

T. W. de
21 to 25

011/DM/24

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 :

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

The Branch Manager

United India Insurance Company

P.P.K. Building

..... Appellant

Marthandam [po] Vilavancode Taluk

Kanyakumari district

[vs]

George and others

..... Respondents

Fact of the case

It is a case of fatal accident took place on 29-05-2010 at about 9.45 a.m. near pandaravilai. The deceased Kavitha was a home maker, aged about 29 years at the time of death and she survived with her husband and two minor children. The legal heirs filed an application seeking compensation before the motor accidents claim tribunal, padhmanabhapuram and the tribunal considering the facts and circumstances of the case, granted a sum of Rs. 10,25,000 as total compensation.

[Turn over

Challenging the same the appellant /united India insurance company limited has preferred the present appeal on the ground that the quantum of compensation by the tribunal is excessive in view of the fact that the deceased was a home maker and the monthly income fixed by the tribunal is excessive. The learned counsel for the respondents 1 to 3 opposed the present appeal stating that the services of the home maker cannot be assessed in terms of money and the tribunal was right in fixing the quantum of compensation and there is no error on record in respect of the award, Hence the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

II. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

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

The Idol of Shri Renganathaswamy

Rep. by It's E.O/Joint Commissioner

Appellant

Srirangam

Trichy - 5

[vs]

P.K. Thoppulan Chettiar and others

Respondents

Fact of the case

The suit property originally belonged to Thoppulan Chettiar. On 08.07.1901, he executed a settlement deed for carrying out Charity by this descendants. In the suit property, he constructed a 'Stone Mandapam' and used to invite Deity Sri Renganathaswamy during the Gajendra Motchem in the Tamil month of Chithirai, pathinettam perukku or Aadi 28th day festival in Tamil month of Aadi and he used to receive Honours from Srirangam Renganathaswamy Devasthanam. The said Thoppulan Chettiar was doing charity of "Thaner Pandal", "Kollu Kanchi" and supply of food for three days during Car Festival of Renganathaswamy in the Tamil Month of Chithirai, from and out of the "Mahimai" fund [Gods Account] which was established from his Granary business. He was doing the Charity for 14 years and was willing to do the same till his life time. After his life time, he directed his three sons to continue to do the Charity and establish "Mahimai" fund from and out of their

income of their business after their life time their descendants must continue to do the said Charity from the income of their business and his sons and descendants are entitled to receive first Honour from the Deity. If "Mahimai" fund is excess, it must be kept as fund and if "Mahimi" fund is less than the expenditure, from and out of the business income, the Charity has to be carried out.

The said property was leased out to Sri Renga Fibre for 20 years, by lease deed, dated 29.04.1978. The said Renga Fibre has sub-let the suit property to various third parties. A portion of the suit property measuring 2,500 sq.ft., was encroached by third parties. The first respondent has filed O.S.NO.706 OF 1984 before the Principal Subordinate Court, Trichy for eviction.

III. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE HIGH COURT, SIKKIM

Taramakami

..... **Appellant/**

[vs]

State of Sikkim

..... **Respondents/**

Fact of the case

It is the Prosecution case that, 03-12-2015, at 15.30 hours, the Naya Bazar Police Station, West Sikkim, received Exhibit 5, the FIR, from P.W.9, the victim's mother, stating that, P.W.4, the 14 year old victim, had revealed to her On 03-12-2015, that around a month back, the Appellant had sexually assaulted her. It was further revealed that in the past also the Appellant had made such attempts. A case was registered under Section 376 of the IPC read with Section 4 of the POCSO Act, on 03-12-2015, against the Appellant, and endorsed to the i.o.,p.w.11, for investigation. The Appellant who was alleged to have absconded from the area on 03-12-2016 from a quarry site near the river Ringyang, below Singla Bridge, West Bengal and brought to Naya Bazar P.S. During the course of investigation, it came to light that P.W.3 the Appellant's elder daughter had also been subjected to sexual assault by the Appellant, therefore, her statement under Section 161, Cr.P.C. was recorded. On completion of investigation, charge-sheet was submitted against the Appellant for the offences under Section 376/377/354/506 of the IPC read with Section 6/10/12 of the POCSO Act, for perpetuation these offences against his minor daughters, allegedly 17 and 14 years old at the time of offence. Upon hearing learned Counsel for the opposing parties the learned Trial Court framed Charge against the Appellant under Section 5(1) of the POCSO Act, for repeated penetrative sexual assault and Section 5(n) of the POCSO Act for incestuous penetrative sexual assault, on the minor "victim A" and for the self-same offences against the minor "victim B" and under Section 506 of the IPC. Having under stood the charges, the Appellant entered a plea of "not guilty", trial thus commenced. The Prosecution examined 11 (eleven) witnesses including the I.O. of the case, on closure of which the Appellant was examined under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C. and the argument of opposing parties heard. An analysis of the evidence on record resulted in the impugned judgment and order on sentence.

IV. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING INTO TAMIL LANGUAGE :

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE HIGH COURT, HIMACHAL PRADESH

Rakesh Kumar

..... **Appellant/**

[vs]

State of Himachal Pradesh

..... **Respondents/**

Fact of the case

Complaint in this case is Reena Devi (PW1). She is wife of accused. They married each other on 7.5.2000. Two sons namely Deepak and Himanshu (deceased) were born to them out of this wedlock. Since the accused was suspecting extra marital relations of the complainant with someone else and was also of the belief that both sons were not born to her from his loins and rather from the loins of the person with whom she was having extra marital relations, he had no liking for both children. He also used to torture the complainant on this pretext. She was given merciless beating by him in the year 2010. She, therefore, left the matrimonial home with her sons and started living in the house of her parents. It is in the year 2013 the accused compromised all disputes with her and assured that he will not torture her any further. On the assurance so given by him she returned to the matrimonial home and they again started living together with children. After some time he again stated torturing her at the same pretext. She had been managing her stay in the matrimonial home anyhow or other. On 30th May, 2015 the accused asked her to accompany him along with Himanshu to Painta Sahib for preparing Adhaar-cards. They went to Painta Sahib with accused on motor cycle. There the accused filled in her form and also form of Himanshu and handed over the same to the complainant. She was asked to stand in queue and deposit the forms in SDM office and himself went to market to purchase computer. Master Himanshu was also taken by him on motorcycle with him. When the accused and deceased Himanshu did not come back for one and half hours, she made a call on his cell phone through the cell phone of Kamla PW2 who was also standing in queue with her. The accused, however, did not pick up the call. When after one and half hours he returned alone she inquired about Himanshu as to where was he. The accused replied that Himanshu had alighted from the motorcycle at Nirmal Sweet Shop. He asked the complainant to search Himanshu at the place of her parents. The missing report (Ext.Pw1/A) lodged by the complainant reveals that she and her husband the accused both searched master Himanshu in the market near and around Painta/Sahib but of no avail. It is thereafter she decided to report the matter to the police.