

1
**IN THE COURT OF THE SPECIAL JUDGE FAST TRACK,
KOYILANDY**

(KOZHIKODE SESSIONS DIVISION)

Present: Sri. Noushadali K., Special Judge, Koyilandy.

Friday, the 27th day of March, 2026

SESSIONS CASE No: 548 / 2025

(Crime No.210/2025 of Balussery Police Station)

Complainant	:	Sub Inspector of Police, Balussery Police Station
Name of accused	:	Prasad P A, S/o. Aanandan Aged 42/25, Pothappally(H) Thalayad P O
No. of crime and name of Police station	:	Crime No.210/2025 of Balussery Police Station.
Prosecution conducted	:	Sri. Adv. P. Jethin, Special Prosecutor, Koyilandy.
Accused defended by	:	Adv. Ajmila (Legal Aid Counsel)
Charge	:	U/s.509 of IPC,79, 351(3) of BNS and 11(i) r/w 12 of PoCSO Act
Plea of the accused	:	Not guilty
Finding	:	Guilty

Sentence:

1. The convict is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 (six) months each and to pay fine of Rs. 2,500/- (₹ two thousand five hundred only) each under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, and in default of payment of fine to suffer simple imprisonment for 1 (one) month each;
2. The convict is further sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 (six) month and to pay fine of Rs. 5,000/- (₹ Five thousand only) under Section 11(i) read with 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, and in default of payment of fine to suffer simple imprisonment for 2 (two) months;

This case coming on for orders, upon hearing the arguments of Adv.Ajmila appearing for the accused and Special Public Prosecutor for the State. I do adjudge and pass the following.

J U D G M E N T

1. This case has been charge-sheeted by the Sub Inspector of Police, Balussery Police Station, in FIR No. 210/2025, for the offences punishable under Section 509 of the Indian Penal, 75 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and

11(i) read with 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act (for brevity, the “POCSO Act”).

2. In brief, the prosecution's case is as follows: PW1 and the accused are neighbours. On an evening in March 2024, while PW1 was removing the jackfruit rind in the backyard of her house, the accused, who was standing behind his own house, attracted her attention by making a noise. When PW1 turned towards him, the accused lifted his dhoti and exposed his genital organ. It is further alleged that, at about 03.45 p.m. on 25.02.2025, while PW1 was standing in the courtyard of her house, the accused abused her in vulgar language. Based on the above allegations, the accused is alleged to have committed the aforesaid offences.
3. The First Information Report in this case was registered by PW9, the Grade Assistant Sub Inspector of Police attached to Balussery Police Station, based on Ext. P1 First Information Statement dated 26.02.2025 furnished by PW1. Thereafter, PW8, the Sub Inspector of Police, Balussery Police Station, took over the investigation. He arrested the accused on 11.04.2025 and subjected him to a potency test, pursuant to which Ext. P12 potency certificate was obtained. PW8 also submitted Ext. P13 report for incorporating the name and address of the

accused in the case records. The accused was thereafter produced before the court and remanded to judicial custody, where he remained until his release on bail on 25.10.2025. After completing the investigation, PW8 laid the final report alleging the aforesaid offence before the Additional District and Sessions Court for the Trial of Cases Relating to Atrocities and Violence Against Women and Children, Kozhikode. Pursuant to the orders of the Principal Sessions Court, Kozhikode, the case was made over to this Court for disposal.

4. The accused, who was in custody, was produced before this Court. He was defended by a legal aid counsel appointed by the Taluk Legal Services Committee. Copies of all prosecution records and documents were furnished to him in compliance with Section 230 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita. Thereafter, the learned Special Public Prosecutor opened the prosecution case under Section 249 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.
5. Upon consideration of the case records and the documents submitted with the final report and after hearing the submissions of the learned counsel for the accused and the learned Special Public Prosecutor, a charge for the offence punishable under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 79 and 351(3) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and 11(i)

read with 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act was framed, read over, and explained to the accused. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. On the side of the prosecution, nine witnesses were examined as PWs 1 to 9, and documentary evidence was marked as Exts. P1 to P15. The learned Special Public Prosecutor gave up CWs 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13 and 15.
7. After the close of the prosecution evidence, the accused was examined under Section 313(1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure with regard to the incriminating circumstances appearing against him. He denied all such circumstances and maintained his plea of innocence. He further stated that he has been falsely implicated in this case to wreak vengeance in connection with a boundary dispute.
8. Thereafter, the matter was heard on both sides under Section 232 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Finding no grounds to acquit the accused under the said provision, he was called upon to enter on his defence, and the case was adjourned for defence evidence.
9. The accused did not adduce any evidence in defence.
10. Heard both sides.

11.The following points arise for consideration:

- i. Was PW1 a “child” as defined in the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act at the time of the alleged occurrence?
- ii. Whether the accused, on an evening in the last week of March 2024, lifted his dhoti and exposed his private parts to PW1, and further, at about 3.30 p.m. on 25.02.2025, uttered vulgar words to PW1 with the intent to outrage her modesty, thereby committing the offences punishable under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita
- iii. Whether the accused, at about 3.30 p.m. on 25.02.2025, threatened to kill PW1 and thereby committed the offence of criminal intimidation punishable under Section 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita?

- iv. Whether the accused, on an evening in the last week of March 2024, with sexual intent, lifted his dhoti and exposed his private parts to PW1, thereby committing the offence of sexual harassment punishable under Section 11(i) read with Section 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act?
- v. Sentence or order?

12.**Point No. i:-** In a prosecution for offences under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, the prosecution bears the duty of establishing that the survivor was a “child” within the meaning of Section 2(1)(d) of the Act at the time of the alleged incident. Section 2(1)(d) defines a “child” as any person below the age of eighteen years. In this context, Section 34(2) of the Act stipulates that where any question arises before the Special Court as to whether a person is a child, such question shall be determined by the Court after satisfying itself regarding the age of the person concerned, and the reasons for such determination shall be recorded in writing. Notably, neither the Act nor the Rules framed

thereunder prescribe a specific procedure for the determination of age.

13. Regarding the determination of the age of the victims of sexual offences, it is well settled that in the absence of any specific provision in the PoCSO Act or rules made thereunder, the law in respect of the Child in Conflict with Law under the Juvenile Justice (Care & Protection) Act is applicable (see **Jarnail Singh V. State of Haryana [2013(7) SCC 263]** and **P. Yuvaprakash v. State represented by Inspector of Police [AIR 2023 SCC 3525]**). So, the survivor's age has to be proved according to Section 94(2) of the JJ Act 2015 and the first preferential document to prove the age is the date of birth certificate from the school or matriculation certificate.
14. In order to establish the age of PW1, the prosecution examined PW2, the mother of the survivor, who categorically deposed that PW1 was born on 26-02-2008. To corroborate her testimony, the prosecution relied upon the evidence of PW7, the Principal of Balussery Government Higher Secondary School, who produced and proved Ext. P6 extract of the school admission register, Ext. P7 school admission register and Ext P7(a), being the relevant entry in Ext. P7, the school admission register. The said entry was marked after verification with the

original register maintained in the school. The prosecution also relied upon Ext. P14, the birth certificate, which was proved through PW8, the Investigating Officer.

15.Exts.P7(a) and Ext. P14 consistently record the date of birth of PW1 as 26-02-2008. The defence did not seriously dispute or challenge the correctness of the date of birth entered in these documents, nor did it impeach the testimonies of PW2, PW7, and PW8 on this aspect. In the absence of any effective challenge, the oral and documentary evidence adduced by the prosecution remains uncontroverted.

16.Accordingly, this Court finds that the prosecution has satisfactorily established the date of birth and age of PW1 in accordance with the law. It is thus proved that, at the time of the alleged incidents in the last week of March 2024 and on 25.02.2025, PW1 was a “child” within the meaning of Section 2(1)(d) of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, as she was below 18 years of age. This point is, therefore, answered in favour of the prosecution.

17.**Point Nos. ii to iv:-** PW1 is the survivor in the case, and PW2 is his mother. PW3 is the helper at Thalayad Anganavadi who allegedly witnessed the incident that occurred on 25.02.2005. PW4 is a Civil Police Officer

attached to Balussery Police Station, who recorded the statement of PW1 under Section 181 of the BNSS. PW5 is the Secretary of Panangad Grama Panchayat, who issued Exts. P3 and P4 ownership certificates. PW6 is the Village Assistant attached to Kanthalad Village Office, who prepared Ext. P5 site plan.

18. PW7 is the Principal of Government Higher Secondary School, Balussery, who proved Ext. P6 admission extract, Ext. P7 relevant page of the school admission register, and Ext. P7(a) the relevant entry therein. PW8 is the Assistant Sub Inspector of Police attached to Balussery Police Station, who conducted the investigation and proved Exts. P8 to P14. PW9 is the Grade Assistant Sub Inspector of Police, Balussery Police Station, who recorded Ext. P1 First Information Statement of PW1 and registered Ext. P15 First Information Report.

19. The learned Special Public Prosecutor contended that the testimony of PW1 is wholly reliable and that the guilt of the accused stands established based on the oral evidence of the survivor, which is duly corroborated by the testimonies of PW2, PW3, and other witnesses. Per contra, the learned counsel for the accused submitted that the testimonies of PW1 to PW3 are unreliable and untrustworthy, and therefore liable to be rejected. The

learned defence counsel further contended that there is no satisfactory explanation for the failure of PW1 to report the incident alleged to have occurred in March 2024 immediately after its occurrence. It was also argued that a compound wall and plants exist between the houses of the accused and PW1, thereby obstructing visibility between the respective courtyards. According to the learned defence counsel, the accused has been falsely implicated due to enmity arising out of a boundary dispute between PW1's father and the accused. On these grounds, it was contended that the accused is entitled to an acquittal.

20. PW1 to PW3 are the material witnesses in this case. PW1 deposed that she knew the accused, who is her immediate neighbour. She stated that the incident occurred in the last week of March 2024 at about 4.00 p.m. She could not recall the exact date. On that day, while she was removing the jackfruit rind in the backyard of her house near the chicken coop, the accused attracted her attention by making a noise from the side of his house. When she looked in that direction, she saw the accused standing behind his house, who then lifted his dhoti and exposed his private parts to her, and thereafter went inside his house. PW1 further stated that she was frightened by the incident and, due to fear, did not disclose it to anyone on

that day, and that she suffered mental distress as a result thereof.

21.PW1 further deposed that on 25.02.2025, at about 03.30-03.45 p.m., while she was standing in the courtyard of her house, the accused, from behind his house, pointed towards her and uttered highly abusive and obscene words. At that time, her mother was inside the house, and her father was not in the house. She stated that PW3, an anganwadi helper residing nearby, who was returning from the anganwadi, heard the accused abusing her and came to her house. Whereupon PW1 disclosed the earlier incident to her mother. PW1 further stated that the accused had threatened to kill her if she disclosed the matter to anyone.

22.PW1 further stated that she informed the incident her father over the phone, and that on the same night, the accused continued to abuse her till about 11.00 p.m., which compelled her to call the emergency number "112". Police personnel thereafter reached the spot, and on seeing the police the accused left. The next day, her father returned home, and thereafter she, along with her parents, went to the Balussery Police Station, where she gave the First Information Statement, which was recorded and marked as Ext. P1. She also stated that she had given

a statement before the Magistrate under Section 164 Cr. P.C., and that she had shown the place of occurrence to the police.

23.PW2 deposed that PW1 is her daughter. Her husband, who is employed at a hotel in Kozhikode, stays there for work and visits home once a week. She stated that she knew the accused, Prasad, who is their immediate neighbour.

24.PW2 further deposed that she came to know about the incident on 25.02.2025 at about 3.30 p.m., when PW1 informed her about it inside their house. She stated that PW1 also disclosed an earlier incident, which had occurred during her SSLC period, wherein the accused had exposed his private parts to her, and that the same was not reported earlier due to fear. She further stated that PW3, an anganwadi helper residing nearby, came to their house after hearing the accused using abusive language, and informed her that there was no use in confronting the accused.

25.PW2 deposed that the accused continued to use abusive language till about 10.30 p.m., following which PW1 called the emergency number "112", and the police arrived at the scene, on seeing whom the accused left. She stated that on the next day, her husband returned home, and

thereafter they went to the police station where PW1 gave the complaint.

26. She further stated that she signed the Scene Mahazar as an attesting witness, which is marked as Ext. P2.

27. PW3 deposed that she is an anganwadi helper at Thalayad and that she knows PW1 as well as the accused. She stated that on 25.02.2025, at about 03.30-03.45 p.m., while returning home after closing the anganwadi, she heard the accused abusing PW1 in obscene language, while the accused was standing behind his house and PW1 was near her house.

28. PW3 further deposed that she went to PW1's house and, on enquiry, PW1 informed her about the incident. She stated that she advised that there was no use in confronting the accused and thereafter left the place, adding that the accused had earlier abused her as well.

29. She further stated that she later came to know that a case had been registered in connection with the incident and that she had given a statement to the police.

30. It is well settled that, in prosecutions under the PoCSO Act, the testimony of the victim, if found to be trustworthy, cogent and credible, can by itself form the basis for conviction, even in the absence of independent corroboration. In the present case, there is no eyewitness

to the incident alleged to have occurred in the last week of March 2024, wherein the accused is stated to have exposed his private parts to PW1. However, insofar as the incident dated 25.02.2025 is concerned, the prosecution has the benefit of corroborative testimony from PW3.

31.The question that arises for consideration is whether the evidence tendered by PW1 in respect of the incident alleged to have occurred in the last week of March 2024 is of such quality and character as to inspire the confidence of the Court and can be accepted as reliable. PW1, the victim, has given a clear, consistent and cogent account of the occurrence. Though she was subjected to a searching cross-examination, nothing material could be elicited to discredit her testimony or to cast any reasonable doubt on her veracity. No major or material contradictions or omissions have been brought out between her deposition before the Court and her earlier statements recorded under Sections 173, 183 and 180(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

32.The defence, as discernible from the cross-examination of PW1 and PW2 and from the statement of the accused recorded under Section 313(1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, is that the alleged incident never occurred and that the accused has been falsely implicated on account of

enmity arising from a boundary dispute between him and the father of PW1.

33. In view of the total denial of the occurrence by the defence, it is necessary to examine whether there is any material on record to probabalise the defence version. During the cross-examination of PW1 and PW2, it was suggested that there existed a boundary dispute between the accused and the father of PW1, and that the accused had lodged a complaint against PW1's father in that regard. It was further suggested that, owing to such enmity, PW1 was compelled by her father to prefer the present complaint. Both PW1 and PW2 emphatically denied the said suggestions. However, apart from the suggestions put to PW1 and PW2, the accused has not adduced any evidence to establish, even prima facie, the existence of the alleged boundary dispute. Though it was suggested that the accused had lodged a complaint against the father of PW1, no copy of such a complaint has been produced before this Court in support of the said contention. It is also pertinent to note that the defence has not even specified the forum before which the alleged complaint was lodged. In the absence of any evidence to establish the existence of a boundary dispute between the accused and the father of PW1, the defence contention

that the present case was foisted on account of enmity arising out of such a dispute cannot be accepted.

34. It is the further contention of the defence that there was no visibility between the courtyards of the houses of PW1 and the accused, as a compound wall and vegetation existed in between. On that premise, the learned defence counsel submitted that the prosecution case that the accused exposed his genital organ to PW1 while she was sitting in the courtyard of her house cannot be believed. It is, however, admitted that the houses of PW1 and the accused are adjacent, and that the place of occurrence is the backyard of the accused's house.

35. As per Ext. P2 scene mahazar, there exists a compound wall of about 130 centimetres in height on the rear side of the two houses, and the presence of plants is also noted therein. At the same time, Ext. P2 records a passage provided for ingress and egress between the two compounds. The evidence of PW1 further discloses that, at the relevant time, a crack had formed in the compound wall due to heavy water flow during the rainy season, and that no plants were then grown in the said portion.

36. It is pertinent to note that Ext. P2 scene mahazar was prepared approximately one year after the incident. Therefore, the physical features noted therein may not

accurately reflect the condition of the property at the time of occurrence. In such circumstances, the version of PW1 regarding the existence of a crack in the compound wall and the absence of obstructing vegetation at the relevant time appears probable and cannot be discarded.

37. Moreover, the existence of a passage having a width of about 50 centimetres between the two compounds assumes significance. The said passage, coupled with the crack in the wall spoken to by PW1, would reasonably afford sufficient visibility from one courtyard to the other. In light of these aspects, the contention of the defence that there was absolutely no possibility of visibility between the two courtyards is not convincing and stands rejected.

38. The learned defence counsel further contended that PW1 did not disclose the incident, allegedly occurring in March, either to her mother or to her friends, and that she chose to reveal the same only after the occurrence of the alleged second incident. It was also pointed out that there was an inordinate delay in reporting the said incident to the police, for which no plausible explanation has been offered. On that basis, it was argued that the failure of PW1 to disclose the incident to others and to report the

matter to the police promptly is fatal to the prosecution case and renders it doubtful.

39. At the outset, it may be observed that delay in reporting offences of the present nature cannot, by itself, be treated as fatal to the prosecution unless it is shown that such delay has caused prejudice to the accused. In the instant case, PW1 was a girl aged only 15 years at the relevant time. The allegation is that her neighbour exposed his private parts to her. It is only natural that a child of such age would feel hesitant to disclose such an incident to others due to fear, shame and embarrassment.

40. PW1 has specifically deposed that she did not share the incident that occurred in March 2024 with anyone on account of fear. Having regard to her age and the nature of the allegation, the said explanation appears to be natural and plausible. There is nothing on record to discredit her version in this regard.

41. Further, the fact that PW1 disclosed the incident only after the occurrence of the subsequent incident cannot, in the circumstances, be viewed as unnatural or suspicious, but rather as a reaction consistent with the conduct of a child placed in such a situation. Moreover, the defence has not been able to demonstrate that any prejudice has been caused to the accused on account of the delay in lodging

the complaint. In the absence of such prejudice, and in view of the satisfactory explanation offered by PW1, the delay in reporting the incident cannot be held to be fatal to the prosecution case.

42. On an appreciation of the evidence relating to the second incident alleged to have occurred on 25.02.2025, I find that the testimony of PW3 lends material corroboration to the version of PW1. Both PW1 and PW3 have consistently deposed that the accused abused PW1 in filthy language, and they have, in their respective depositions, reproduced the very words allegedly uttered by the accused. The evidence of PW3 has withstood cross-examination, and nothing has been elicited to discredit her testimony. There is nothing on record to suggest that PW3 had any motive to falsely implicate the accused. In such circumstances, her evidence inspires confidence and is liable to be accepted. Having regard to the nature of the words uttered by the accused, directed against PW1, who is a child, I am satisfied that the same were intended to, and in fact did, insult her modesty.

43. In view of the foregoing discussion, the testimony of PW1 in respect of both incidents appears to be cogent and convincing, and there is no reason to disbelieve the same. The question that now arises for consideration is whether

the accused is liable to be convicted for all or any of the offences with which he stands charged.

44. The accused stands charged with the offences punishable under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, Sections 79 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, and Section 11(i) read with Section 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act. The charge under Section 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita was framed on the allegation that the accused had threatened PW1 with dire consequences if she disclosed his indecent acts to anyone. However, there is not even a whisper in the testimony of PW1 before this Court that the accused had extended any such threat. In the absence of any evidence in this regard, the accused cannot be held liable for the offence of criminal intimidation punishable under Section 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

45. As already observed, the prosecution has successfully proved that, on a day in the last week of March 2024 at about 4.00 p.m., the accused exposed his private parts to PW1 by lifting his dhoti, and that on 25.02.2025 he abused her in the most filthy language. The sexual intent of the accused is evident from his conduct, and the said acts were committed with the intention of insulting the modesty of PW1.

46. The ingredients and the punishment prescribed for the offence under Section 509 of the erstwhile Indian Penal Code and Section 79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita are the same. The ingredients of the offence defined under Section 11(i) of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act are also broadly similar to the aforesaid offences. The acts of the accused in exposing his private parts to PW1 and abusing her in filthy language are sufficient to attract the ingredients of the said offences. Accordingly, the accused is liable to be convicted for the said offences. The points are answered accordingly.

47. Accordingly, the accused is found not guilty of the offences punishable under Section 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and acquitted under Section 258(1) of the Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita for the said offence and he is found guilty of the offences under Section 509 of the erstwhile Indian Penal Code, Section 79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, and Section 11(i) of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, and is convicted thereunder.

48. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of the offences proved against him, I am of the considered view that this is not a fit case to extend the benefit of the Probation of Offenders Act to the accused.

49. The accused shall, therefore, be heard on the question of sentence as contemplated under Section 258(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita.

(Dictated to the C.A., typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, on this the 27th day of March, 2026).

SPECIAL JUDGE

50. **Point No. v:-** Heard the convict, the learned counsel for the convict, and the learned Special Public Prosecutor on the question of sentence.

51. The convict submitted that he is a coolie worker by profession and the sole breadwinner of his family, consisting of his unemployed wife and a son who is presently studying in the 10th standard.

52. The learned Special Public Prosecutor submitted that the offence was committed against a child and is grave in nature, and on that basis canvassed for the imposition of the maximum sentence. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the convict pleaded for leniency in the matter of sentence.

53.This is not a case where the convict inflicted any physical injury to PW1. The prosecution has no case that the accused has any criminal antecedents.

54.Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made at the Bar, I am of the considered opinion that sentencing the convict to undergo simple imprisonment for six months each for the offences under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, and Section 11(i) of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, along with a direction to pay fine and, in default, to undergo a further term of imprisonment, would meet the ends of justice.

55.*In the result,*

- i. the convict is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 (six) months each and to pay fine of Rs. 2,500/- (₹ two thousand five hundred only) each under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, and in default of payment of fine to suffer simple imprisonment for 1 (one) month each.

- ii. the convict is further sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 (six) month and to pay fine of Rs. 5,000/- (₹ Five thousand only) under Section 11(i) read with 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, and in default of payment of fine to suffer simple imprisonment for 2 (two) months;
- iii. the substantive sentence shall run concurrently;
- iv. the convict is entitled to set off for the period from 11.04.2025 to 25.10.2025;
- v. fine, if paid or realised, shall be released to PW1 as compensation under Section 395(1)(b) of BNSS.

(Dictated to the C.A., typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, on this the 27th day of March, 2026).

SPECIAL JUDGE

APPENDIX

A. Prosecution Witnesses :

Rank	Name	Date of Evidence	Whether Eye witness, Police witness, Expert witness, Medical witness, Other witness.
PW1	xxx	13-10-2025	Victim
PW2	Saritha	13-10-2025	Other witness
PW3	Subija	25-10-2025	Other witness
PW4	Shalima	25-10-2025	Other witness
PW5	Jaison	25-10-2025	Other witness
PW6	Vinodkumar	25-10-2025	Other witness
PW7	Indu R	22-11-2025	Other witness
PW8	Sujilesh	22-11-2025	Police witness
PW9	Sujatha	17-01-2026	Police witness

B. Defence Witnesses:

Rank	Name	Date of Examination	Whether Eye witness, Police witness, Expert witness, Medical witness, Other witness
		Nil	

C. Court Witness:

Rank	Name	Whether Eye witness, Police witness, Expert witness, Medical witness, Other witness
	Nil	

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Exhibit**A. Prosecution Exhibits:**

Sl.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Ext.P1/PW1	First Information statement
2	Ext.P2/PW2	Scene mahazar
3	Ext.P3/PW5	Ownership Certificate
4	Ext.P4/PW5	Ownership Certificate
5	Ext.P5/PW6	Site Plan
6	Ext.P6/PW7	Admission Extract
7	Ext.P7/PW7	Copy of Admission Register
8	Ext.P7(a)/PW7	Relevant entry in Ext.P7
9	Ext.P8/PW8	Medico Legal Examination Report
10	Ext.P9/PW8	Arrest Memo
11	Ext.P10/PW8	Inspection Memo
12	Ext.P11/PW8	Arrest Intimation memo
13	Ext.P12/PW8	Potency Certificate
14	Ext.P13/PW8	Report to add name and address of accused
15	Ext.P14/PW8	Birth Certificate
16	Ext.P15/PW9	FIR

B. Defence Exhibits:

Sl.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
	Nil	

C. Court Exhibits:

Sl.No	Exhibit Number	Description
	Nil	

D. Material Objects:

Sl.No.	Material Objects	Description
	Nil	

SPECIAL JUDGE

Tabular statement as per Rule 132 of Crl.Rules of Practice in Kerala

1. Serial No. SC 548/2025

2. Description of the accused

Sl. No	Name	Father's Name	Occupation	Age	Residence
1.	Prasad	Aanandan		42/25	Pothappally House, Thalayad PO

Date of :-

Occurrence : 01-03-2024 to 25-02-2025

Complaint : 26-02-2025

Apprehension : 11-04-2025

Release on bail : Custody

Arrest : 11-04-2025

Commencement of trial : 13-10-2025

Close of trial : 17-01-2026

Sentence or order : 27-03-2026

Explanation for the delay : No delay

Examination of witnesses commenced on 13-10-2025 Evidence closed on 17-01-2026. Judgment pronounced on 27-03-2026.

**NOUSHADALI.K.,
SPECIAL JUDGE,
FAST TRACK SPECIAL COURT,
KOYILANDY**

FAIR/COPY JUDGMENT IN SC
NO.548/2025,DATED:
27-03-2026