

Register Number									
--------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATIONS**TRANSLATION TEST – FIRST PAPER – TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH
PASSAGE BEARING ON COURT JUDGMENT INTO URDU LANGUAGE**

(Without Books)

Maximum Time : 2.30 hours

Maximum Marks : 100

Answer ALL questions.

1.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS**HON'BLE JUSTICE A.C. ARUMUGAPERUMAL ADITYAN****K. Muthusamy****...Appellant****-Vs-****S. Krishnamurthi****...Respondent**

The second appeals have been directed against the decree and Judgment in A.S. Nos. 4 & 3 of 2002 respectively on the file of the Court of Additional District Judge, (FTC), Thanjavur, which had arisen out of the decree and Judgment in O.S. Nos. 1096 & 775 of 1989 on the file of the Court of District Munsif, Thanjavur. The plaintiff in both the suits are one and the same. The plaintiff has filed O.S. No. 775 of 1989 for a declaration that the plaintiff is having right, title and interest over the plaint schedule property and also for consequential injunction restraining the defendants and their men from in any way interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaint schedule property by the plaintiff. O.S. No. 1096 of 1998 was also filed for the same relief. In both the suits the plaintiff would rely on a Will dated 07.05.1988 said to have been executed by one Lakshmiammal. The plaintiff had proved the will by examining P.W.2 & P.W.3, the attestors to Ex.A.1-Will. To show that the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the plaint schedule property from the date of Ex.A.1, the plaintiff had produced Ex.A.15 to Ex.A.36. Further, the plaintiff has also entered into the box and deposed his case as P.W.1 besides examining P.Ws.2 to 4 on his side. The defence taken by the defendants before the trial Court is that Ex.A.1-Will is a forged one and that the Left Hand Thumb impression contained in Ex.A.1 is not that of the alleged testatrix Lakshmiammal.

[Turn over

2.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS

HON'BLE JUSTICE B. RAJENDRAN

Dhanalakshmi Charitable Trust

...Appellant

-Vs

The Sub Registrar, Mettupalayam

...Respondent

The petitioner has come forward with this writ petition challenging the validity of the notice dated 16.08.2010 of the respondent, by which, the respondent called upon the petitioner pay the requisite stamp duty on the document dated 14.05.2010 executed by the Official Liquidator, High Court in their favour. The petitioner, a charitable Trust and is providing free education to the poor students, would contend that they have participated in the auction conducted by the Official Liquidator, High Court, Madras in respect of the land measuring 23.338 acres of vacant land situated at Jadayampalayam Village, Alagambu, Mettupalayam Taluk, Coimbatore District, pursuant to the order dated 27.04.2010 made in C.A. Nos. 368, 1717 of 2009 and 625 of 2010 in C.P. No. 17 of 2010 and they were declared as the success bidder. The sale was confirmed in favour of the petitioner at Rs. 7,15,00,000/ and the petitioner also paid the entire amount and received the sale certificate from the Official Liquidator on 14.05.2010. The copy of the sale certificate was sent to the office of the respondent so as to enable them to enter it in the Book-I register as per Section 89 of the Registration Act. Instead of registering the sale certificate, the respondent sent the impugned order dated 16.08.2010 demanding stamp duty and registration charges so as to comply with the request of the Liquidator for entering the sale particulars in Book I Register.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS

HON'BLE JUSTICE S. NAGAMUTHU

Chandrasekar

...Appellant

-Vs

- 1. T. Kumaresan,**
- 2. The State represented by Sub-Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch, Coimbatore**

...Respondents

The petitioner filed a private complaint before the learned Judicial Magistrate No. 2, Coimbatore against the respondents herein alleging that they had committed offence punishable under Sections 406, 415, 417, 420, 465 and 471 I.P.C. The learned Judicial Magistrate referred the same to the fifth respondent under 156(3) Cr.P.C., for registration of the case. Accordingly, the case was registered by the fifth respondent and a negative final report was filed before the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and the same was accepted by him. The petitioner has come up with this petition seeking a direction to the fifth respondent to re-investigate the complaint filed by the petitioner dated 18.06.2008. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (criminal side) appearing for the fifth respondent. There is no representation for the respondents. This petition is highly mis-conceived and the remedy for the petitioner would have been to file a protest petition before the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned. When such an efficacious remedy is available, filing this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., is only an abuse of process of Court. Hence, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

4.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS

HON'BLE JUSTICE VELMURUGAN

K. Ramesh

...Petitioner/Appellant/Accused

-Vs

State, Rep. by Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station,

Chengalpattu

Crime No. 12 of 2015

...Respondent

This Criminal Appeal has been filed against the Judgment dated 17.12.2020 passed in Spl.S.C. No. 23 of 2019 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Case under POCSO Act, Chengalpattu. The respondent police registered the case in Crime No. 17 of 2015 initially for the offence punishable under Section 376 IPC and Sections 6, 8 of POCSO Act 2012 and after investigation, laid charge sheet for the offences punishable under Sections 450, 354 D 506 (ii) IPC and under Section 6 of POCSO Act before the Mahila Court, Chengalpattu in Spl.CC. No. 11 of 2017 and since the offences are against a child, the case was transferred to the learned Sessions Judge, Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Cases under POCSO Act, Chengalpattu and got renumbered as Spl.SC. No. 23 of 2019 and after completing the formalities, the learned Sessions Judge framed charges against the appellant for the offence punishable under Sections 450, 354 D, 506(ii) IPC and under Section 6 of POCSO Act, 2012.