

**IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT  
AND SESSIONS JUDGE, UDUPI**

**CASE No: S.C 34/2025 PW: 8**

**CW: 10**

Name of the Witness : Dr.Geethalakshmi P.  
Husband Name : Dr. Sathymoorthy Kumble  
Age : 50 Years  
Occupation : Assistant Director, Biology Department,  
Regional Forensic Science Laboratory,  
Mangaluru.  
Address : Mangaluru.

**EVIDENCE RECORDED THROUGH V.C**

Duly sworn on 11-02-2026.

**Chief examination by: Public Prosecutor.**

1) Since from 2004, I am working as Assistant Director at Regional Forensic Science Laboratory, Mangaluru. My qualification is M.Sc., in Bio-Science and Ph.D. in Applied Botany. Till today I have examined more than 8500 samples and issued my report.

2) On 05-04-2025, our office received sealed articles from Udupi Town Police Station in Crime No.53/2025 through PC 14 with a requisition for scientific examination and report. On examination I found the seals on the articles were intact and tallied with sample seal.

3) The said articles was opened in the Lab for examination

SL. No.	Description of Articles	I.O Marking.
1	One Knife	1
2	One Pant	2
3	One T-Shirt	3

Duration of examination 05-04-2025 to 11-04-2025.

4) Method of Analysis

Specimen scrapings/cuttings from the suspected areas on the articles were tested for blood using presumptive tests namely, Benzidine/Phenolphthalein tests. The presence of blood stains was further confirmed by conducting Takayama crystal tests. The nature of the stains, their extent/size and location were also noted.

The results of the examinations are furnished below.

Item No.	Stained with blood/Not Stained	Extent of stains	Size(approx)	Location
1	Stained	Few	0.1-6 cm	Here & there on blade
2	Stained	Few	0.1.20 cm	Here & there
3	Stained	Moderate	Large	Here & there

5) Serology report: The specimen cuttings/scrapings of the blood stained articles were subjected to serological analysis. The origin was determined by Gel Diffusion method, Cross over Electrophoresis and the blood grouping was determined by the Absorption Elution method. The results of the serological examination are;

1. Blood stains were detected in item Nos. 1, 2 and 3.
2. Article Nos.1, 2 and 3 are stained with human blood.
3. Article Nos.2 and 3 are stained with "A" group blood.
4. The blood group of the stains in Article No.1 could not be determined as the results of the tests were inconclusive.

6) Accordingly I issued Report. The Report now shown to me is the same. It bears my signature. The same is marked at

**Ex.P. 16** and signature of the witness is marked at **Ex.P. 16(a)**.  
The sample is marked at **Ex.P.17**.

7) After conducting examination and issuing my opinion, I had resealed the articles and sent back to the I.O. I can identify the articles examined by me on that day. The same are already marked at M.O.1 to 3.

**Cross-examination by: Sri.R.P.(LADC) Advocate for Accused**

1) I didn't described the seal when received the pack of articles. But, I compared the seals found on the packs with samples furnished. I conducted presumptive test for the necessity to conduct confirmation test. In case presumptive test result are negative and then confirmation of tests does not arrive. It is incorrect to say that, the confirmation test may sometimes indicate the results as false positive or false negative. I have the notes for conducting respective tests on different dates. I have not furnished those notes to the I.O. It is false to say that, M.O. 1 to 3, did not possess the human blood stains. It is false to say that, without following chemical examination procedures, I have issued Ex.P.16.

Re examination: Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C

Prl. District & Sessions Judge,  
Udupi.

