

T.C - 021 + 026

011/DD/22

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

1. Answer all questions.
2. All questions carry equal marks.
3. Good hand writing well fetch you more marks.

(4 × 25 = 100)

I. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING INTO TAMIL :

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**MR. JUSTICE.N. KIRUBAKARAN**

**MOKKARAJ AND 5 OTHERS**

**..... PETITIONERS**

**Vs**

**PANDIAMMAL**

**..... RESPONDENT**

It is a classic case in which the proposed accused are sought to be prosecuted two times for the same offence otherwise called double Jeopardy, which is prohibited by the constitution of India under Article 20(2). The case of the defacto complainant in that; while drawing drinking water from a public tap, the petitioners assaulted and caused injury to the de facto complainant, resulting in giving a complaint to police against the petitioners. After the investigation, the police filed a charge sheet against the petitioners 1 to 4.

[Turn over

**II. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING INTO TAMIL :**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE. R.S. RAMANATHAN**

**R. SENTHILKUMAR ..... PETITIONER**

**Vs**

**D. VILVANATHA MUDALIAR (DIED) ..... RESPONDENTS**

**AND 12 OTHERS**

Learned counsel for the revision petitioner submitted that immediately on coming to know about the death of the first defendant, the petitioner filed a petition to bring on record the legal representatives of the deceased first defendant and at that time, he was not aware of the date of death of Vilvanatha Mudaliar and the other contesting defendants also did not furnish the date of death of the first defendant and petition was adjourned and during that period he came to know about the death of Vilvanatha Mudaliar and therefore filed these applications

**III. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL :**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**

**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**GAMBHIR SINGH R. DEKARE ..... APPELLANT**

**Vs**

**FALGUNBHAI CHIMANBHAI PATEL ..... RESPONDENTS**

**AND ANOTHER**

The Accused No. 1 and 2 of this case have deliberately published the news in the Page No. 12 of their daily newspaper 'SANDOSH' dated 28/9/1999, which is quite defaming and offending to us. The accused persons were in the knowledge that use the complainant shall be defamed in the society due to publishing of such news and with a view to vilify us as the person having bad character, the accused person, in collusion with each other, have published the following news in the newspaper deliberately.

**IV. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL :**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**

**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**SHIVDEV KAUR,**

**..... APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**GREWAL.R.S.**

**..... RESPONDENT**

These appeals have been preferred against the impugned Judgement and order dated 2-7-2004 passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh, in Regular second appeal No. 257 of 1982 and Regular second appeal No. 608 of 1982 and Cross objection No. 14-C of 1982 by which the High court has affirmed the Judgement of the first appellate court as well as the trial court so far as the nature of the right of the appellant in the suit property are concerned. The High Court allowed both the Regular second appeals filed by the Respondent and dismissed the claim of the appellant.