

011/DM/18

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.

I. Translate the following into Language :

(4 × 25 = 100)

This appeal arises under the Essential commodities Act. The appellant is a dealer holding license to run a rice-mill. He is required to maintain register; he has been maintaining the same regularly every day making entries there in after milling operations for the day are over. One day in the afternoon, the inspecting officials visited the mill and on the ground that no entries were made in the register for the stock on the day, the entire quantity of rice and the paddy stocked and meant for milling were seized. The appellants contends that there were no illegalities and that there was no obligation to sell mill levy. There was no act of black-marketing or violation of price order, that he was not expected to make entries in the register on an hourly basis. The government representatives argues contra. But in view of the submissions made by the appellant, I am convinced that there is no violation of the conditions of licence and even if there is any, the same is only technical in nature. There is no case of public sufferance. A lenient view has been taken and the seized commodities are directed to be handed over to the appellant. Appeal is allowed.

II. Translate into Language :

In this special leave petition, challenging the validity of the conviction under section 307 Indian penal code, the parties want to have the offence compounded. They have come to terms. They want this court to permit them to compound the offence. The accused were acquitted by the trail court, but they were convicted by the high court. This offence is not compoundable under law. The parties, however want to treat this as a special case, in view of the peculiar circumstances of the case. It is said and indeed not disputed that one of the accused is a lawyer. There was a counter case arising out of the same transaction. It is said that this case has already been compromised. The decision of the court in Suresh Babu Vs State of Andhra Pradesh (1987 2 JT 361) has also been referred to in support of the plea for permission to compound the offence.

[Turn over

We have our anxious considerations to the case and also the plea put forward for seeking permission to compound the offence. After examining the nature of the case and the circumstances under which the offence was committed, it may be proper that the trial court shall permit them to compound the offence.

We therefore, direct the trial Judge to accord permission to compound the offence, after giving an opportunity to the parties and after being satisfied with the compromise agreed upon. The parties, if they want, may file additional documents.

Special leave petition is accordingly disposed of.

III. Translate into Language :

The petitioner has filed this Writ Petition for challenging the validity of impugned order declaring him as Excess landowner passed by the Appellate Tribunal under the Urban Land Ceiling Act. The Tamil Nadu government had promulgated an special Enactment of Urban Land Ceiling Act and then the enforcement of the same had been repealed orders which were passed by the competent officials under this according to learned counsel of petitioner. According to learned government pleader the order which were passed by the competent officers is valid one prior to repealing the Act.

The government did not acquire the excess land as ordered and it does not come under the possession of the government and hence the contention of the learned government pleader cannot be accepted so the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of the Repealed Act. Under the above circumstances the order issued by the competent officer declaring that the petitioner holding excess land holder is deleted and writ petition is allowed accordingly.

IV. Translate the following into Language :

Madras High Court

Present : P.K. Sethuraman. J

Cr. M. P. No : 1077 of 1986

Date of Order : 14.3.1988

Order :

This is a petition by 44 petitioners who are counter petitioners in M.C. No 3 of 1987, on the file of the Executive Sub Divisional Magistrate and Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruppathur, North Arcot District. On the information furnished by the Inspector of Police, Rural Police station, Ambur, the Executive Sub Divisional Magistrate has initiated proceedings under sec.107 of the Criminal Procedure Code in M.C. No. 3 of 1987 against the petitioners.

The petitioners are said to be workers in Akbar. Leather Factory at Ambur, North Arcot District. Among the petitioners, petitioners 1 to 3 are said to be the office bearers of Leather and Leather goods Democratic Labour Union and according to the information led by the petitioners on 25.10.1987 at about 11.30 am, the counter petitioners 1 to 44, the active members of the said Union joined together in front of the said Akbar Leather factory, formed themselves into an unlawful assembly with common object to violate the order passed by the public servant, prevent that public servant from discharging his duties and violated the orders under Sec. 30 (2) of the Police Act passed by the public servant by preventing the ordinary public from discharging their daily work. A case was registered in Cr. No. 358/87 under Ss. 143 and 188 of IPC read with Section 7(1)(a) of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the same is being investigated. Besides that occurrence in the notice issued, mention has been made about the occurrence that took place on 04.10.1987, 22.10.1987 and 23.10.1987. It is to be pointed out that in the occurrence that is alleged to have taken place on 4.10.1987, the petitioners 6 to 8 and in the occurrence that is alleged to have been taken place on 22.10.1987 petitioners 4 to 7, 9, 38 and 42 and in the occurrence that allegedly took place on 23rd October 1987 petitioners 4 and 5 are shown to have participated. As regards the occurrence that is alleged to have taken place on 25.10.1987, petitioners 10 to 44 are shown to have joined together.
