

011/DM/22

T.C: 21 To 26

Register
Number

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATIONS

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

(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 MADRAS

HON'BLE JUSTICE. Mr. S.NAGAMUTHU

SHANMUGAM AND OTHERS

..... APPELLANTS

Vs

CHANDRASEKARAN

..... RESPONDENT

The defendants in OS. No.321 of 2004 on the file of the learned District Munsif, Sirkali, are the appellants herein; the sole respondent herein is the plaintiff in the suit. The said suit was filed by the respondent for permanent injunction restraining the defendants from in any manner interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The suit property is admittedly, a vacant site measuring a total extent of 11 cents comprised in S. F. No. 63/17 at Allivillagam village, Sirkali Taluk, Nagapattinam district. The trial court decreed the suit by decree and judgment dated 16.6.2008. As against the same, the appellants herein filed an appeal suit in A.S. No.70 of 2008 before the learned Additional Sub Judge, Mayiladuthurai. By decree and judgment dated 6.11.2008, the first appellate court dismissed the appeal thereby confirming the decree and judgment of the trial court. As against the same, the appellants herein have come up with the present second appeal.

[Turn over

II. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS

HON'BLE JUSTICE Mr. P.R. SHIVAKUMAR

CHAKRAVARTHI

..... APPELLANT

Vs

KISHANLAL

..... RESPONDENT

This appeal has been preferred against the decree of the trial court dated 18.9.2012 passed in O.S. No. 2500/2011 on the file of the XVII Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai. The above said suit was filed by the respondent herein for the relief of specific performance based on an agreement for sale dated 17.11.1988 in respect of the suit properties and also an alleged endorsement dated 20.3.1999. After contest, the learned trial judge upheld the prayer made by the respondent herein/plaintiff and granted a decree directing execution of a sale deed in respect of the suit properties on deposit of 11,79,349 being the balance sale consideration as per the agreement on or before 18.10.2012. As against the said decree, the appellants 1 to 4 preferred an appeal. Subsequently, by an order dated 27.11.2013 made in M.P.No. 2/2013 in A.S.No. 193/2013, the 5th appellant got impleaded.

III. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS

(MADURAI BENCH)

HON'BLE JUSTICE Mr. S. NAGAMUTHU. J,

AYYAPPAN

..... APPELLANT

Vs

STATE,

Rep by Inspector of Police,

Tirunelveli Police Station, Tirunelveli District RESPONDENT

The appellants in Crl. A. (MD) No.109 of 2011 are accused in S.C. No. 109 of 2009 and the appellants in Crl. A. (MD) No 110 of 2011 is the accused in S.C. No109 (A) of 2009 on the file of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court No.2, Tirunelveli. The trial court conducted joint trial in both the cases and delivered a

common judgment. The appellants in CrI.A. (MD) No. 109 of 2011 were arrayed as A1, A2, A4 and A5 and the appellant in CrI.A. (MD) No 110 of 2011 was arrayed as A3. (In this judgement, for the sake of convenience, we refer to the appellants in the order of array before the trial court). They stood charged for offences under sections 148,302 & 506 (ii) of IPC. By judgment dated 14.2.2011, the trial court acquitted all the five accused from the charge under section 506(ii) of IPC, but convicted them for the offences under sections 148 & 302 of IPC and sentenced all of them to undergo imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of 20,000 each in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year for the offence under section 302 of IPC and to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year for offence under section 148 of IPC. Challenging the said conviction and sentence, the appellants are before this court with these criminal appeals.

IV. TRANSLATE INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS

(MADURAI BENCH)

HON'BLE JUSTICE Mr. P.R. SHIVAKUMAR

RAJA

..... APPELLANT

Vs

STATE,

Rep. By the Inspector of Police,

Nesamani Nagar Police Station,

Kanniyakumari District.

..... RESPONDENT

The Appellant figured as first Accused in S.C. No. 235 of 2003 in the Court of Assistant Sessions Judge cum Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nagarcoil. He was prosecuted along with his mother Kamalam (second accused) for offences punishable under Sections 498-A & 306 of the Indian Penal Code and under Sections 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. After trial, by a judgement dated 10.08.2006, the Trial Judge

acquitted the second accused-Kamalam of all offences for which she was prosecuted, but convicted the Appellant-Raja (A1) for offences under Sections 498-A & 306 IPC alone and acquitted him of the offences under Sections 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The learned Trial Judge imposed a sentence of three years' Rigorous Imprisonment, a fine of Rs. 5000 and default sentence of six months' Rigorous Imprisonment for the offence under Section 498-A, IPC, and ten years' Rigorous Imprisonment for the offence under section 306, IPC. As against the said conviction as well as sentence, the first accused – raja has prepared this Appeal before this Court under section 374(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure on various grounds set out in the Appeal petition.
