judgment to the trial Court, on or before 21.12.2023.

L.R. copy be marked.

Date: 14.12.2023

PGR