

IN THE SPECIAL COURT FOR THE TRIAL OF NIA CASES, ERNAKULAM

Present: Sri. P.K. Mohandas, Judge for NIA Cases

Thursday the 20th day of November, 2025/29th Karthika, 1947.

Crl.M.P. 462/2025

In

SC No.03/2023/NIA

(RC No.01/2011/NIA/DLI)

Petitioner/Accused No. 1 : Savad @ Savadh @ Shajahan (A1), Age 40/2024, S/o Meerankkutty, Muthuvassery House, Odakkali, Nooleli, Ernakulam District.

Represented by Adv. Sri. Wakarulislam K.S.

Respondent/Complainant : Union of India represented by National Investigation Agency, Kochi.

**Represented by Sri. Arjun Ambalapatta
(Senior Public Prosecutor, NIA) and
Sri. Sreenath.S (Public Prosecutor, NIA).**

This petition is came up for hearing before me on 20.11.2025 in the presence of the counsel for the petitioner and respondent and Court on the same day passed the following:

ORDER

This is an application filed by the 1st accused, seeking permission to visit his father.

2. The petitioner's case is that he has been undergoing detention in this case at the High Security Prison, Viyyur, for 22 months. His father, aged

70 years, who had earlier suffered a stroke and undergone hernia surgery. He is presently suffering from health issues, such as breathing difficulties and mumps, and is unable to walk or visit the petitioner at the jail. The petitioner has been unable to see him during this period. He further states that he has no criminal antecedents. Hence, the petitioner seeks permission to visit his aged and ailing father for one day and seeks physical appearance before the court to meet his advocate.

3. The Public Prosecutor filed objection stating that the petitioner is the prime accused in this case. He absconded immediately after committing the offence. He was evading the process of law for about 14 years by taking shelters in Tamil Nadu and Kerala. The petitioner's father and mother met him on two occasions at Koratty in Thrissur during the period of his absconding. The family members of the accused have the opportunity to meet him in jail. If escort is allowed to the petitioner, there is a chance of influencing the witnesses against him.

4. I have heard the counsel for the petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor. Perused the case records.

5. The application is filed seeking escort parole to meet the father of the petitioner. The Public Prosecutor opposed the application stating that the petitioner is the prime accused in the case and was absconding for long years. Though it is stated in the petitioner that his father is laid-up, there is

nothing to support the same. The petitioner was absconding for more about 14 years. This shows that for more than 14 years the petitioner was not concerned about his father or other family members. The family members can visit the petitioner at the jail. As reported by the Public Prosecutor, as the petitioner is the prime accused in the case, if he is taken to his native place, there is chances for law and order issues. On going through the petition and hearing the counsel for the petitioner and the Prosecutor, I am of the view that no special occasion, which warrants the presence of the petitioner at his residence is made out in this case.

6. In the light of the objection and considering the gravity of the offence alleged against the petitioner and for the reasons stated above, I am not inclined to allow the petition at this stage. Hence the petition is only to be dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Dictated to the Confidential Asst., transcribed and typewritten by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this the 20th day of November, 2025.

Appendix: Nil

Sd/-
P. K. Mohandas
Judge, Special Court for NIA Cases

Id/-
Judge, Special Court for NIA Cases
(By Order)

// True Copy//

Sd/-
Sheristadar