

T.C-021 to 026

01/DD/23

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 INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

THE HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE S.M. SUBRAMANIAM

K.R. CHOKKALINGAM

..... **PETITIONER**

Vs

R.K. SREE VENKATESHRAJ & OTHERS

..... **RESPONDENTS**

In. K.M. Balasubramaniam vs. C. Loganathan and another, the suit was filed for recovery of money which was decreed exparte and the Execution Petition filed by the decree holder was also ordered exparte. Thereafter, the decree holder obtained sale certificate also and at the time of taking delivery of the property, the petitioner therein filed the application to condone the delay of 1581 days in setting aside the exparte decree. In that case also, a petition under Section 47 of the CPC was filed stating that the decree is not executable. In the above facts and circumstances, this Court held that the reason offered for condonation of delay is not proper and acceptable.

[Turn over

II. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T. RAJA

N. THANGAMANI @ RADHAMANI APPELLANT

Vs.

A. VELLIANGIRI RESPONDENT

The case of the appellant is that the suit properties and other properties were ancestral properties and in the partition between her father Annamalai and his brothers in 1962, the suit properties were allotted to Annamalai. The partition list was registered on 04.02.1992. Annamalai was in possession and enjoyment of the properties allotted to him along with the appellant, respondent, deceased mother and one more brother Arunagiri. They constituted Hindu Undivided Joint Family. Arunagiri left the family in the year 1984 without getting marriage and his whereabouts is not known till now. He is presumed to be dead in law. Annamalai died intestate on 09.09.2008. The suit properties are still undivided and being enjoyed in common by the appellant and respondent. The appellant demanded the respondent to effect partition on several occasions. However, the respondent has not come forward to effect partition and give share to the appellant. During the pendency of this suit, the mother Alagiri Ammal executed a registered release deed in respect of her undivided 1/3 share in the suit properties in favour of the appellant for a valid consideration. As such the appellant is entitled to 2/3 share in the suit properties.

III. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE:

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE G. JAYACHANDRAN

M. SOUNDARARAJAN

..... APPELLANT / ACCUSED

Vs.

STATE THROUGH THE

DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,

VIGILANCE AND ANTI-CORRUPTION,

RAMANATHAPURAM

..... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

By amending paragraph 8 in Part A of the Schedule to the Prevention of Money laundering Act, 2002 certain offences under the prevention of corruption Act, 1988 are included to the PMLA, 2002. Since, offence analogous is already in statute prior to the amendment, Chapter IV A and section 19 of The Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018 alone will fall away from protection given under Article 20 (1) of the Constitution and therefore (thus will fall away from protection) will have application to the pending cases either under investigation or pending trial after investigation.

Therefore, Courts cannot apply the amended provisions of the Act for the crime committed on or before 26.9.2018, except section 18(A) and 19 of the Principal Act which came to be introduced by Act 16 of 2018.

IV. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE:

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

THE HONOURABLE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. S.M. SIKRI

HIS HOLINESS KESAVANANDA

BHARATI SRIPADGALVARU & OTHERS

..... PETITIONERS

Vs.

STATE OF KERALA & OTHERS

..... RESPONDENTS

It is difficult to accept the argument that inherent limitations should be read (with extra meaning) into the amending power on the ground that Fundamental Rights are natural rights which inhere in every man. There is intrinsic evidence in Part III of the Constitution to show that the theory of natural rights was not recognized by our Constitution-makers. Article 13(2) speaks of rights "conferred" by Part III and enjoins the States not to make laws inconsistent therewith. Article 32 of the Constitution says that the right to move the Supreme Court for the enforcement of rights 'conferred' by Part III is guaranteed. Before the Fundamental Rights were thus conferred by the Constitution, there is no tangible evidence that these rights belonged to the Indian people.