

State Represented By vs / on 24 July, 2013

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and Crl.A.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 13.12.2023

Pronounced on: 21 .12.2023

Coram:

THE HONOURABLE Dr. JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016
& Crl.A.No.1402 of 2023

Crl.A.No.516 of 2016:-

State represented by:
The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

... Appellant/Complainant

/versus/

Kalyanasundaram, Male Aged 34 years (A-1),
S/o.Thangavelu @ Periannan,
No.53, Maariamman Kovil Street,
Karuvaddikuppam,
Pondicherry.

.... Respondents/Accused [A1]

Prayer: Criminal Appeal has been filed under Section 378 of Cr.P.C., pleas
to set aside the judgment of acquittal passed in Crl.A.No.17 of 2013 (comm
judgment passed in Crl.Appeal Nos.16/2013, 17/2013 & 18/2023], dated
24.07.2013 by the Hon'ble II Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Tindivanam against C.C.No.32 of 2012, Judicial Magistrate-I, Tindivanam an
convict the respondent/accused [A-1] as charged.

For Appellant : Mr.Babu Muthu Meeran,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

For Respondent : Mr.R.John Sathyan, Senior Couns
for Mr.Swami Subramanian

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.1/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and Crl.A.

Crl.A.No.763 of 2016:-

State represented by:
The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

... Appellant/Complainant

/versus/

Rajinikanth, Male Aged 33 years [A-3],

S/o.Annamalai,
No.9, Meenatchi Amman Kovil Street,
Tindivanam,
(At present) No.3, Vanidhasan Kurukku Street,
Kamaraj Nagar, Pondicherry. ... Respondent/Accused [A-3]

Prayer: Criminal Appeal has been filed under Section 378 of Cr.P.C., pleas
to set aside the judgment of acquittal passed in CrI.A.No.18 of 2013 (comm
judgment passed in CrI.Appeal Nos.16/2013, 17/2013 & 18/2023], dated
24.07.2013 by the Hon'ble II Additional District and Sessions Judge, again
C.C.No.32 of 2012, Judicial Magistrate-I, Tindivanam and convict the
respondents/accused [A-1 to A-3] as charged.

For Appellant : Mr.Babu Muthu Meeran,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

For Respondent : Mr.V.Balamurugane.

CrI.A.No.1402 of 2023:-

State represented by:
The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras. ... Appellant/Complainant

/versus/

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.2/25

CrI.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

Aathavan, Male, Aged/40 years (A-2),
S/o.Ponnusamy,
No.22-A, Udaya Nagar,
Chennai Main Road,
Tindivanam. ... Respondent/Accused [A-2]

Prayer: Criminal Appeal has been filed under Section 378 of Cr.P.C., pleas
to set aside the judgment of acquittal passed in CrI.A.No.16 of 2013 (comm
judgment passed in CrI.Appeal Nos.16/2013, 17/2013 & 18/2013], dated
24.07.2013 by the Hon'ble II Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Tindivanam and convict the respondent/accused [A-1] as charged.

For Appellant : Mr.Babu Muthu Meeran,
Additional Public Prosecut

For Respondent : Mr.S.Ashok Kumar, Senior C
for Mr.P.Palaninathan.

COMMON JUDGMENT

These three Criminal Appeals are preferred by the State against the Lower Appellate Court judgment of acquittal reversing the trial Court judgment of conviction.

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.3/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

2. The case of the prosecution:-

On 30/09/2011, P.Kuppusamy (P.W.1), the Chief Education Officer, in-charge of Villupuram and Tindivanam District was on duty at Chennai in connection with preparation of text books. At about, 10.15 a.m., P.W.1 received a call from an unknown person in his Mobile phone and the caller informed him that at Tagore Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam instead of the Student by name P.Kalyanasundaram, somebody else is writing the supplementary examination for the 10th standard Social Science exam. The caller also informed P.W-1 that, even on the previous day (29/09/2011) for Social Science exam only the impersonator wrote the examination instead of P.Kalyanasundaram

3. Immediately P.W.1 called P.W.2 Mr.Shanmugam, the District Education Officer at Tindivanam and instructed him to visit Tagore Higher Secondary School and verify the hall tickets and identity card and find out whether there is any impersonation. Accordingly, P.W.2 went to the Higher Secondary school and found that the student P.Kalyanasundaram did not take up his examination on 30/09/2011 and in the

attendance register he was shown as 'absent'. However, he found that, the

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>

Page No.4/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

address of the P.Kalyanasundaram was shown as P.Aathavan (guardian), Udaya Nagar, Chennai Road, Tindivanam. The said Aathavan is the Teacher at Singanur Government Higher Secondary School and he was the room supervisor of the Hall No:14 in which the said P.Kalyanasundaram wrote his Science exam on 29/09/2011. In the ledger for the exam dated 29/09/2011, the entries were made by the Chief Invigilator for the rest of the halls in blue ink but for Hall No:14, it was in red colour ink. With these observations forwarded his report to the Director of School Examination and to the Chief Education Officer (P.W.1)

4. P.W-2 in his proceedings dated 16/09/2011 had appointed Invigilators. Over phone, the School Management had sought for one more invigilator. So, P.W-2 had included the name of Mr.Karthick as 23rd Invigilator for Tagore Higher Secondary School and issued proceedings Ex.P.9. While so Rajinikanth (A-3) the Clerk in D.E.O Office without the knowledge of P.W-2 had substituted the proceedings with Ex.P.10 by deleting the name of Karthick at Serial No:23 and wrote the name of Aathavan (A-2). Rajinikanth (A-3) had affixed the facsimile signature of P.W-2 and rubber stamp. The said false document prepared by Rajinikanth to facilitate Aathavan to be in the Hall

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>

Page No.5/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

Invigilator. To aid and assist P.Kalyasundaram wrote his exam in writing t
examination by collecting answers over phone.

5. With the false document prepared by Rajinikanth (A-
Aathavan (A-2) along with Kartick had met Mrs.Rajalakshmi (P.W-4), the
Headmistress of Tagore Higher Secondary School and produced the fake
proceedings without the relieving order from their respective Schools. The
promised to produce it later. Aathavan (A-2) was allotted room No:9. He di
not report duty on 28/09/2011. He came on 29/09/2011 but did not produce h
relieving order from his School. He informed P.W-4 that, his School
Headmaster was on leave, so he will produce it next day. On 29/09//2011
Aathavan was allotted Room No:14 for invigilation. On 30/09/2011, he was
allotted room No:5 for invigilation.

6. Through P.W-10, Tmt.Kanaga, the Head Mistress, in-c
Adi Dravidar Higher secondary School, Singanur, it has been confirmed that
Aathavan (A-2) did not attend the School on 29/09/2011. He did not intimat
about his deputation for exam duty. There is no proceedings received from
D.E.O office intimating deputation of Aathavan for exam duty at Tagore Hig

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.6/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and C

Secondary School.

7. The School Education department conducted prelimina
enquiry through Jayashree Ragunathan (P.W.19), the State Planning Officer
and Director of School Education. She, in her report submitted that from h

enquiry, prima facie case of forging the proceedings nominating Aathavan as invigilator for Tagore Higher Secondary School made out. She also noticed malpractice during the examination and recommended for detailed enquiry. Meanwhile, the Director of School Examination P.W.55 Vasundra Devi, based on the enquiry took action against the students indulged in malpractice and blacklisted Tagore Higher Secondary School besides recommended action against the Headmistress Rajalakshmi.

8. On the complaint given by P.W.1 Kuppusamy, Chief Educational Officer, case was registered by the Crime Branch, Sub Inspector Police, Pramilasasi Kumari P.W.52 for the offences under section 465, 466, 468, 471, 473, 419, 420 r/w 120(b) IPC in Crime No.74/2011. The investigation was conducted by the Inspector of Police Mr.Shankar P.W.56. He, in the course of investigation recorded the statements of staff of Tagore

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.7/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and Tagore Higher Secondary School, the Invigilators who were on examination duty for the supplementary 10th Standard examination held during the 4th week of September 2011 at Tagore Higher Secondary School examination centre, the members of flying squad and the students who wrote examination on 29th and 30th September, 2011 in Hall No:14 and the Officials of Directorate of School Examination. He collected the admitted signatures and writings of P.Kalyanasundaram (A-1) and Rajinikanth (A-3), sent them along with the questionable writings and signatures for Forensic examination by expert. T. Associates of P.Kalyanasundaram, who helped him in filing the application

were examined and their statements were recorded.

9. On completion of investigation, P.W.56 Shankar, Inspector of Police, being satisfied that, pursuant to the conspiracy hatched, to facilitate P.Kalyanasundaram (A-1) the then Minister for Education in the Government of Pondicherry, to complete X-Standard and pursue his further studies, his associates particularly, P.W-39 Jayasankar @ Kalaipuli Sankar advised A-1 to take up the supplementary exam at Tindivanam and provided his cousin Aathavan A-2's address at Tindivanam so that, A-1 will be allotted Examination centre at Tindivanam. Aathavan (A-2) a School Teacher in the Adi Dravida

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.8/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

School near Tindivanam sought the help of Rajinikanth (A-3) a Clerk in the D.E.O office. In furtherance of the conspiracy, A-3 Rajinikanth, fabricated a false document viz., the proceedings of D.E.O (P.W-2) by including the name of Aathavan A-2 as one of the invigilators for Tagore Higher Secondary School. Affixed the facsimile signature of D.E.O and gave it to A-2 to use as a genuine document so as to gain entry in the Examination Hall and aid A-1 in providing answers. Thus, using the false document Ex.P-10 as genuine, A-2 himself allotted to the Room No:14 as invigilator in which, A-1 wrote his examination on 29/09/2011 and aided him by providing answers by consulting outsiders through his mobile phone.

10. Charges and trial court findings:-

On the basis of material relied by the prosecution, the

Magistrate, Tindivanam framed the following

Kalyanasundaram (A-1), Aathavan (A-2) and Rajinikanth (A-3).

P.Kalyanasundaram (A-1):-

Sections 120(b) of I.P.C, Section 468 r/w 109 I.P.C and
Section 471 r/w 109 I.P.C

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.9/25

CrI.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016

Aathavan (A-2):-

Sections 120(b) of I.P.C, Section 468 r/w 109 I.P.C and
Section 471 of I.P.C

Rajinikanth (A-3):-

Sections 120(b) of I.P.C, Section 468 of I.P.C and Sec
r/w 109 I.P.C of I.P.C

11. On the side of the prosecution, 56 witnesses (P.W.
were examined, 67 Exhibits (Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.67) were marked and one mark
stamp of D.E.0 was marked as material object. On the side of the defence,
letters date 30/09/2011 wrote by Tmt.Rajalakshmi P.W.4 to the Chief
Educational Officer marked as defence exhibit.

12. The trial Court held the charges against A1 to A3
sentenced them to undergo punishment as under:

Accused	Offences under Section	Conviction and Sentence passed
A-1	120(b) of I.P.C, 471 r/w 109 of I.P.C 468 r/w 109 of I.P.C	To undergo two years S.I. To undergo two years S.I and to

in default of payment of fine t

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.10/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 201

Accused	Offences under Section	Conviction and Sentence passe
A-2	120(b) of I.P.C and 471 To of I.P.C 468 r/w 109 of I.P.C	undergo two years S.I. To undergo two years S.I and t in default of payment of fine
A-3	120 (b) of I.P.C and 471 To r/w 109 of I.P.C 468 of I.P.C	undergo two years S.I To undergo two years S.I and t in default of payment of fine

13. Being aggrieved by the judgement of conviction by Court, Appeal was preferred by the accused and they were taken up for consideration before the II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tindivanam in Criminal Appeal Nos.16 of 2013, 17 of 2013 and 18 of 2013.

14. The Appellate Court, on re-appreciating the evidence, held that the prosecution has failed to prove conspiracy among the accused. Though there is strong suspicion about the manner in which A-2 entered the examination centre as Invigilator for Hall No.14 in Tagore Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam, on 29/09/2011 and A-1 (P.Kalyanasundaram) declaring the address of A-2 (Aathavan) to get the centre at Tindivanam, the same has blossomed into proof to sustain the conviction. Therefore, the Criminal Appeals were allowed and the judgement of the trial Court was set aside, resulting

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.11/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

acquittal of all the accused.

15. The Learned Additional Public Prosecutor Appellant/State Mr.Babu Muthu Meeran, submitted that, the Lower Court ought not have reversed the well considered judgement of the trial Court, ignoring the clinching evidence through Ex.P.3 application form of (A1) mentioning the address as P.Kalyanasundaram, C/o.P.Aathavan, No.22/A, Udaya Nagar, Chennai Main Road, Tindivanam. The said address is that of A2 (Aathavan) and same is proved through the documents like surrender application and memo of appearance filed on behalf of accused with his signature. The First accused, Education Minister of Pondicherry, having his residence at Pondicherry. There is no necessity to give a temporary address the address of (A-2), who was the Invigilator for the room in which, A1 wrote his exam at Tagore Higher Secondary School. Having proved that, Ex.P.10 proceedings issued in the name of D.E.0 is a document fabricated by A-3 and used by A-2 as genuine to be with the A-1 in the Examination Hall to assist is adequate proof and material to attract offence of conspiracy, fabrication of document and used the fabricated document as genuine.

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.12/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

16. The Learned Additional Public Prosecutor Appellant/State further submitted that, P.W.2 D.E.0 has identified Ex.P.10 had categorically deposed that the proceedings marked as Ex.P.10 was not issued on his instruction. The facsimile signature and his name affixed by without his knowledge and intimation. The correction in the said proceedings inserting the name of A2 as one of the Invigilator did not emanate on his

instruction. This piece of evidence is strong and sufficient to hold that, abusing his office as a Clerk in the D.E.0 Office had fabricated a proceeding in the name of P.W.2, which attract the offence under Section 468 of I.P.C. committing this offence, A1 & A2 had abetted A3. Hence, they both are liable to be punished for the offences under Section 468 r/w 109 of I.P.C.

17. According to P.W.4 Rajalakshmi, the Headmistress of Tagore Higher Secondary School and the Chief Examiner/Superintendent for the Supplementary Exam held during September 2011 had deposed that, A2 Aathavan along with another Invigilator by name Karthick P.W.12 came to the Tagore Higher Secondary School with Ex.P.10 and reported that, they have been nominated as Invigilator.

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.13/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

18. It is contended by the Additional Public Prosecutor, Appellant/State that the trial Court, while rightly ignoring the fact that 56 witnesses, 26 witnesses were turned hostile, since they are interested witnesses and held that, the evidence of P.W.3, P.W.10, P.W.56 are sufficient to hold that the A-3 had fabricated proceedings of D.E.0 appointing Invigilators for the examination held in Tagore Higher Secondary School and that fabricated document was used as genuine by A-2. His presence in the Hall No.14, on 29.09.2011 as Invigilator and A1/Kalyanas Student/examination candidate been spoken by witnesses, who were present in the Hall and wrote exam.

19. P.Kalyansundaram (A-1) had given the address of A-Application Form and same never denied. The surrender application and Memo of Appearance are the documents filed before the Court by him through his Advocate. These documents are admission in nature and cannot be ignored. Unfortunately, the Lower Appellate Court erred in ignoring the admission.

20. Per contra, the Learned Senior Counsel for the res submitted that, upon an unanimous call alleging impersonation in the Tagore

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.14/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and Crl.A

Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam, Examination Centre, the Higher Officials of School Education Department had immediately inspected Examination Centre and the Hall No.14 in particular. The information about the impersonation of a candidate by name P.Kalyasundaram found to be false since on 30.09.2011, the candidate P.Kalyasundaram, (A-1) did not take up examination and he was shown as absent in the attendance register. The D.E who had conducted inspection had brought to the notice of the Senior Officer particularly P.W.1 that, though P.Kalyasundaram did not take up examination on 30.09.2011, he had taken up his Social Science examination on 29.09.2011 in that centre at Hall No.14. Also, he has collected certain materials regarding malpractice in that centre which was probed by the Departmental Higher Officials. The police having failed to find material for impersonation had prosecuted the respondent/accused on the premise that, the presence of P.Kalyasundaram as a candidate in Tagore Higher Secondary School and A-2 as Invigilator of the room in which Kalyasundaram wrote examination is

consequence of conspiracy. Therefore, it is alleged that, the proceedings name of D.E.0 marked as Ex.P.10 is a fabricated document and that fabricated document was done by A-3 Rajinikanth. Using that fabricated document, A-2 was assigned as an Invigilator for room No.14 on 29.09.2011. On that day,

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.15/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

wrote his Social Science examination in the Hall No.14. The Hall Ticket and other documents of A-1 show that, he has given the address of A-2 (Aathavan

21. However, the prosecution has failed to prove that, Aathavan who was shown as Guardian of A-1 (P.Kalyanasundaram) in the Application Form Ex.P.3 is the Aathavan, who was secured and tried before Court as A2.

22. While the trial Court ignored the evidence of P.W. Jayasankar @ Kalaipulisankar, who had categorically deposed that, the Application Form Ex.P.3 was filled by the Office Assistant of A-1, since A felt that being an Education Minister, writing examination for X-Standard be a headlines news and will give room to comment and criticism. Therefore he wanted to write up the examination somewhere outside Pondicherry. A-1 was suggested to write the examination at Tindivanam and he provided his cousins address, whose name was also Aadhavan but that Aathavan is not the Aathavan, who is present in the Court as A2.

23. Regarding the address shown in the Memo of Appearance and Surrender Petition of A-1, it was contended that they are not the documents

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.16/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

emanated from the accused maintained in the ordinary course but were prepared by the respective Counsels based on the F.I.R and therefore, the entries found in those documents are not at all reliable and that is not the proof for the residence of the accused.

24. The Appellate Court has rightly considered this fact in view of the absence of reliable evidence for the proof of identity of the Aathavan, who is mentioned in the Application form Ex.P.3, the acquittal of the petitioners against the charge of conspiracy is sustainable.

25. Regarding the alleged fabrication of proceedings Evidences, Learned Senior Counsels for the respondent argued that, except P.W.2, there is no evidence to show that, it is a fabricated document. Even P.W.2 admits that for the use to issue orders affixing his facsimile signature, he also admits that in such a case, if he is out of station, he will instruct the office to issue the order in his name by affixing the facsimile signatures. Later, he will come back and raise the order or proceedings issued on his instruction in his absence.

26. The Appellate Court has rightly taken into account

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.17/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

that, the Management of Tagore Higher Secondary School wrote letter to D.E. seeking additional Invigilators. The Management of that School has felt that

the proceedings of D.E.0 dated 16.09.2011 nominating 22 Invigilators might not be sufficient. This has spoken by the prosecution witnesses P. Rajalakshmi as well as P.W.12 Karthick. In response to the request to allow additional Invigilators Karthick (P.W.12) and P.Aathavan (A-2) were nominated as Invigilators.

27. Ex.P.9 is the proceedings initially issued including Karthick P.W.12. Ex.P.10 is the proceedings in the name of A-2 (P.Aathavan) D.E.0 showing A-2 as the 23rd Invigilator in the place of Karthick. prosecution witness had also spoken that, P.W.10 Kanaga, was in-charge of A-2 School as Headmistress, due to casual leave of the regular Headmaster Madhivanan and had admitted in the cross examination that, before attending the examination duty, A-2 sought for permission but she refused to grant the said permission since she was not the Competent Authority to grant leave 'Duty' in the absence of the regular Headmaster.

28. Further, the Learned Senior Counsels for the respondent

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.18/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 a

submitted that the alleged information received by P.W.1 over phone about impersonation turned to be hoax. Including the members of the flying squad had deposed that there was nothing untoward happened on 29.09.2011 and on 30.09.2011. When sudden inspection conducted on receipt of the unanimous phone call, it was found that the said P.Kalyasundaram had not even attended the exam. Despite that, the prosecution been launched due to political enmity

The error in appreciating the evidence by the trial Court was revisited by Lower Appellate Court. When two views are possible, then view which is in favour of the accused has to be taken into account.

29. Finding:-

As per the prosecution, the presence of A-1 in the Hall where A-2 was assigned to be an invigilator on 29.09.2011 is the consequence of the conspiracy hatched by the accused persons few days earlier to the examination, when they met in a hotel.

30. Further, the case of the prosecution is that, A-3 proceedings in the name of A-2. The said proceedings Ex.P.10 was used as genuine by A-2. The perusal of Ex.P.10 reveals that the name of A-2 alone

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.19/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and written in hand by A-3, while rest of the 22 Invigilators names are typed. While the other two proceedings of A-2 which are marked as Ex.P.8 and Ex.P.9, are also in respect of appointing of Invigilators to the Tagore Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam, Examination Centre No.5303. These two proceedings are signed by A-2 manually. In Ex.P.10 the facsimile signature P.W.2 is fixed. P.W.2 had categorically deposed that, Ex.P.10 proceedings not issued by him. He did not permit to include Aathavan as one of the Invigilators for Tagore Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam. His name has been written in hand by A-3, a Clerk working at D.E.O Office.

31. Further, the case of the prosecution is that Ex.P.

16.09.2011 is the genuine proceedings issued by P.W.2 duly signed manually by him. In the proceedings, Court finds that, 23rd Invigilator name (Karthick) has been written manually below the names of the Invigilators in typed format. In this proceedings Ex.P.9 one Karthick is added as Invigilator for Tagore Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam. Using the proceedings Ex.P.9, Karthick (P.W.12) had attended the Invigilator duty at Tagore Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam on 23.09.2011, 24.09.2011, 26.09.2011, 29.09.2011. This witness had further deposed that, on 29.09.2011, he was

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.20/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and allotted Hall No.12. P.W.12 was not aware who was the Invigilator for room No.14 on 29.09.2011.

32. The use of facsimile signature of D.E.0 in the proceedings is not banned or barred as per P.W.2. He admits that, at the time of exigency, the use of facsimile signatures was allowed to be used on his consent and ratification. Whether, in this case such consent or rectification took place or not is matter for evidence. The defence had established that the facsimile found in Ex.P.10 was affixed by A3 on consent of P.W.2 since there was dire need of additional Invigilators and the D.E.0 was out of station. Ex.P.10 was prepared on his instruction by A-3 and despatched.

33. To link A2 and A1, the address declared by A-1 in the application form and the address in the surrender application and memo of appearance filed on his behalf of A-2 is the only evidence. While the trial Court has accepted the same as a reliable evidence, the Lower Appellate Court

has declined to accept the information furnished in the Memo of Appearance and Surrender Petition as a proof of A-2's residential address. Except the piece of evidence which were emanated after registration of the complaint. Investigating Officer in the course of the investigation, not collected an

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>

Page No.21/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

reliable piece of evidence for proof of address. The prosecution ought to collected material regarding the residence of A2 and the proximity between and A2. The only witness which the prosecution rely is evidence of P.W.39, who is the friend of A1. This witness had categorically deposed before the Court that, he has provided the address of his cousin by name Aathavan to P.A, who filled up the Application form Ex.P.3. He had stated that the A-2 present in the Court is not his cousin Aathavan. This witness was treated hostile and cross examined by the State, but nothing could be elucidated in favour of the prosecution to hold P.W.39 had turned hostile to favour A1 o

34. It is noted that P.W.5 Vijayakumar the member of t squad had deposed that, on 29.09.2011, he inspected Tagore Higher Secondary School, Tindivanam and found nothing to attribute malpractice in examination Hall. P.W.20 to P.W.34 are students, who wrote Supplementary Examination at Tagore Higher Secondary School during the 4th week of September 2011 and they have identified A-1 as one of the candidate, who wrote the examination in the Hall No.14 and some of them had identified A-2 also as the Invigilator. none of them had deposed that, A-1 aided A-2 to write answers. They all were declared as hostile witnesses by the prosecution because they did not supp

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.22/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

their earlier statement given to the Police.

35. The material placed by the prosecution only prove Ex.P.3 application form, A-1 gave his address as C/o.Aathavan, No.22/A, Udhaya Nagar, Chennai Main Road, Tindivanam. A-1 wrote his Social Science examination on 29.09.2011 at Tagore Higher Secondary School. Though, A-1 was supposed to take up his science exam on 30.09.2011 also, he did not turn up to take the examination. There is nothing untoward on 29.09.2011 in the Examination Centre as per the evidence of the Chief Superintendent or Member of the Flying Squad or any Invigilators or by students. The opinion given by P.W.47 the hand writing expert is marked as Ex.P.43. It does not incriminate A1. The answer script and signature in the Hall Ticket attendance are all of A-1, to show that there was no impersonation and answers were written by A-1 and nonelse. There is no evidence to show that for writing this exam, there was external aid for A1. Specifically from A-2, who was the Invigilator of Room No.14 on 29.09.2011.

36. The prosecution has failed to collect call details from A2 whether while on duty as invigilator, A2 called or received any phone to s

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.23/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and

that he collected answers from outside and aided to A-1.

37. The main charge is for fabricating document and using the same as genuine i.e., for the offences under Section 468 and 471 of I.P.C. Having proved the fact that, Ex.P.10 is a forged document by A-3 without knowledge and consent of P.W.2, the admission of P.W.2 that the practice of affixing facsimile signature in proceedings and getting post ratification from him as a judge in his office, renders the prosecution case and evidence not reliable to convict the accused (A1 to A3), for the offence under Section 468 or Section 471 of I.P.C.

38. In the said circumstances, the view of the Appellate Court in its judgment is more probable and possible. Hence, these Criminal Appeal Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and Crl.A.No.1402 of 2023 are dismissed. The judgment passed by the II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tindivanam in Crl.A.Nos.16 to 18 of 2013, dated 24.07.2013 are hereby confirmed.

21.12.2023

Index :Yes/No.
Internet :Yes/No.
bsm

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
Page No.24/25

Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 and Crl.A.

Copy To:-

1. The II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tindivanam.
2. The Judicial Magistrate-I, Tindivanam
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.

bsm Pre-delivery common judgment made in Crl.A.Nos.516 of 2015 & 763 of 2016 21.12.2023
_____ <https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>