

ption does not
Section 2(xvii)
he respondents
not pressed.

ort Exhibit 12 as
as contained in
stance found was
was identified as
only. The said
by the substance
as defined under
S Act.

pellant stated that
nceable and they
fore this Court to
therefore, does not
This appeal is
pressed.

of all the charges levelled against them. Earlier, the appellants had been convicted by the trial court under Sections 498A and 304B IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years under Section 498A and 7 years under Section 304B IPC. However, the appellants in Criminal Appeal No. 221/1994 who are respondent 3 and 4 before us were released on probation under Section 4 of the Probation of Offenders Act. As earlier noticed, the High Court by its impugned judgment and order has acquitted all of them of the charges levelled against them.

3. We have heard counsel for the parties and we have also perused the records placed before us. We find ourselves in agreement with the High Court that so far as the allegations relating to the offence under Section 498A is concerned, the prosecution

has not been able to establish its case against the respondents. The High Court has considered the evidence on record and we find no reason to interfere with the finding of fact recorded by the High Court. So far as the offence under Section 304B is concerned, there is no evidence to suggest that soon before the occurrence the deceased was subjected to torture and harassment. In the absence of any such evidence, conviction under Section 304B cannot be sustained. Even the medical evidence on record is rather ambiguous.

4. We are, therefore, of the considered opinion that the High Court has recorded the order of acquittal based on the evidence on record and on proper appreciation of such evidence. We, therefore, find no merit in the appeals and the same are accordingly dismissed.

48

Appellant

Respondents

OF OFFENDERS
convicted by the
undergo rigorous
der Section 304B
on — High Court
and acquitted the
the appeals held.
the evidence on

49 and 221 of 1994
07. The High Court
and order allowed
of the respondents

2005(2) SCALE

S. PUSHPA AND OTHERS

VS

SIVACHANMUGAVELU AND OTHERS

49

Appellants

Respondents

CORAM: R.C. LAHOTI, C.J., K.G. BALAKRISHNAN AND G.P. MATHUR, JJ.

SERVICES — RESERVATIONS — CONSTITUTION — ARTICLE 239, 239A, 241 & 341
— GOVERNMENT OF UNION TERRITORIES ACT, 1963 — SECTION 50 —
CONSTITUTION (PONDICHERRY) SCHEDULED CASTES ORDER, 1964 — GENERAL
CLAUSES ACT, 1897 — SECTION 3(8) — PONDICHERRY (ADMINISTRATION) ACT,
1962 — SECTION 3 — Selection made of migrant Scheduled Caste candidates against
the quota reserved for Scheduled Castes on post of Selection Grade Teachers in
Union Territory of Pondicherry — Validity — Advertisement issued for recruitment
of 350 General Central Service Group 'C' posts of Secondary Grade Teachers —
56 posts were reserved for Scheduled Caste candidates — Employment exchange
sponsored some names of SC candidates from neighbouring employment exchanges
as sufficient number of SC candidates were not available in Union Territory of
Pondicherry — After holding interview a final selection list was prepared — Out of
55 finally selected SC candidates, 29 candidates had produced community certificates