

T.C: 21 to 26

011/DD/21

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

DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATIONS

TRANSLATION TEST - FIRST PAPER - TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH
PASSAGE BEARING ON COURT JUDGMENT INTO TAMIL

(Without Books)

Maximum Time : 2.30 hours

Maximum Marks : 100

Answer ALL questions.

(4 × 25 = 100)

I. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE. MADAN B. LOKUR

DATARAM SINGH

..... APPELLANT

Vs

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH

..... RESPONDENT

AND ANOTHER

A fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this court and by every high court in the country. Yet occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case.

[Turn over

II. BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE. G.R. SWAMINATHAN

M. GNANASEKARAN APPELLANT
MOTHI PERIYAKARUPPAN @ M. MAHARAJAN RESPONDENTS
AND ANOTHER

The First respondent here in filed O.S.No. 11 of 2014 on the file of V additional district Judge, Madurai seeking the relief of partition in respect of A, B and C schedule properties and for declaration that he is the trustee of the suit trust by enjoying the D schedule properties. The plaintiff and the defendants are sons of late. Mothi Ayyan Ambalam, who passed away on 2.11.2013. The second defendant who is the appellant here in filed his written statement contending that a suit for partition will not be in view of execution of a registered will dated 02.03.2007 in his favour by Late. Mothi Ayyan Ambalam. After the plaintiff examined himself and another witness on his side, closed his evidence.

III. IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.V. MURALIDARAN

SENTHIL KUMAR PETITIONER

Vs

S.PALANI KUMAR RESPONDENT

The Petitioner herein is accused by the respondent namely S. Palani Kumar in the above private complaint for having committed the alleged offences under Section 120(B), 148, 149, 450, 325, 307 r/n 34 of IPC. According to the respondent/ Complainant he was acid attacked by the petitioner and some others on 11.12.2007 at about 5.00 A.M and thereby have involved in the offences stated above. There upon a complaint dated 11.12.2007 lodged by the respondent before the Inspector of Police, Dharapuram and a FIR in Crime No. 910 of 2007 dated 11.12.2007 came to be registered against the petitioner and one another under sections 452, 326 and 506 (ii) of I.P.C.

IV. IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

K.I. SUDHIR MATHULLA APPELLANT

D. RAJKUMAR AND ANOTHER RESPONDENTS

The Respondent No. 1, Mr. D. Rajkumar, moved for being declared an insolvent by filing a petition on 12.5.2006. The subject property was sold by Respondent No. 1 to the appellant on 18.5.2006. Respondent No. 1 was declared on Insolvent, as indicated above, after adjudication on 6.6.2006. The official assignee filed an application (i.e.) Application No. 95 of 2009 for annulling the sale effected between the appellant and respondent No. 1 on 18.5.2006. We are told, that the official assignees application (i.e.) application No. 95 of 2009 is still pending adjudication.

