CNR : KLHC010049412021

2026:KER:68857

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE PREETA A.K.

TUESDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026/17TH BHADRA, 1948

W.A.NO.350 OF 2021

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DATED 21.12.2020 IN W.P(C).NO.13875 OF 2020 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA

APPELLANT/PETITIONER:

RAKHUL KRISHNAN,
AGED 41 YEARS
S/O.LATE T.N.RADHAKRISHNA PILLAI, ASHWATHY, CHERUMUKHA, AYIRANIKKUDI P.O., NOORANAD, MAVELIKKARA, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN-690558

BY ADV.SRI.YESHWANT SHENOY
BY ADV SMT.AYSHA ABRAHAM

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 8:

1 UNION OF INDIA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, NEW DELHI, PIN-110001

2 THE SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, NEW DELHI-110001

3 THE SECRETARY,
CPV AND OVERSEAS INDIAN AFFAIRS DIVISION, MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, NEW DELHI-110001

4 THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (NATIONAL CENTRAL BUREAU (INTERPOL) NEW DELHI), CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, PLOT NO.5-B, 6TH FLOOR, A-WING, CGO COMPLEX, LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI-110003

5 THE STATE POLICE CHIEF,
KERALA POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695010

6 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
CB/CID HURT AND HOMICIDE WING, POLICE HEAD QUARTERS COMPLEX, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695010

7 THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
KOLLAM CITY, PIN-691001

8 SREEJITH VIJAYAN,
S/O.VIJAYAN PILLAI, VIJAYASREE, 89 MUKUNDAPURAM P.O., CHAVARA, KOLLAM DISTRICT, PIN-691585

9 SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, NORTH BLOCK,
NEW DELHI-110001.

BY SRI.C.DINESH, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL
BY SRI.DAYA SINDHU SHREEHARI N.S., SENIOR PANEL COUNSEL
BY SRI.T.C.KRISHNA, SENIOR PANEL COUNSEL
BY SRI.SREELAL N.WARRIER, SPL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (CBI)
BY ADV.SRI.P.VIJAYAKUMAR
BY ADV.SRI.SAIBY JOSE KIDANGOOR
BY SRI.M.R.ARUN KUMAR, SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER
BY SRI.SUNILKUMAR KURIAKOSE, GOVERNMENT PLEADER
BY ADV.SRI.NAVANEETH D.PAI
BY ADV.SMT.PRAMITHA AUGUSTINE
BY ADV.SMT.AFSANA KHAN
BY ADV.SRI.SREERAJ S. RAJARAM
BY ADV.SMT.SNEHA J.
BY ADV.SRI.ADARSH PADMANABHAN
BY ADV.SRI.AMAL DILEEP

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 08.09.2026, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

"C.R."

JUDGMENT

Dr. A.K. Jayasankaran Nambiar, J.

The petitioner in W.P.(C).No.13875 of 2020 is the appellant before us impugning the judgment dated 21.12.2020 of a learned Single Judge that dismissed his writ petition.

2. The brief facts necessary for disposal of this writ appeal are as follows:

The appellant's case is that he is an NRI businessman and that the 8^{th} respondent had borrowed about 6 million UAE dirhams from him by stating that the amount was required for augmenting his finances in a hotel business that he was a partner of.

3. Although the 8^{th} respondent promised to return the money before 10.06.2015, he absconded to India without doing so. The personal guarantee cheque of 6 million AED issued by the 8^{th} respondent on 01.04.2016 was also dishonored by the bank when presented for encashment by the appellant. The appellant therefore filed a criminal case against the 8^{th} respondent in Naif Police Station, Dubai. In the proceedings that followed, the Dubai Court convicted the 8^{th} respondent and sentenced him to imprisonment for a term of two years.

4. Finding that the 8th respondent had absconded from Dubai, the appellant initiated proceedings before the authorities in Dubai for the issuance of the Interpol Red Corner Notice and International arrest warrant against the 8th respondent. An International arrest warrant was accordingly issued against the 8th respondent on 16.05.2018 [Ext.P2]. According to the appellant, although the said International arrest warrant was transmitted to the Nodal Agency [4th respondent] of the Union of India [1st respondent] through the Interpol for execution, the 1st respondent, which had executed an Extradition Treaty with the UAE, did not act upon the International arrest warrant, thereby allowing the 8th respondent to evade arrest and extradition to UAE for undergoing the sentence imposed on him by the Dubai Court. The prayer of the appellant in the writ petition was for a direction to respondents 1 to 4 to implement Ext.P2 arrest warrant as per the provisions of the Extradition Act, 1962, read with the provisions of the Extradition Treaty, entered into between India and UAE, and to arrest and hand over the 8th respondent to the Government of Dubai in accordance with the said provisions.

5. In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the State Government as well as the Union Government, the stand taken was that, as per Article 5 of the Extradition Treaty, nationals of Contracting States could not be extradited unless the Government of UAE sent a formal request to the Government of India through diplomatic channels and even then, the case of the 8th respondent would only be submitted to the competent authorities

in India for a prosecution in India. The counter affidavit filed on behalf of the 8th respondent was also on similar lines.

6. The learned Single Judge, who considered the matter, found that in terms of Article 5 of the Extradition Treaty, the nationals of Contracting States could not be extradited unless there was a formal request made by the States concerned. In the instant case, it was found that there was no formal request for extradition made by the Government of Dubai, and the mere issuance of an International arrest warrant was not sufficient to arrest an accused in India and extradite him to UAE.

7. Although this Writ Appeal impugning the aforesaid judgment of the learned Single Judge was filed as early as in 2021, there was no stay of the impugned judgment by the Division Bench, and further, no positive directions were issued to direct the arrest of the 8th respondent. It is also significant that no fresh request was received from the authorities in UAE to extradite the 8th respondent. For all practical purposes, therefore, this writ appeal has become infructuous by efflux of time. The learned counsel for the appellant Sri.Yeshwanth Shenoy would, however, seek our indulgence in laying down the law with regard to the procedure to be followed by the authorities functioning under the Extradition Act, 1962, in cases where there is a treaty in existence between India and another foreign State, and an International arrest warrant issued in respect of a fugitive criminal that is transmitted to the authorities in India through the Interpol. It is his submission before us that, even though the said

declaration of the law may not enure to the benefit of his client in seeking an arrest of the 8th respondent in India, on account of the subsequent developments in this case, the declaration of law would provide clarity for the enforcement agencies in India in similar situations that may arise in future.

8. Taking note of the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant, and finding that in the impugned judgment, the learned Single Judge had laid down as a general proposition that unless there was a specific request for extradition in writing from a foreign treaty State, that was dispatched to India through diplomatic channels, a mere International arrest warrant issued by a foreign treaty State to the Nodal Agencies in India through Interpol would not be sufficient to apprehend the 8th respondent and extradite him to UAE, we feel that a clarification of the legal position obtaining under the Extradition Act requires to be made. As a prelude to that, we consider it apposite to make a few observations regarding the concept of extradition that must inform us while interpreting the provisions of the Treaty and the Act aforementioned.

9. In **Abu Salem Abdul Qayoom Ansari v. State of Maharashtra and Another – [(2011) 11 SCC 214**, the Supreme Court had occassion to consider the scope and ambit of the term “extradition” and the historical reasons that led to its recognition under International Law. At paragraphs 31 to 33 of the said judgment, it was explained as follows:

> "**31.** The term 'extradition' denotes the process whereby under a concluded treaty one State surrenders to any other State at its request, a person accused or convicted of a criminal offence committed against the laws of the requesting State, such requesting State being competent to try the alleged offender. Though extradition is granted in implementation of the international commitment of the State, the procedure to be followed by the courts in deciding whether extradition should be granted and on what terms, is determined by the municipal law of the land. Extradition is founded on the broad principle that it is in the interest of civilised communities that criminals should not go unpunished and on that account it is recognised as a part of the comity of nations that one State should ordinarily afford to another State assistance towards bringing offenders to justice.
>
> **32.** With the tremendous increase in the facility of international transport and communication, extradition has assumed prominence since the advent of the present century. Because of the negative attitude of the customary international law on the subject, extradition is by and large dealt with by bilateral treaties. These treaties, inasmuch as they affected, the rights of private citizens, required in their turn alterations in the laws and statutes of the States which had concluded them. The established principle requires that without formal authority either by treaty or by statute, fugitive criminals would not be surrendered nor would their surrender be requested.
>
> **33.** There is no general rule that all treaty rights and obligations lapse upon external changes of sovereignty over territory nor is there any generally accepted principle favouring the continuity of treaty relations. Treaties may be affected when one State succeeds wholly or in part to the legal personality and territory of another. The conditions under which the treaties of the latter survive depend on many factors including the precise form and origin of the succession and the type of treaty concerned. The emancipated territories on becoming independent States may prefer to give general notice that they were beginning with a "clean slate" so far as their future treaty relations were concerned, or may give so-called "pick and choose" notifications as to treaties as were formally applicable to it before achieving independence. The "clean slate" doctrine was ultimately adopted in the relevant provisions of the Vienna Convention of 1978. The sound general working rule which emerges is to look at the text of the relevant treaty and other arrangements accompanying change of sovereignty and then ascertain as to what was the intention of the State concerned as to the continuance or passing of any rights or obligations under the treaty concerned. The question whether a State is in a position to perform its treaty obligations is essentially a political question which has to be determined keeping in view the circumstances prevailing and accompanying the change of sovereignty."

10. Doctrinally speaking, 'extradition' has five substantive ingredients. They are:

(i) reciprocity, that honours the principle of comity of nations and the obligations owed between contracting States under a treaty;

(ii) double criminality, that requires a mutually acceptable position between the requesting as well as the requested State on all the aspects of the criminal acts committed by the person who is to be extradited. The rule of double criminality requires that an act shall not be extraditable unless it constitutes a crime according to the laws of both the requesting and requested States;

(iii) extraditable offences that are specifically defined in the treaty entered into between the States;

(iv) Speciality – the rule that mandates that when a person is extradited for a particular crime, that person can be tried for only that crime. If the requesting State deems it desirable to try the extradited fugitive for some other crime committed before his extradition, the fugitive has to be brought to the *status quo ante*, in the sense that the person has to be returned first to the State which granted the extradition and a fresh extradition has to be requested for the latter crime;

(v) non-inquiry – that requires a requested State not to normally make inquiry about the nature of the criminal justice system in the requesting State. The requested State, in other words, must see nothing unjust in surrendering to a requesting State a person accused of having committed a crime there for trial in the ordinary way in accordance with the system for the administration of justice prevailing in that country simply because that system is substantially different from those of the requested country with different checks and balances.

11. In the instant case, there is admittedly an Extradition Treaty in force between India and UAE. The said treaty has been notified through an order under Section 3 of the Extradition Act, 1962, which directs that

the provisions of the Extradition Act, other than Chapter III, shall apply to UAE with effect from the date of publication of the notification. The Extradition Treaty with the UAE has been set out in full in the notified order that is produced as Ext.P3 in these proceedings. Before we proceed to deal with the provisions of the Extradition Treaty as well as the provisions of the Extradition Act, 1962, we deem it apposite to extract the relevant provisions of the Extradition Treaty and the Extradition Act as below:

EXTRADITION TREATY:

ARTICLE 4

1. Extradition shall be granted in respect of an extraditable offence committed outside its territory but within the jurisdiction as asserted by the requesting State if the requested State would, in corresponding circumstances, have jurisdiction over such an offence. In such cases, the requested State shall have regard to all the circumstances of the case including the seriousness of the offence.

2. Extradition shall be available for an extraditable offence if committed in a third State by a national of the requesting State who is present in the requested State and provided that it would be an extraditable offence under the laws of the requested State had the offence been committed in the requested State.

3. Extradition shall also be available for an extraditable offence notwithstanding the conduct of the person sought occurred wholly or partly in the requested State, if under the law of that State his conduct and its effects or its intended effects, taken as a whole, would be regarded as constituting the commission of an extraditable offence in the territory of the requesting State.

ARTICLE 5

The nationals of the Contracting States shall not be extradited to the other Contracting State provided that the requested State shall submit the case to its competent authorities for prosecution if the act committed is considered as an offence under the laws of both Contracting States.

ARTICLE 8

The request for extradition shall be made in writing and despatched through the diplomatic channels with the undermentioned documents and particulars appended;

a) If the request relates to a person already convicted and sentenced, an official copy of the sentence passed against the person to be extradited;

b) The warrant of arrest, or remand or any document having the same effect, by a competent authority, if the person to be extradited is under investigation;

c) Particulars as to identity, description and a photograph of the person to be extradited, if possible;

d) The date, the place of the commission of the acts for which extradition is requested, the legal characterisation of those offences, and a certified copy of the applicable legal provisions, and a statement by the prosecuting authorities as to evidence against the person to be extradited.

e) In case of persons not yet sentenced, such other evidence, as according to the laws of the requested State, would justify his arrest and committal for trial had the offence been committed within the jurisdiction of the requested State;

All the documents referred to above shall be translated into English and authenticated by the requesting State.

ARTICLE 9

1. In case of urgency, a person to be extradited may be provisionally arrested and remanded in custody until the request for extradition, together with the documents referred to in the preceding Article are received.

2. The request for provisional arrest and remand shall be communicated in writing to the competent authority of the requested State, either directly or through the International Criminal Police Organisation (INTERPOL) channels.

3. The same request shall be confirmed through the diplomatic channels, and shall contain a reference to the existence of any of the documents, enumerated in the preceding Article, and intimating the intention of the requesting State to transmit a request for extradition, a statement of the offence for which extradition is requested, the sentence specified for that offence or the sentence imposed, the time and place of the commission of the offence and a detailed description of the person to be extradited, as far as possible. The requesting State shall forthwith be notified of any action taken in respect of the request.

4. The provisional arrest and remand shall be made in accordance with the legal procedures of the requested State.

THE EXTRADITION ACT, 1962:

2. Definitions:- In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,-

xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx

(*c*) "extradition offence" means -

(*i*) in relation to a foreign State, being a treaty State, an offence provided for in the extradition treaty with that State;

(*ii*) in relation to a foreign State other than a treaty State an offence punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than one year under the laws of India or of a foreign State and includes a composite offence;

xxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx

(*f*) "fugitive criminal" means a person who is accused or convicted of an extradition offence within the jurisdiction of a foreign State and includes a person who, while in India, conspires, attempts to commit or incites or participates as an accomplice in the commission of an extradition offence in a foreign State.

xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx

4. Requisition for surrender:- A requisition for the surrender of a fugitive criminal of a foreign State may be made to the Central Government -

(*a*) by a diplomatic representative of the foreign State at Delhi; or

(*b*) by the Government of that foreign State communicating with the Central Government through its diplomatic representative in that State;

and if neither of these modes is convenient, the requisition shall be made in such other mode as is settled by arrangement made by the Government of the foreign State with the Government of India.

5. Order for Magisterial inquiry:- Where such requisition is made, the Central Government may, if it thinks fit, issue an order to any Magistrate who would have had jurisdiction to inquire into the offence if it had been an offence committed within the local limits of his jurisdiction, directing him to inquire into the case.

xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx

9. Power of Magistrate to issue warrant of arrest in certain cases:- (1) Where it appears to any Magistrate that a person within the local limits of his jurisdiction is a fugitive criminal of a foreign State, he may, if he thinks fit, issue a warrant for the arrest of that person on such information and such evidence as would, in his opinion, justify the issue of a warrant if the offence of which the person is accused or has been convicted had been committed within the local limits of his jurisdiction.

(2) The Magistrate shall forthwith report the issue of a warrant under sub-section (1) to the Central Government and shall forward the information, and the evidence or certified copies thereof to that Government.

(3) A person arrested on a warrant issued under sub-section (1) shall not be detained for more than three months unless within that period the Magistrate receives from the Central Government an order made with reference to such person under section 5.

xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx

34-B. Provisional arrest:- (1) On receipt of an urgent request from a foreign State for the immediate arrest of a fugitive criminal, the Central Government may request the Magistrate having competent jurisdiction to issue a provisional warrant for the arrest of such fugitive criminal.

(2) A fugitive criminal arrested under sub-section (1) shall be discharged upon the expiration of sixty days from the date of his arrest if no request for his surrender or return is received within the said period.

12. As has already been noticed, the provisions of the Extradition Treaty and the Extradition Act are founded upon the principle of reciprocity under International law that obliges a State to extradite or prosecute a fugitive criminal who has entered into its jurisdictional limits from another State where he/she is accused of or has committed an extraditable offence. The role that the obligation to extradite or prosecute plays in supporting international cooperation to fight impunity has been recognized at least since the time of Hugo Grotius, who postulated the principle of *aut dedere aut punire* [either extradite or punish]. The modern terminology replaces "punishment" with "prosecution" [*aut dedere aut judicare*] as the alternative to extradition in order to reflect better the possibility that an alleged offender may be found not guilty. The principle today, in other words, is that, if a State is unwilling to extradite a fugitive criminal, it should undertake the responsibility of prosecuting him or her, the theory being that a criminal should not go unpunished. The prosecute-or-extradite regime has long since received the imprimatur of the International Court of Justice **[See Marie-Emmanuelle, Verhoeven v. Union of India and Others - [(2016) 6 SCC 456]**. Article 5 of the Extradition Treaty with the UAE reflects the principle of reciprocity and the obligation to extradite or prosecute referred to above.

13. A perusal of the Articles in the Extradition Treaty together with the corresponding provisions under the Extradition Act, excluding Chapter

III thereof, clearly bring out a distinction between (a) an arrest of a fugitive criminal pursuant to the receipt of a prior request from a foreign State for his extradition, and (b) an arrest of a fugitive criminal prior to the receipt of a formal request from a foreign State for his or her extradition to that State. While Article 8 of the Extradition Treaty and Sections 4 to 8 of the Extradition Act, 1962 deal with the former viz. the requisition for surrender of a fugitive criminal of a foreign State and consequential arrest of the said fugitive criminal by the requested State, Article 9 of the Extradition Treaty read with Section 9 and Section 34-B of the Extradition Act deal with the latter viz. the immediate arrest of a fugitive criminal whose presence is detected in the requested treaty State immediately on intimation of the fact of issuance of an International arrest warrant outstanding against the accused issued by the foreign State that is outstanding against the fugitive criminal and which is communicated to the requested State through Interpol. Thus, while for initiating action in terms of Article 8 of the Extradition Treaty and Sections 4 to 8 of the Extradition Act, a prior requisition for surrender of a fugitive criminal has to be made to the Central Government in the manner provided under Section 4 of the Extradition Act, namely, through diplomatic channels, there is no necessity for a formal requisition from the foreign State if the urgent need of the foreign State is only for effecting an immediate arrest (without extradition) of the fugitive criminal in the requested State. This is further apparent from a comparison of the provisions of Section 9 and Section 34-B of the Extradition Act. While Section 9 confers an independent power to a Magistrate to issue a warrant of arrest in any case where it appears to the Magistrate that a person within the local limits of his jurisdiction is a fugitive criminal of a foreign State and obliges the Magistrate to detain such person for a period not exceeding three months within which period he has to report the issuance of a warrant to the Central Government and receive from the Central Government an order made with reference to such person in terms of Section 5 of the Extradition Act, Section 34-B is a power given to a Magistrate to issue a provisional warrant for the arrest of a fugitive criminal based on a request made by the Central Government, which in turn must be based on the receipt of an urgent request from a foreign State for the immediate arrest of a fugitive criminal. Under both the provisions referred above, the information regarding the fugitive criminal, must be one that is obtained from the foreign State through a recognized channel such as the Interpol, and the provisions only mandate that a request for arrest of the fugitive criminal, be routed through a jurisdictional Magistrate for the purposes of issuance of a warrant of arrest that will authorize the arrest in accordance with the laws of India.

14. In the instant case, it is not in dispute that an International arrest warrant seeking the arrest of the 8th respondent was issued by the Prosecution department of the Government of Dubai and the said warrant was transmitted through Interpol to the Nodal Agency in India, the CBI-NCB Interpol. The latter Nodal Agency in India did not thereafter follow the procedure envisaged either under Section 9 or under Section 34-B of the Extradition Act, 1962, thereby leading to the evasion of arrest

by the 8th respondent. In our view, when the Nodal Agency in India receives an International arrest warrant in relation to a fugitive criminal, that is issued by a department of a foreign treaty State and routed through the Interpol, it must immediately resort to the following procedure, namely, (i) intimate the Central Government in the Ministry of External Affairs of the fact of receipt of the International arrest warrant, so that the Central Government may then consider whether a request is to be made to the jurisdictional Magistrate for the issuance of a provisional warrant for the arrest of the fugitive criminal in terms of Section 34-B of the Extradition Act. Simultaneously, the Nodal Agency must also intimate the jurisdictional Magistrate of the fact of issuance of an International arrest warrant in relation to the fugitive criminal so that the Magistrate can independently exercise his discretion as to whether or not he must issue a warrant for the arrest of the said fugitive criminal in terms of Section 9 of the Extradition Act. In any event, we are of the view that it was not open to the Nodal Agency to simply ignore the International arrest warrant issued in relation to the 8th respondent without forwarding the said arrest warrant to the Central Government and to the jurisdictional Magistrate concerned. The Nodal Agency ought to have found that the request for immediate arrest of the fugitive criminal did not have to be routed through diplomatic channels and could have been routed through Interpol and at any rate, its obligation was merely to forward the said International arrest warrant to the Central Government and the jurisdictional Magistrate for consequential action in accordance with law. The only interdiction for the Nodal Agency is in relation to acting directly based on the International arrest warrant and proceeding to arrest the fugitive criminal without the intervention of a Judicial Magistrate. This legal position was clarified by the Supreme Court in **Bhavesh Jayanti Lakhani v. State of Maharashtra and Others – [(2009) 9 SCC 551]**.

15. Thus, in our view, the correct procedure to be followed by the Nodal Agency on receipt of an International arrest warrant issued by the Prosecution department of a foreign treaty State, through Interpol, would be the following two courses of action namely, (i) forward the same to the Central Government for initiating action under Section 34-B; and (ii) bring it to the notice of the jurisdictional Magistrate under Section 9, for, the latter to exercise its power if found necessary. It has to be borne in mind that the two courses of action referred above are not mutually exclusive and they can run in parallel. The Nodal Agency can simultaneously alert the Ministry of External Affairs and also bring the same information to the jurisdictional Magistrate under Section 9 given the risk of the fugitive absconding while the Central Government's channel is being worked through. Nothing in the Extradition Act requires the Nodal Agency to elect the one over the other for they operate as independent legal bases for the arrest of the fugitive. That apart, the three months sunset clause under Section 9 is effectively the bridge between the two courses of action since, even when the procedure under Section 9 is invoked first, the substantive extradition process still has to be regularized through the Central Government within three months via a Section 5 order, for otherwise, the detention lapses. In that view, the recourse to the

procedure under Section 9 does not, in any manner, bypass the primacy given to the Central Government over the decision for ultimate surrender of the fugitive criminal. It only supplies an interim, judicially sanctioned, power of arrest pending the regularisation of the extradition process.

16. As already noticed earlier, the developments that took place during the pendency of these proceedings have effectually rendered infructuous the prayers sought for by the appellant in the writ petition. Hence, the above clarification with regard to the procedure to be followed by the Nodal Agency is made only for the purposes of guiding the Nodal Agency in future cases.

The Writ Appeal is disposed as above.

Sd/-
DR. A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR
JUDGE

Sd/-
PREETA A.K.
JUDGE

prp/

APPENDIX OF W.A NO.350 OF 2021

RESPONDENTS ANNEXURES:

ANNEXURE R4(1)	TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION DATED 31-5-2018 FROM FEDERAL NCB-ABU DHABI.
DOCUMENT 1	COPY OF THE COMPLAINT FILED BY THE COMPLAINANT UNDER SECTON 138 AND 142 OF THE NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS ACT, 26 OF 1881 READ WITH SECTIONS 190(1) OF THE CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, FILED BY THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE HON'BLE JUDICIAL FIRST-CLASS MAGISTRATE COURT, CHENGANNOOR, ALONG WITH ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION.
DOCUMENT 2	COPY OF THE COMPLAINT FILDED UNDER SECTIONS 198 AND 199 OF THE CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE SUBMITTED BY THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE HON'BLE JUDICIAL FIRST CLASS MAGISTRATE COURT, CHAVARA, ALONG WITH ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE