

011/DD/20

T.C - 021
to
026

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.

All questions carry equal marks.

Good handwriting will fetch you more marks.

(4 × 25 = 100)

I. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING INTO LANGUAGE :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE. N. PAUL VASANTHAKUMAR

TAMILNADU MEDICAL COUNCIL PETITIONER

Vs

DR. EASWARAN AND ANOTHER RESPONDENT

The writ petition was filed before the learned single Judge by the 1st respondent, praying for issuing direction to the Tamilnadu and Indian Medical Council to investigate and take appropriate action on those doctors who were responsible for the criminal negligence in treating his father. The Registrar, Tamilnadu Medical Council filed a counter affidavit that the council has no power to take action relating to medical negligence. According to the council, only in case of professional misconduct action could be taken by the council. It was further contended that the 1st respondent has already approached the consumer forum claiming compensation and as such the complaint before the council is not maintainable.

[Turn over

II. IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE. N. SESHASAYEE

UNITED INDIA INSURANCE CO. LTD APPELLANT

Vs

SIDHESWARAN AND ANOTHER RESPONDENT

Per contra, the learned counsel for the claimant would argue that the insurance company has not pleaded any policy violation in its counter. Replying to the afore said argument, the learned counsel for the appellant took this court through the evidence of R.W.Z. In which the witness has deposed that the vehicle was not issued with a fitness certificate by the R.T.O office, Hosur, on the date of accident. In the Cross examination it was suggested to the said witness if he knew about any fitness certificate that might have been issued by the R.T.O office, Krishnagiri and the witness replied that he did not know about the same.

III. IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AADARSH KUMAR GOYAL

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE UDAY UMESH LALITH

NITHYA DHARMANANDA APPELANT

Vs

NITHYA BHAKTANANDA RESPONDENT

The respondent was charge sheeted for offences, inter alia, under section 376 of the Indian Penal Code. The respondent approached the High court with the prayer that the entire material available with the investigator, which was not made part of the charge sheet, ought to be summoned under section 91 of the G.P.C. The High court reversing the contrary view of the trial court allowed the said application. The contention raised on behalf of the appellants is that the view of the High Court is contrary to law laid down by this court in State of Orissa Versus Debendra Nath Padhi and reiterated in the subsequent decisions.

IV. IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF MADRAS

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH. K. AGNIHOTRI

P. GOVINDARASU

&

G. RAMASAMY

}

..... PETITIONERS

Vs

REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, HARUR RESPONDENT

All the four writ petitions are filed questioning the order passed by the respondent rejecting the Petitioners applications for grant of community certificate and consequential direction to issue community certificate as Kurumans (ST) based on the community certificate already issued to the members of the Petitioners family. Since the issue involved in all the writ petitions are common, all the writ petitions are considered and decided by this common order. On receipt of the application for verification, the state level scrutiny committee shall refer the matter to the vigilance cell for enquiry.