

IN THE COURT OF THE FAST TRACK SPECIAL JUDGE, HARIPAD
(SESSIONS DIVISION, ALAPPUZHA)

Present:- Sri. Hareesh G., Special Judge

Wednesday, the 25th day of March, 2026

S.C. No.1225/2023

(Crime No.1633/2020 of Kayamkulam Police Station)
(C.P. No.55/2023 of Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-1, Kayamkulam)

Complainant : State of Kerala – represented by S.I. of
Police, Kayamkulam Police Station.

(By Adv.Sri.S. Reghu, Spl. Public Prosecutor)

Accused : 1. Vijayan.
2. Saran.
3. Laly Thankachy.
4. Shilpa.
5. Prasanna.
6. Sunil @ Ambili.
7. Shyam.
8. Sunilkumar @ Kochumon.
9. Santhosh.
10. Vishnu Prasad.

(By Adv.Sri.D. Biju)

Charge : u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/w S.34 of the Indian
Penal Code and S.75 of the Juvenile
Justice (Care and Protection of Children)
Act, 2015.

Plea : Not guilty.

Finding : Not guilty.

Sentence or Order : ***The accused are acquitted u/S.235(1)
Cr.PC for the offences punishable
u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/w S.34 of the***

***Indian Penal Code and S.75 of the
Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection
of Children) Act, 2015.***

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACCUSED

Sl.No.	Name	Father's name	Religion	Occupation	Residence	Age
1	Vijayan S/o Govindan, Krishnasree Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					68/20
2	Saran S/o Vijayan, Lavis Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					35/20
3	Laly Thankachy W/o Vijayan, Krishnasree Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					62/20
4	Shilpa W/o Saran, Lavis Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					32/20
5	Prasanna W/o Soman, Karliyil Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					50/20
6	Sunil @ Ambili S/o Sivanandan, Cherukara Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					39/20
7	Shyam S/o Raveendran, Sarika Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					30/20
8	Sunilkumar @ Kochumon S/o Anirudhan, Kolasseril Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					45/20
9	Santhosh S/o Mohanan, Valyathu Veedu, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					42/20
10	Vishnu Prasad S/o Krishnadas, Krishnalayam, Eruva West Muri, Pathiyoor Village.					21/20

Date of:-

Offence	Report	Apprehension	Release on bail	Committal
18/11/2020	12/04/2021	25/05/2023 (A1, A2, A4, A5, A6 & A7) 03/08/2023 (A3, A8, A9 & A10)	25/05/2023 03/08/2023	25/08/2023

Commencement of trial	Close of trial	Sentence/order	Explanation for delay, if any
12/03/2024 & 18/03/2024	06/03/2026	25/03/2026	-

This Sessions Case having been finally heard on 06/03/2026 and stood over for consideration to this day and the Court delivered the following:

J U D G M E N T

- (1) This case is based on the final report filed by the Sub Inspector of Police attached to the police station at Kayamkulam in Crime No.1633/2020 of the said police station. The accused are put to trial alleging commission of the offences punishable u/Ss.294(b), 323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code (For Short, I.P.C.) and Sec.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act (For Short J.J. Act).
- (2) The prosecution allegation against the accused is as follows:- that the defacto complainant has been living separately from her husband; the defacto complainant obtained an order from the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-1, Kayamkulam and at 03.00 pm on 18/11/2020, she reached her matrimonial house bearing No.III/396 of the Municipality, Kayamkulam with name Krishnasree situated on the western side of Eruva Sree Krishnaswamy Temple in Pathiyoor Village. While the defacto complainant was in the kitchen of the said house, the accused manhandled her in several ways to oust her from the said house.

The 1st accused abused CW1 and slapped on her cheek; the 2nd accused caught hold of her hair and dashed her head against the wall; the accused Nos.3 to 5 assaulted the defacto complainant by beating and hitting her; the 4th accused in the said transaction, slapped on the face of CW3, who cried on seeing the manhandling of his mother; at about 06.30 pm, the accused Nos.6 to 10 and one another person, he can be identified by sight, pulled the defacto complainant to oust her from the house; the 2nd accused in the incident, pressed on the breast of CW1 and also tore her churidar top; the accused Nos.2 & 6 to 10 ousted the defacto complainant by throwing her from the house. In the incident, the defacto complainant lost two cello phones, purse containing ₹.5,000/- which were kept in her car and thereby she sustained loss of ₹.40,000/. Thus, the accused persons have committed the offences punishable u/Ss.294(b), 323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sec.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act.

- (3) The case had its genesis on Ext.P1 FIS given by PW1 before PW10; on the basis of Ext.P1 F.I.S, PW9 has registered the case as per Ext.P7 FIR and after completing the investigation, PW9

has laid the final report before the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-1, Kayamkulam by citing CWs 1 to 13.

- (4) The learned Magistrate took cognizance of the offences u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code and S.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and taken the case on the file as C.C. No.514/21.
- (5) Later, during the pendency of the case, the learned Magistrate having found that the case involves offence u/S.75 of the J.J. Act, converted the case as C.P. No.55/2023 u/S.323 Cr.PC and committed the case against the accused to the Hon'ble Children's Court, Alappuzha u/S.209 Cr.PC. The Hon'ble Children's Court taken the case under the present number and issued process to the accused and thereafter, made over the case to this Court for trial and disposal.
- (6) Upon receipt of the case records, this Court issued process to the accused. The accused appeared before the Court in response to the process issued. On their appearance before the Court, the accused were furnished with copies of all relevant prosecution records and since they were enlarged on bail at the investigation stage of the case, the accused were permitted to continue on the same bail bonds executed by them during the

investigation of the case. The accused were defended by the counsel appointed by them.

- (7) The learned Special Public Prosecutor (the SPP, for short) opened the case u/S.226 of the Cr.PC by describing the charge brought against the accused and by what evidence he proposes to prove the guilt of the accused. Then, after hearing the learned SPP and the learned counsel for the accused u/S.227 of the Cr.PC., charge u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code and S.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 was framed, read over and explained to the accused. The accused pleaded not guilty to the offence charged against them and claimed to be tried.
- (8) Thereafter, from the side of the prosecution, **PW1 to PW10** were examined, marked **Exts.P1 to P12 and MO.1 & MO.2.**
- (9) After closure of the prosecution evidence, the accused were examined u/S.313(1)(b) Cr.PC with respect to the incriminating circumstances brought out against the accused in the prosecution evidence. The accused denied all the incriminating circumstances brought out against them in the prosecution evidence and stated that they are innocent of the allegations levelled by the prosecution.

- (10) Thereupon, the learned SPP and the learned counsel for the accused were heard u/S.232 Cr.PC. Since there is evidence against the accused, it is found that the accused are not entitled to be acquitted u/S.232 Cr.PC. Then the case was posted for the evidence of the accused. From the side of the accused, DW1 was examined and marked Ext.D1 document when they were called upon to enter on their defence.
- (11) Among the prosecution witnesses examined, PW1 is the injured in this case; she has set the law in motion by lodging Ext.P1 FIS. PW2 is the attestor of Ext.P2 scene mahazar. PW3 is the son of PW1; he is also examined to prove the incident. PW4 is an independent witness examined to prove the fact that he has copied the footages of the CCTV installed in the house of the 1st accused in MO.2 pen drive. PW5 is the Registrar attached to the department for registration of births/deaths/marriage in the Panchayat Office, Oachira; he has issued Ext.P3 birth certificate pertaining to PW2. PW6 is the CPO attached to the police station, Kayamkulam; she has recorded additional statement given by PW1 and she has also an attestor of Ext.P4 seizure mahazar, which was prepared to seize the garment of PW1. PW7 is the doctor attached to the Taluk Hospital, Kayamkulam;

she has examined PW1 and issued Ext.P5 certificate. PW8 is the CPO attached to the police station, Kayamkulam; he has signed Ext.P6 mahazar, which was prepared to seize MO.2 pen drive. PW9 is the S.I. of Police attached to the police station, Kayamkulam; he has registered the case as per Ext.P7 FIR and conducted the investigation; through him, Exts.P7 to P12 documents were marked. PW10 is the CPO attached to the police station, Kayamkulam; she has recorded Ext.P1 FIS given by PW1 and she has also prepared Ext.P1(a) body note.

(12) Prosecution has given up CWs 8 & 9. Pending trial, CW2 is reported to be no more.

(13) Heard the learned S.P.P. and the learned counsel for the accused.

(14) The following points arise for consideration:-

- 1) Whether PW3 was a minor at the time of the incident of the case?
- 2) Whether the accused voluntarily caused hurt to PW1?
- 3) Whether the 4th accused voluntarily caused hurt to PW3?
- 4) Whether the 2nd accused outraged the modesty of PW1?
- 5) Whether the accused committed mischief and thereby caused loss to PW1?

- 6) Whether the accused shared any common intention to commit the offence?
- 7) What, if any is the offence committed by the accused?
- 8) Regarding sentence or order?

(15) **Point No.1 to 6:-**

Since these points are interconnected, they all are considered together. The prosecution alleges the offence u/S 75 of the J.J Act against the accused on the ground that PW3 ,the son of PW 1, also sustained assault in the alleged incident. Therefore the prosecution is bound to prove that PW3 was child at the time of the alleged incident. PW1 the mother of PW3 deposed that her son was born on 20/09/2014.PW5 the Registrar attached to the department for registration of births/deaths/marriage in the Grama Panchayat Office, Oachira has issued **Ext.P3** certificate showing the date of birth of PW3 and as per the said certificate, the date of birth of PW3 is on 20/09/2014.the above mentioned evidence regarding the age of PW3 is not disputed by the accused. Accused have no case that at the time of the date of the incident PW3 is not child. As per the prosecution case the incident happened on 18/11/2020. Thus, it is found that on the said day PW3 has not completed the age of 18 years and therefore he is child as defined in the J.J Act.

(16) In this case, PW1 is the person who set the law in motion. Gist of her evidence is that on 22/05/2011, her marriage with Sarath (the son of the 1st and the 2nd accused) was solemnized. PW1 deposed that after the demise of her father, her husband moved the court for divorce. She testified that on 20/09/2014, she gave birth to PW3. She deposed that she was not ready for divorce. She deposed that she secured protection order from Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-1, Kayamkulam. It is her evidence before the court that on 13/11/2020, she secured protection order from Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-1, Kayamkulam and then she along with her son and mother reached the house of her husband in the car bearing Regn.No.KL-29-C 6363. PW1 further deposed that the said car was purchased in the name of the 3rd accused. She deposed that at that time she was preparing for UPSC examination and her tablet, notes, text books, two phones, ₹.50,000/- and her gold chain were kept in the said car. She deposed that when she reached the house of her husband, the house was remained closed and then she and her son entered into the house through the kitchen.

(17) PW1 further deposed that on knowing that she has arrived in the house, her husband's brother (the second accused) together

with her father-in-law and mother-in-law and the 4th accused, who is the wife of the 2nd accused reached the house. PW1 further deposed that the 5th accused, who is residing in the next door also reached the house. She deposed that then her mother-in-law abused her and asked her to leave the kitchen. She deposed that she did not leave the place and her mother-in-law sat on a chair in the kitchen. It is her evidence before the court that then the 1st accused abused her in filthy languages and slapped on her face. PW1 deposed that the 2nd accused dashed her head against the wall by holding her hair. She deposed that then the 4th accused Shilpa hit her on the back. She further testified that the 4th accused then slapped on the face of PW3. PW1 further testified that the 5th accused Prasanna abused her in filthy languages. She deposed that her in-laws tried to expel her from the house, but she remained there and then the 2nd accused called Sunil (the 8th accused). PW1 deposed that then the 8th accused reached the place with the members of the political faction, DYFI. She deposed that she came to know that the 8th accused and his associates were summoned by paying ₹.25,000/-. She further deposed that it is the accused nos.6, 9 & 10 are the persons reached the place. PW1 further deposed that then after leaving of ladies from the

cite, the other persons who were summoned by the 8th accused, entered into the kitchen. She deposed that as she was not ready to leave the place, the 2nd accused tore her attire and pressed her breast.

(18) PW1 further deposed that then all the said persons threw her out of the house. It is her evidence before the court that at that time, the 7th accused were also there, but he did not do anything. PW1 deposed that the said persons damaged her car and the 1st accused took PW3 to a nearby shop to give him juice. She deposed that her son told her that he has witnessed her car being taken away on a pick-up. PW1 deposed that later she came out of the house with her son and then the ladies entered into the house and closed the house.

(19) It is her evidence before the court that after the incident, she went to the police station, Kayamkulam and gave a statement, but she could not give a proper statement. PW1 deposed that she was afraid of going to the hospital as covid pandemic was prevailing. PW1 further deposed that later police have summoned her to give statement. She deposed that on her way to Kayamkulam police station from Chengannur, she consulted the doctor in the Govt. Hospital, Kayamkulam. She further

testified that the accused exploited her ignorance and tender age. PW1 deposed that the in-laws tried to avoid her as they were on the belief that they will not get money from her house. The statement given by PW1 in the police station is marked as **Ext.P1** and her churidar, which she had worn at the time of the incident is marked as **MO.1**.

(20) PW3 is the son of PW1. He would depose that on 18th November 2020, he along with his mother and his grandmother reached his father's house at Eruva. PW3 deposed that his grandmother waited outside and then he and his mother entered into the house through the kitchen. It is his evidence before the court that then his father's mother reached there and sat on a chair in the kitchen. PW3 deposed that later his father's father slapped on the cheek of PW1. He further deposed that then the 2nd accused and his wife, the 4th accused were also reached there and both of them hit on the back of PW1. He further testified that then he left the place by crying. PW3 deposed that the 4th accused slapped on his cheek. He deposed that later the 1st accused took him to a nearby shop and then he witnessed his car is being removed on a pick-up. It is his evidence before the court that when he returned to his mother, he saw her standing

with torn attire. PW3 deposed that the accused persons acted as above to oust his mother.

- (21) PW2 is the attestor of **Ext.P2** scene mahazar. He deposed that he is residing at Eruva of Kayamkulam and he has got acquaintance with PW1 and the accused. He deposed that he has witnessed the preparation of mahazar and he has signed the same.
- (22) PW4 Anu G. testified that he is doing the installation of CCTV and he has installed CCTV in the house of the 1st accused. He further deposed that he has copied the footage in the CCTV in the house of the 1st accused in MO.2 pen-drive.
- (23) PW5 is the Registrar attached to the department for registration of births/deaths/marriage in the Grama Panchayat Office, Oachira. He deposed that he has issued **Ext.P3** certificate showing the date of birth of one Vijai Sarath (PW3) and as per the said certificate, the date of birth of PW3 is on 20/09/2014.
- (24) PW6 is the CPO attached to the police station, Kayamkulam. She deposed that she has recorded the additional statement given by PW1 and she has also signed the seizure mahazar

which was prepared to seize MO.1 garment. The said mahazar is marked as **Ext.P4**.

- (25) PW7 is the doctor attached to the Taluk Hospital, Kayamkulam. She deposed that at 05.00 pm on 19/11/2020, she examined PW1 and issued **Ext.P5** certificate. PW7 deposed that on her examination of PW1, she has noted one abrasion .5 x .5 cm on the right forearm, contusion 1x1 cm on left upper arm, scratch marks, light abrasion in a region of 3 x 2 cm of left breast.
- (26) PW8 is the CPO attached to the police station, Kayamkulam. He testified that he has signed **Ext.P6** seizure mahazar, which was prepared to seize MO.2 pen drive.
- (27) PW9 is the S.I. of Police attached to the police station, Kayamkulam. He deposed that he has registered the case as per Ext.P7 FIR and inspected the scene of occurrence and prepared Ext.P2 scene mahazar. He deposed that he has arrested the accused Nos.1 to 5, 7 and 8. It is his evidence before the court that he has collected the footage in CCTV installed at the crime scene in MO.2 pen drive. PW9 deposed that he has prepared Ext.P6 mahazar after seeing the CCTV footage in the pen drive in a computer. He further deposed that

he has filed **Ext.P8** report stating that the offence u/S.31(1) of PWDV Act is not made out in the incident.

(28) PW9 further deposed that he has incorporated Sec.75 of J.J. Act in the case by filing **Ext.P9** report. He deposed that he has seized the attire of PW1, which she had worn at the time of the incident as per Ext.P4 mahazar. He deposed that he has produced MO1 & MO2 before the court as per **Ext.P10** property list. He testified that he has obtained Ext.P3 birth certificate to prove the date of birth of PW3 and he has obtained Ext.P5 wound certificate pertaining to PW1. He further deposed that through him, the arrest memo of the accused Nos.1 to 5, 7 & 8 are marked as **Ext.P11** series and the bail bonds of the said accused are marked as **Ext.P12** series.

(29) PW10 is the CPO attached to the police station, Kayamkulam. She deposed that she has recorded Ext.P1 FIS given by PW1 and she has also prepared **Ext.P1(a)** body note with respect to PW1.

(30) The prosecution has adduced the abovementioned evidence to bring home the charge against the accused. The prosecution case is that PW1 upon reaching her matrimonial house with a protection order against her in-laws, the accused persons manhandled her and her son. The counsel for the accused

argued that this is a false case foisted against the accused. It is his argument that the case hinges solely on the testimony of PW1 and her son and there is no corroboration to their evidence and therefore, it is very unsafe to rely on the evidence of PW1 and her son. The counsel for the accused also argued that PW1 is facing trial in another case instituted by the 4th accused herein and prosecution has suppressed the existence of said case. The learned counsel for the accused also argued that the evidence of PW1 is unbelievable and the prosecution has suppressed the first version of PW1 from the court.

(31) To substantiate the contention of the accused, the 2nd accused in this case testified as DW1. He deposed that PW1 has instituted a complaint against him and his brother, who is the husband of PW1 as per the provisions of P.W.D .V. Act and on 31/10/2025, the court passed the final order in the said M.C. The certified copy of order in M.C. No.43/2020 is marked as **Ext.D1**. DW1 deposed that in Ext.D1 order, all allegations levelled against him are rejected by the Magistrate's Court.

(32) The contentions raised from the accused are put to scrutiny. PW1 deposed before the court that the 1st accused slapped on her cheek, the 2nd accused dashed her head against the wall and the 4th accused hit her on the back. As per Ext.P1 FIS, the 3rd

accused also hit on the back of PW1. But, before the court PW1 has no case that the 3rd accused attacked her. As per the evidence of PW1, the persons who were summoned by the accused thrown her out of the house. But, it is to be noted that the incident happened in the broad day light, but none of the persons from the locality was either cited or examined to prove the overt act of the accused. As per Ext.P1 FIS, the accused persons removed the car of PW1 in a pick-up and PW1 sustained a loss of ₹.12,000/- as she lost the articles in the car. Here, it is to be noted that prosecution has not conducted any investigation regarding the car of PW1. The car was not seized or any mahazar was drawn with respect to the car and the articles kept therein. It is not gatherable whether the prosecution has recovered the articles. PW1 admitted that she has received some articles from the police station. This aspect casts a serious doubt with regard to the genuineness of the prosecution case.

(33) The only other witness spoke about the incident is PW3, the son of PW1. PW3 deposed that the 2nd and 4th accused hit on the back of PW1. PW3 has no case that the 2nd accused dashed the head of PW1 against wall. Here in this case, PWs 1 & 3 deposed that the 4th accused slapped on the cheek of PW3. But, PW3 was

not attended by a doctor and no medical evidence is produced to prove that PW3 also sustained attack in the alleged incident.

(34) Here, the medical evidence on record also not in accordance with the evidence of PW1. As per Ext.P5, the doctor (PW7) noted only abrasion on right forearm, a contusion on the left upper arm and a scratch mark on the left breast of PW1. Had PW1 was manhandled by the accused as deposed by her before the court, she would have sustained injuries on her head as well as on her back. Here the medical evidence on record does not support the evidence of PW1 regarding the attack meted out by her at the hands of the accused.

(35) It is to be noted that the alleged incident happened on 18/11/2020 afternoon, but PW1 reached the hospital only at 05.20 pm on 19/11/2020. Thus, it is found that had PW1 sustained injuries in the attack, she would have reached the hospital soon after the incident. PW1 deposed before the court that after the incident, she gave a statement in the police station, Kayamkulam. But, that statement was not a correct one and on the next day, she was summoned to the police station to give her statement and on her way to the police station, she consulted in the hospital. Here, it can be seen that PW1 had

given a statement in the police station soon after the incident, but the police has not acted upon the statement and she was again called up to give another statement. So, the chance of PW1 giving an embellishment version after due deliberation cannot be ruled out. The prosecution suppressed the first statement given by PW1.

- (36) Interestingly, when PW1 was cross-examined with respect to the case pending against her on the allegation that on the alleged time and place of the incident of the case, she attacked the 4th accused herein, she pleaded ignorance. Thus, on consideration all these aspects, it is found that the evidence of PW1 is not free from suspicion. The prosecution has suppressed the earliest version of PW1 regarding the incident. There is no independent corroboration of the testimony of PW1. The medical evidence on record is also not in tune with the ocular evidence of PW1. Thus, it is found that it is very unsafe to rely on the evidence of PW1 to enter into a finding against the accused persons.
- (37) The function of the Court in a criminal trial is to find whether the person arraigned before it as the accused is guilty of the offence with which he is charged. For this purpose, the Court scans the material on record to find whether there is any reliable and trust

worthy evidence upon the basis of which it is possible to convince to pass the conviction of the accused and to hold that he is guilty of the offence with which he is charged. If in a case prosecution leads uncorroborated evidence and shows it to be unreliable, the result would necessarily be that the Court would left with no reliable and trustworthy evidence upon the conviction of the accused might be based. Inevitably, the accused would have the benefit of such a situation.

(38) Upshot of the discussion is that the prosecution could not prove the overt act of the accused persons herein beyond reasonable doubt and it is also found that the prosecution evidence is not sufficient to prove that the accused have committed the offences punishable u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code and S.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. These points are answered accordingly.

(39) **Point No.7:-**

Vide discussions made in the foregoing points, it is found that the prosecution has failed to prove that the accused has committed the offence punishable u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code and S.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. This point is answered accordingly.

(40) **Point No.8:-**

Vide discussions made in the foregoing points, it is found that the prosecution has failed to prove that the accused have committed the offences punishable u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code and S.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.

In the result,

the accused are acquitted u/S.235(1) of Cr.PC. for the offences u/Ss.323, 354 & 427 r/W S.34 of the Indian Penal Code and S.75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. The bail bonds executed by the accused stand cancelled and they are set at liberty, forthwith.

MO.1 (churidar top) is directed to be destroyed & MO.2 (pendrive) is ordered to be kept in the file as per rules after the expiry of the appeal period or if an appeal is preferred, the said items shall be disposed subject to the direction of the Appellate Court.

(Dictated to the Confidential Asst. directly typed on the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court on this the 25th day of March, 2026).

Sd/-
Special Judge,
Fast Track Special Court, Haripad.

APPENDIX

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Witnesses:-

STATEMENT UNDER RULE 134 OF THE CRIMINAL RULES OF PRACTICE

A. WITNESSES FOR THE PROSECUTION:-

Rank	Name	Whether eye-witness, police witness, expert witness, medical witness, other witness	Date of deposition
PW1	Sonia Soman	-	13/01/25
PW2	Sathyadas	Witness	13/01/25
PW3	Samarth	-	14/01/25
PW4	Anu G.	Witness	14/01/25
PW5	Dileep T.	Registrar of Births/Deaths/Marriage, Grama Panchayat Office, Oachira	14/01/25
PW6	Jazeela H.	CPO, Kayamkulam Police Station	15/01/25
PW7	Dr. Shoukath A.	Taluk Hospital, Kayamkulam	16/01/25
PW8	Arunkumar K.	CPO, Kayamkulam Police Station	16/01/25
PW9	Anilkumar K.R.	S.I. of Police, Kayamkulam P.S.	16/01/25
PW10	Anoopi A.	CPO, Kayamkulam Police Station	24/01/25

B. WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENCE:-

Rank	Name	Whether eye-witness, police witness, expert witness, medical witness, other witness	Date of deposition
DW1	Saran	-	11/12/25

C. WITNESSES FOR THE COURT:-

Rank	Name	Whether eye-witness, police witness, expert witness, medical witness, other witness	Date of deposition
- NIL -			

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Exhibits:-

Sl.No	Exhibit Number	Description	Date
1	P1/PW1	First Information Statement	19/11/20
2	P1(a)/PW10	Body note	19/11/20
3	P2/PW2	Scene mahazar	26/08/21
4	P3/PW5	Birth certificate	24/03/21
5	P4/PW6	Seizure mahazar	22/01/21
6	P5/PW7	Medical certificate	19/11/20
7	P6/PW8	Mahazar (pendrive)	27/11/20
8	P7/PW9	First Information Report	19/11/20
9	P8/PW9	Section adding report	05/02/21
10	P9/PW9	Section adding report	05/02/21

11	P10/PW9	Property list	22/01/21
12	P11 series/PW9	Arrest memo	22/12/20
13	P12 series/PW9	Bail bond	22/12/20

B. EXHIBITS FOR THE DEFENCE:-

Sl.No.	Exhibit Number	Description	Date
1.	D1/DW1	Certified copy of order in MC 43/20	31/10/25

C. EXHIBITS FOR THE COURT:-

Sl.No.	Exhibit Number	Description	Date
- N I L -			

D. MATERIALS OBJECTS:-

Sl.No.	Exhibit Number	Description	Date
1	MO1/PW1	Churidar top	-
2	MO2/PW4	Pendrive	-

Sd/-
Special Judge,
Fast Track Special Court, Haripad.

-//True Copy//-

Special Judge,
Fast Track Special Court, Haripad.