

IN THE COURT OF SESSION KOLLAM DIVISION

Present : Smt.Sushama. P, Asst. Sessions Judge

Monday, the 6th day of April, 2026

16th day of Chaitra 1948 S.E.

Sessions Case No. 876/2022

(C.P.No. 65/2020 of J.F.M.C- I, Kollam, Crime No.1167/20 of Kilikolloor Police Station.)

Complainant

State represented by the Sub Inspector
of Police, Kilikolloor Police Station.

(Represented by
Addl. Public Prosecutor)

Accused

Biju @ Fraud Biju, Aged 38/2020 yrs,
S/o. Sivankutty, Manju Bhavan,
Sree Durga Nagar,
Near Karunamani Temple,
Chathinamkulam Cherry,
Mangadu Village.

(By Adv. **N.R. Roy**)

Charge

Offences Punishable u/ss. 294(b),
506(ii), 324, 308 of IPC.

Plea of the accused

Not Guilty

Finding of the Court

The accused is found guilty of offence
punishable u/s. 506(ii) and 324 of
the Indian Penal Code and is
convicted thereunder. The accused is
not found guilty of offence punishable

u/s. 294(b) and 308 of the Indian Penal Code and is acquitted thereunder.

The accused is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year u/s 506 (ii) of IPC and the sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 2 years and a fine of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only) u/s 324 of IPC. In default of payment of the fine, the accused shall undergo simple imprisonment for 6 months. Upon realization of the fine amount, the same shall be given to PW1 as compensation u/s 357 (1)(b) of the CrPC . The accused is entitled to set-off for the period of 15 days already undergone. The sentence shall run concurrently.

Sentence or Order

06-04-2026

Dates of trial and hearing 11.01.2023, 24.01.2023, 01.04.2023,

07.10.2023,	23.11.2023,	12.01.2024,
02.02.2024,	20.02.2024,	11.03.2024,
01.06.2024,	18.06.2024,	20.06.2024,
24.06.2024,	25.06.2024,	28.06.2024,
06.07.2024,	11.07.2024,	19.07.2024,
22.07.2024,	29.07.2024,	24.08.2024,
31.08.2024,	24.09.2024,	08.10.2024,
01.11.2024,	16.11.2024,	02.12.2024,
04.12.2024,	21.01.2025,	15.02.2025,
30.05.2025,	04.07.2025,	18.09.2025,
23.10.2025,	13.11.2025,	04.12.2025,
15.01.2026,	02.03.2026,	04.03.2026,
13.03.2026,	16.03.2026,	24.03.2026,
25.03.2026,	26.03.2026,	27.03.2026,
31.03.2026.		

This case has been finally heard on 27-03-2026 and the court on 06-04-2026 delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

This is a case charged by the Sub Inspector of Police, Kilikolloor Police Station, in Crime No. 1167/2020 against the accused alleging the commission of offences punishable u/ss. 294(b), 506(ii), 324, 308 of IPC.

2. The substance of the charge against the accused is that, on 06.02.2020 at 15.30 hours, near Kuruthamani temple in Chathanamkulam, Mangattu Village near the house of Viswanathan Pillai, on the road side, due to sudden provocation, the accused

threatened to kill and used abusive language with a knife he had with him. He swung at the stomach of CW1 to stab him as CW1 dodged the cut caused a long wound on the side of his left knee. The accused stabbed the right forearm of CW2 who came to rescue CW1. The stab aimed at the stomach of CW1 would have caused death amounting to culpable homicide. Thereby the accused committed the aforesaid offences .

3. After completing the investigation, charge was laid by the Investigating Officer before the Court of Judicial Magistrate of the First Class - I, Kollam where the case was taken on file as CP. 65/2020 against the accused. The accused was enlarged on bail and the copy of prosecution records were furnished to him. After complying with section 207 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the learned JFCM-Paravoor committed the case against the accused to the Hon'ble Court of Sessions, Kollam. Later, the case was made over to this court for trial and disposal.

4. On the appearance of the accused, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opened his case by describing the charge brought against the accused and stating by what evidence he proposes to prove the guilt of the accused. Upon consideration of the records of the case and the

documents submitted therewith and after hearing the submissions of the accused and the prosecution, charge was framed against the accused for the offences punishable u/ss. 294(b), 506(ii), 324, 308 of IPC which was read over and explained to the accused to which he pleaded not guilty and claims to be tried.

5. On the side of prosecution, PW1 to PW8 were examined and Exhibits P1 to P8 and MO1 were marked. CW9, CW13, CW17, to CW20, CW25 and CW27 were given up by the prosecution.

6. After closing the evidence of prosecution, the accused was questioned u/s.313 (1) (b) of Cr.P.C. He denied all the incriminating circumstances brought out against him. After the examination of the accused u/s.313 (1) (b) of Cr.P.C, an opportunity was afforded to the defence counsel to address argument u/s.232 Cr.P.C. Since the materials placed before the court are sufficient to proceed further, section 232 Cr.P.C was not invoked. Thereafter, the accused was called upon to enter on his defence. But no oral evidence was adduced. Exhibits D1 to D7 were marked.

7. Heard both sides.

8. The points that arise for consideration are:

1. Has the accused uttered obscene words to the PW1 and thereby committed the offence punishable u/s.294(b) of Indian Penal Code as alleged by the prosecution?
2. Has the accused threatened to kill the PW1 and thereby committed the offence punishable u/s. 506(ii) of IPC as alleged by the prosecution?
3. Has the accused voluntarily caused hurt to the PW1 and CW2 with dangerous weapon and thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code as alleged by the prosecution?
4. Has the accused attacked PW1 with a knife with an intention to attempt to commit culpable homicide not amounting to murder and thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 308 of the Indian Penal Code as alleged by the prosecution?
5. Whether the prosecution proved the offences?
6. If so, what is the order and sentence to be passed against him?

9. **Point Nos: 1 to 5:-** For the sake of convenience, these points are considered together. The offences committed by the

accused are punishable under sections u/ss. 294(b), 506(ii), 324, 308 of IPC.

10. PW1 is the injured witness. He testified that on 08.06.2020 at about 3.00–3.30 p.m., while he is proceeding along the road near the temple, the accused comes in an auto rickshaw, stops in front of him, and attacks him with a knife. PW1 further stated that the accused first attempts to stab him, and when he tries to escape, he falls down. At that time, the accused inflicts injury on his left leg with a weapon. He also states that if he had not moved away, he would have been killed. PW1 further states that when he cries for help, CW2 Sivadasan Pillai comes to rescue him, and the accused also stabs CW2. PW1 identifies the accused in court and also identifies MO1 as the weapon used. According to PW1, the people gathered there took him to hospital. Sivadasan Pillai also took medical treatment at hospital. On the next day, he has given statement to the police. He identified the FIS and was marked as Ext.P1. CW2, Sivadasan Pillai is no more.

11. PW2 is an independent eyewitness. He states that he sees the accused arriving in an auto rickshaw and attempting to stab PW1 on neck. According to him, PW1 moves aside and sustains injury on his leg.

He also states that CW2 is stabbed while intervening. PW2 identifies both the accused and MO1. At the time of occurrence he was present in the shop. PW2 further deposed that the accused used a steel knife. Then he stated that he could not say on which leg the injury happened.

12. PW3 is another eyewitness who supports the prosecution case. He states that the accused comes in an auto rickshaw and attacks PW1 with a knife. PW1 falls down while trying to escape, and sustains injury on his leg. He states that CW2 is injured when he tries to intervene. PW3 also identifies MO1 and the accused. PW4 is the witness to seizure mahazar. He identified his signature in the mahazar and was marked as Ext.P2.

13. PW5 is the doctor, who examined PW1. He deposed that he has examined Janardhanan(PW1) on 08-06-20 at 4.10 PM at Assesiya Hospital. On examination he has noted following injuries

1. A lacerated wound size 1x1cm over left thigh
2. A lacerated wound size 3x1cm over upper left calf.

According to the PW5, the aforesaid injuries could be caused when attacked with MO1. The certificate issued by PW5 in this regard is marked as Ext.P3. On the same day he also examined another person named

Sivadasan Pillai (CW2) aged 69 years. On examination the following injuries are noted .

1. A lacerated wound 5x1 cm on the right forearm.

14. According to the PW5, the aforesaid injuries could be caused with MO1. The certificate was marked as Ext.P4.

15. PW6 is the Senior Police Officer of Kilikolloor Police station. He deposed that on receiving information that Janardhanan sustained injuries and taking rest at home , he proceeded to the house of Janardhanan and recorded the statement of Janardhanan. He identified the signature in Ext.P1. The injury of PW1 is noted in Ext.P1 and the relevant portion is marked as Ext.P1(a).

16. PW7, the then Grade Sub Inspector of Kilikolloor Police Station. He deposed that on 09-06-2020, an auto rickshaw bearing **Reg. No. KL02 A2 7235**, in which accused travelled was kept in the Police Station. On 10-2-2020 at 8.am., he witnessed the recording of the Mahazar of the autorickshaw. He has signed the mahazar, which is marked as Ext.P5.

17. PW8, the then Sub Inspector of Kilikollor Police Station, deposed that he received information that PW1 is taking rest at home after medical check up, on sustaining injury, as instructed by him Ext.P1

statement was recorded by Binu. On the basis of Ext.P1, he has registered the FIR in this case , which is marked as Ext.P6. On 10-06-20 at 9.00 am., he reached the place of occurrence and prepared Ext.P2 mahazar. On inquiry, he received information that the accused was present near the Guruthikavu temple and he proceeded to that place and restrained the auto bearing Reg. No. KL02 A2 7235 driven by the accused. The accused and autorickshaw were taken into custody. The accused was identified by CW1 and the accused was arrested after the preparation of the arrest memo, custody memo and inspection memo which are marked as Ext.P7 series. The auto rickshaw was seized as per the Ext. P5 mahazar. From the dashboard of the autorickshaw, a knife with a length of 22 cm with orange colour handle was seized. It was produced before the Court on preparing Ext.P8 property list. After investigation, he filed the charge sheet against the accused.

18. The statement of PW1 in Ext P1 that 'ഒരാൾ സൈക്കിളിൽ കയറ്റി ചന്ദന തോപ്പ് അസീസിയ ആശുപത്രിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോയിരുന്നു' is marked as Ext D1.'ഒരു കൈമടക്കിന്റെ നീളം വരുന്ന കത്തിവെച്ച് എന്റെ നേർക്ക് വീശി'. The said statement in Ext P1 is marked as Ext D2

19. The portion of statement given U/s 161 Cr.P.C by PW2 that അയാൾ സ്റ്റാർട്ട് ചെയ്തു നിർത്തിയിരുന്ന ഓട്ടോ മുന്നോട്ട് എടുത്തുകൊണ്ട് പോയി അപ്പോൾ എനിക്ക് മുന്നിലായി ഓടിച്ചെന്ന് ശിവദാസൻ പിള്ള ചേട്ടനെ വണ്ടിയിൽ നിന്നും എണ്ണീറ്റ് നിന്ന് കൂത്തുന്നതും ടിയാലൂടെ വലത്ത് കൈയിൽ ആണ് കുത്ത് കൊണ്ടത്. ഞാൻ വണ്ടി നിർത്താൻ നോക്കിയപ്പോൾ എന്നെ വെട്ടിച്ച് ചന്ദന തോപ്പ് ഭാഗത്തേക്ക് പോകുന്നത് കണ്ടു are marked as Ext D3 to D5.

20. The portion of statement given U/s 161 Cr.P.C by PW3 that ചേട്ടൻ താമസിക്കുന്ന കുരുത്താമണി അമ്പലത്തിനടുത്തുള്ള വീട്ടിൽ പോയി തിരിച്ചുവരുന്ന വഴി is marked as Ext. D5.

21. During cross-examination, Attention of PW8 was brought to D3 , D4 and D5 and he stated that PW2 has given such a statement. Further he stated that Ext D6 statement was given by PW3 . PW8 stated that at the time of preparation of Ext.P5 the accused was present. PW8 denied the suggestion that the accused was not present at the time of preparation of the recovery mahazar. According to PW8, he had not inquired about the registered owner of the autorickshaw . Ext.D7 is the final report in Crime No. 1535/14 under Sections 294(b), 323, 324 and

427, r/w Section 34 of IPC, registered by the Kilikolloor Police Station against Thambi (PW3), Akulananthan and Baiju .

22. The defence case is that the mother of the accused filed a complaint against PW3 and his friends and out of that grudge a false case is foisted against the accused . A suggestion was put to PW1 by the learned counsel for the accused that, in order to prevent the hitting of the vehicle coming from the opposite side, PW1 lean towards the side of the road , fell down and sustained injury as an iron rod to pierce into the legs of PW1 . This suggestion was denied by PW1. Further suggestion is that consuming of liquor by PW1 is questioned by the mother of the accused, out of that grudge a false case is foisted against the accused. There is no material to improve the suggestion put to PW1 that the mother of the accused had questioned the consuming the liquor by PW1. On perusal of Ext.D7, it is seen that PW3 is the accused No. 1 in that case. During the cross-examination, PW3 stated that he was acquitted in that crime.

23. The learned Prosecutor submitted that with intent to cause death the accused attacked PW1. PW1 sustained injury and wound was sutured. CW2 also sustained injury and his wound was also sutured. The accused is a habitual offender. The evidence given by PW1 to PW3 and PW5 and Exhibit P3 and P4 wound certificates are sufficient to

prove the injury sustained to PW1 and CW2. Minor contradictions and discrepancy in the evidence given by PW1 to PW3 will not cut the root of the prosecution case when the evidence given by PW1 to PW3 is credible and believable. PW1 to PW3 had clearly identified MO1. Injury sustained to CW2 is not challenged by the accused. A lacerated wound can be caused with a sharp-edged weapon. PW5 has given evidence to that effect. According to PW5, the injury noted in Exhibit P3 and P4 could be caused with MO1.

24. The learned prosecutor relied on *Gangadhar Behera v. State of Orissa* reported in 2002 KHC 1080 wherein Hon'ble Apex Court held that when Major portion of evidence of a witness is found unreliable, if the remaining part of the evidence inspires confidence and is sufficient to prove the guilt of the accused, conviction can be based thereon. Court has to separate chaff from the grain and to find in each case whether as to what extent the evidence is acceptable, if separation cannot be done, the evidence has to be rejected in toto.

25. The Learned Prosecutor further relied on '*Rakesh and Another v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another* reported in 2021 KHC 6299 wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court held that for convicting an

accused, recovery of weapon used in commission of offence is not a sine qua non'.

26. Per contra, the learned counsel for the accused would contend that the injury noted in Exhibit P3 and Exhibit P4 could not be caused with a sharp-edged weapon. The MO1 seized in this case is a knife which is a sharp-edged weapon. The injury caused is a lacerated wound which can be caused only with a blunt object. There is discrepancy in the evidence of PW1, PW2 and PW3. There is discrepancy in the description of MO1 by the witnesses. Ext D1 to D6 are proved through PW8. There is no element to attract 294(b)IPC. There is no ingredient to attract Section 506 Part II of IPC. No injury is caused to vital part of the body. Hence 308 IPC is not attracted and the accused is to be acquitted.

27. In Exhibit P1, PW1 stated that he was discharged from hospital at night and the incident happened at 03.30 p.m. on that day. PW1 was treated at 04.10 pm on the same day. He was taking rest in his house. Hence, the delay occurred in informing the police. The accused was arrested on 09.06.2020 at 18.30 hours. The FIR was registered on 09.06.2020 at 16.56 hours under Section 294B, 324 and 308 IPC. PW1's evidence remains consistent regarding the

occurrence, the presence of the accused, and the overt act. PW2's presence near the scene is natural as he is residing nearby. Nothing material is brought out in cross-examination to discredit his version.

28. PW3's evidence corroborates the version of PW1 and PW2. The evidence of PW1 to PW3 is consistent and reliable on all material particulars. They clearly speak about the presence of the accused at the scene, his arrival in an auto rickshaw, and his act of attacking with a knife. Their evidence also consistently establishes that PW1 sustained injuries in the incident and that CW2 also sustained injuries when he intervened. All these witnesses have identified MO1 as the weapon used by the accused. Ext D2 is with respect to the size of the Knife. I find merit in the contention of Learned prosecutor that it is not possible to verify the size of the weapon at the time of occurrence. Ext D1 is with respect no of persons took PW1 to the hospital. It is not a material contradiction. Ext D3 to D6 are not material contradiction effecting the veracity and credibility of PW1 to PW3. It is not expected to reproduce the same statement as given to the police. The medical evidence adduced through PW5, the doctor, fully supports the ocular version. PW5 notes injuries on the left thigh and calf of PW1 and an injury on the right forearm of CW2. He gives a clear opinion that such injuries sustained by PW1 and CW2 can be caused by MO1. He states in

cross-examination that such injuries could also be caused by a fall on sharp object. I do not find any merit in the contention of the learned counsel for the accused that a lacerated wound can be caused only with a blunt weapon. I find merit in the contention of the Learned Prosecutor that there is possibility to cause lacerated wound with a sharp edged weapon. The manner in which the weapon is used and the body part where the injury is inflicted is very relevant. The defense has no dispute that MO1 is a dangerous weapon. MO1 was seized from the autorikshaw. The direct evidence of PW1 to PW3, coupled with the medical evidence, clearly proves the manner of occurrence, the role of the accused and the injuries caused to PW1 and CW2.

29. Minor inconsistencies do not go to the root of the prosecution case and do not in any way shake the credibility of the witnesses. On the other hand, the core of the prosecution case remains intact and consistent throughout, namely that the accused came to the scene, attacked PW1 with a knife, caused injuries to him, and also inflicted injury on CW2 when he intervened. Therefore, the defence contentions are not sufficient to discredit the otherwise reliable and cogent evidence adduced by the prosecution. The presence of PW1 and the accused at the scene is

proved beyond doubt. Testimony of PW1 carries great evidentiary value. There is no reason for him to falsely implicate the accused.

30. It is evident that the accused uses a knife, which is undeniably a dangerous weapon, in the course of the assault, and by such use causes injuries to PW1 and CW2; hence, the offence under S. 324 IPC is clearly made out. In so far as the offence under S. 506 (II) IPC is concerned, the conduct of the accused, as spoken to by PW1, assumes significance. PW1 deposes that the accused, without any provocation, attacks him in a violent and aggressive manner with a knife. The very act of wielding a knife and attempting to stab a person in a public place is sufficient to create a reasonable apprehension in the mind of the victim that his life is in imminent danger. The evidence indicates that PW1 raises alarm during the incident, which further reflects the fear and panic caused by the act of the accused. Therefore, the element of criminal intimidation, accompanied by a threat to life, is clearly established, and the ingredients of S. 506 (II) IPC stand satisfied.

31. In order to attract section 308 IPC, it is to be proved that when a person performs any act with the specific intention or knowledge and under such circumstances, such that if death were caused by that act, the person would be guilty of culpable homicide

not amounting to murder. The intention or knowledge must be inferred from the facts like weapon used ,injury nature ,location, number of blows, circumstances and absence of vital part targeting . Mere use of dangerous weapon de facto will not attract section 308 IPC. In the instant case injury is sustained at non vital part. Motive for causing death or the intention or knowledge to inflict injury which would cause death cannot be inferred from the facts and circumstances of the case. Repeated attempts to cause such injury is also not brought out in evidence. Hence offence U/s 308 IPC is not attracted.

32. Insofar as the offence under S. 294(b) IPC is concerned, the prosecution has failed to establish the essential ingredients required to constitute the said offence. It is pertinent to note that none of the prosecution witnesses, including PW1 to PW3, have deposed before the Court regarding the exact obscene words allegedly uttered by the accused at the time of occurrence. The mere allegation that the accused used obscene language, without specifying the actual words or expressions used, is not sufficient to attract the provisions of Section 294(b) IPC. Therefore, due to lack of cogent and reliable evidence on this aspect, the prosecution has

failed to prove the charge under S. 294(b) IPC, and accordingly, the accused is entitled to be acquitted of the said offence.

33. In view of the discussion above, it is found that the prosecution has succeeded in proving an offence punishable u/s. 506(ii) and 324 of Indian Penal Code against the accused. These points are answered accordingly.

34. **Point No.6:-** In view of the findings above, the accused is found guilty of offence punishable u/s. 506(ii) and 324 of the Indian Penal Code and is convicted thereunder. The accused is not found guilty of offence punishable u/s. 294(b) and 308 of the Indian Penal Code and is acquitted thereunder. Point is answered accordingly

Considering the facts and circumstances and the nature of injuries, this is not a fit case for invoking the benevolent provisions of the Probation of Offenders Act. Hence the accused will be heard on the question of sentence.

(Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on this the 6th day of April 2026.)

Sushama. P,
Assistant Sessions Judge.

35. Heard on the question of sentence. The accused pleaded for mercy. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the period for which the accused has faced trial. I am of the view that the following sentence shall meet the ends of justice. Hence the accused is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year u/s 506 (ii) of IPC and the sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 2 years and a fine of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only) u/s 324 of IPC. In default of payment of the fine, the accused shall undergo simple imprisonment for 6 months. Upon realization of the fine amount, the same shall be given to the complainant as compensation u/s 357 (1)(b) of the CrPC . The accused is entitled to set-off for the period 15 days already undergone. The sentence shall run concurrently. MO1 shall be confiscated after the period prescribed for filing appeal.

(Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on this the 6th day of April 2026.)

Sushama. P,
Assistant Sessions Judge.

APPENDIX:
WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR THE PROSECUTION

PW1 : Janardhanan examined on 12-01-2024
 PW2 : Sreekumar examined on 02-02-2024
 PW3 : Thampi examined on 02-02-2024
 PW4 : Suresh Kumar examined on 02-02-2024
 PW5 : Dr. Anaz Azeez examined on 20-02-2024
 PW6 : Binu examined on 11-03-2024
 PW7 : Joy. T examined on 11-03-2024
 PW8 : Saji. S examined on 11-03-2024

EXHIBITS MARKED FOR PROSECUTION:

Ext.P1: FIS dated 09.06.2020 proved by PW1 on 12.01.2024
 Ext.P1(a): Body note proved by PW6 on 11.03.2024
 Ext.P2: Scene Mahazar dated 10.06.2020 proved by PW4 on
 02.02.2024
 Ext.P3: Wound certificate dated 08.06.2020 proved by PW5 on
 20.02.2024
 Ext.P4: Wound certificate dated 08.06.2020 proved by PW5 on
 20.02.2024
 Ext.P5: Recovery Mahazar dated 10.06.2020 proved by PW7 on
 11.03.2024
 Ext.P6: FIR dated 09.06.2020 proved by PW8 on 11.03.2024
 Ext.P7(series): Arrest Memo, Inspection memo, Intimation memo and
 Custody memo dated 09.06.2020 proved by PW8 on
 11.03.2024
 Ext.P8: Property list dated 10.06.2020 proved by PW8 on 11.03.2024

WITNESS FOR THE DEFENCE: Nil**EXHIBITS FOR THE DEFENCE:**

- D1 : Relevant portion of 161 statement of PW1 proved by PW1 on 12.01.2024
- D2 : Relevant portion of 161 statement of PW1 on 12.01.2024
- D3 : Relevant portion of 161 statement of PW2 on 02.02.2024
- D4 : Relevant portion of 161 statement of PW1 on 02.02.2024
- D5 : Relevant portion of 161 statement of PW1 on 02.02.2024
- D6 : Relevant portion of 161 statement of PW3 on 02.02.2024
- D7 : Certified copy of charge sheet dated 28.06.2024

MATERIAL OBJECTS MARKED : MO1 steel knife proved by PW1 on 12.01.2024

Sushama P.,
Assistant Sessions Judge.

Tabular form to be annexed to judgment as per Rule 132 of criminal Rules of Practice.

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1. | Serial Number | : | Sessions Case No.876/2022 |
| 2. | Name of Police Station and
Crime No. of the offence. | : | Kilikolloor Police Station.
Crime No.1167/20 |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACCUSED

- | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|-------------------|
| 3. | Name | : | Biju @ Fraud Biju |
| 4. | Father's Name | : | |

Sivankutty

5. Occupation : ---
 6. Residence : Manju Bhavan,
 Sree Durga Nagar,
 Near Karunamani Temple,
 Chathinamkulam Cherry,
 Mangadu Village.
7. Age : 38/2020 yrs,
 8. Caste : ---

DATE OF

9. Occurrence : 08.06.2020
 10. Complaint : 09.06.2020
 11. Apprehension : 09.06.2020
 12. Released on bail : 24.06.2020
 13. Commitment : 11.04.2022
 14. Commencement of trial : 11.01.2023
 15. Close of trial : 27.03.2026
 16. Sentence or order : 06.04.2026
 17. Service of copy of Judgment or finding on accused. : No delay
 18. Explanation for delay : No delay

Sd/-
 Sushama P.,
 Assistant Sessions Judge.

Typed by: Salini.S
 //True Copy//

Sushama P.,
 Assistant Sessions Judge.

CALENDAR STATEMENT IN SESSIONS CASE NO.876/2022 ON THE FILE OF THE ASST. SESSIONS COURT,KOLLAM.

1. Serial Number : Sessions Case No.876/2022
2. Name of Police Station and Crime No. of the offence. : Kilikolloor Police Station. Crime No.1167/20

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACCUSED

3. Name : Biju @ Fraud Biju
4. Father's Name : Sivankutty
5. Occupation : ---
6. Residence : Manju Bhavan,
Sree Durga Nagar,
Near Karunamani Temple,
Chathinamkulam Cherry,
Mangadu Village.
7. Age : 38/2020 yrs,
8. Caste : ---

DATE OF

9. Occurrence : 08.06.2020
10. Complaint : 09.06.2020
11. Apprehension : 09.06.2020

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---|------------|
| 12. | Released on bail | : | 24.06.2020 |
| 13. | Commitment | : | 11.04.2022 |
| 14 | Commencement of trial | : | 11.01.2023 |
| 15 | Close of trial | : | 27.03.2026 |
| 16 | Sentence or order | : | 01.04.2026 |
| 17 | Service of copy of judgment or finding on accused. | : | No delay |
| 18 | Explanation for delay | : | No delay |

Sushama P.,
Assistant Sessions Judge.

