

IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS, KOLLAM SESSIONS DIVISION

Present: Sri. Shanavas. A, Assistant Sessions Judge, Kottarakara

Monday the 16th day of March 2026/The 25th day of Phalguma 1947

Sessions Case No. 344/2021

(CP No. 50/2020 of Judicial First Class Magistrate Court (Tem.),Kadakkal)

Complainant:- State of Kerala represented by the Inspector of Police,
In crime No. 2226/2020 of Kadakkal Police Station

(Represented by Adv. Sri. Shaji .K , Addl. Public
Prosecutor Kottarakara)

Accused:-

1. Sudheer, S/o Sulaiman, Ramsu Manzilil,
Elambazhannoor P.O, Kadakkal Village.
Residing at Rose Villayil,
Near Thongatukonam, Elampazhannoor.
2. Ajas, S/o Hussain, Charuvila Veedu,
Kunnumpuram, Elambazhannoor P.O,
Kadakkal Village. Residing at Rented House,
Hayarinisa Near Muslim, Jumayath,
Elampazhannoor .

By Adv. Sri. A.K Gopakumar

Charge Offence punishable u/s.294(b), 341, 324,427,308 r/w 34
of the Indian Penal Code,1860.

Plea of the Accused Not guilty

Finding of the Court Not guilty

Sentence or Order The accused are found not guilty of the offence
under Sections 294(b), 341,324,427, 308 r/w 34 of
the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and they are acquitted
under Section 235(1) of the Code of Criminal

Procedure, 1973.

Dates of Trial 16/09/2025, 14/10/2025, 15/10/2025, 27/10/2025,
10/11/2025

This sessions case has been finally heard on 13/03/2026 and the court 16/03/2026 delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

The accused persons faces trial for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b),341,324,427, 308 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code 1860 on the basis of the final report filed by Sub Inspector of Police Kadakkal in Crime No. 2226/2020 of Kadakkal Police Station.

2. Prosecution case id that on 15/08/2020 at 14:00 hours at Kallyani Mukku-Sri Sathya Quarry Road at Kuttiyittavila, the accused out of animosity towards CW1 and in furtherance of their common intention, when CW1 drove his motorcycle with CW2 as pillion rider, accused No.1 uttered profanity against CW1. When that was questioned by CW1the accused along with the juvenile in conflict with law wrongfully restrained the motorcycle of CW1 and accused No. 1 kicked on the motorcycle, thereby CW1 and CW2 fell down on the ground with the motorcycle. When CW2 tried to arise from the ground, accused No. 1 caught hold on the neck of CW1 and the child in conflict with law handed over and iron bar to accused No.2 to attack CW1. Thereupon accused No.2 attempted to hit on the head of

CW1 with an iron bar that was averted by CW1 causing contusion and swelling on the right elbow. Accused No. 2 hit on the back of body of CW1 with the iron bar and the child on conflict with law hit on the back of body of CW1 with a stick causing injury. In the midst of the incident half portion of the gold chain of CW1 weighing 1.5 sovereigns had lost thereby causing wrongful loss to CW1 to the tune of ₹ 25,000/-. Had CW1 not averted the act of accused No. 2, it would have caused his death. Thus the accused interalia attempted to commit culpable homicide not amounting to murder of CW1.

3. After the investigation, the investigating officer filed final report before the Judicial First-Class Magistrate Court, Kadakkal (Temporary). The case was taken on file as CP 50/2020 against the accused persons. After serving copies of the prosecution records and thereby complied Section 207 of the Criminal Procedure Code 1973, the learned Judicial Magistrate committed the case to the Honourable Court of Sessions, Kollam. The Honourable Court of Sessions, Kollam took cognizance of the offences and made over the case for trial and disposal to this court.

4. On appearance of the accused persons before this court, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opened the prosecution case, by describing the charges against the accused and the evidence by which he proposes to prove the guilt of the accused. Upon considering the prosecution records and the documents submitted there with and on

hearing the submissions of the accused persons and the prosecution, the court framed charges for offences under Sections 294(b),341,324,427, 308 r/w 34 of Indian Penal Code 1860 . When the charge was read over and explained to the accused persons in Malayalam translation, they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5. To prove the case of the prosecution, the prosecution examined 5 witnesses as PW1 to PW5 and Ext. P1 to Ext. P11 and MO1 and MO2 were marked. After the closure of evidence of prosecution, the accused was questioned under section 313 (1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973. Accused No. 1 stated that he and accused No. 2 are loading laborers. When they loading wooden logs to a lorry PW1 came there on a motorcycle and the motorcycle was wobbled and crashed the same causing injury. Thereupon a portion of the gold chain of PW1 was lost. He misunderstood that it was the accused No. 1 and 2 took the broken piece of gold chain and that culminated the case against the accused. He is innocent and he is falsely implicated in this this case. Accused No. 2 reiterated his innocence. No defence evidence was adduced.

6. Heard both sides.

7. The following points arose for consideration:-

1. Had the accused No. 1 in furtherance of the common intention with accused No. 2 with uttered obscene

words to PW1 on 15/08/2020 at 14:00 at Kallyani Mukku – Sri. Sathya Quarry Road at Kuttiyittavila as alleged?

2. Had the accused No. 1 in furtherance of their common intention wrongfully restrained the motorcycle of PW1 and CW2 on 15/08/2020 at 14:00 at Kallyani Mukku – Sri. Sathya Quarry Road at Kuttiyittavila as alleged?
3. Are the accused in furtherance of their common intention voluntarily caused hurt to PW1 with MO1 and MO2 on 15/08/2020 at 14:00 at Kallyani Mukku – Sri. Sathya Quarry Road at Kuttiyittavila as alleged?
4. Had the accused caused mischief to the gold chain worn by PW1 on 15/08/2020 at 14:00 at Kallyani Mukku – Sri. Sathya Quarry Road at Kuttiyittavila as alleged?
5. Had the accused in furtherance of their common intention attempted to commit culpable homicide not amounting to murder of PW1 with MO1 and MO2 on 15/08/2020 at 14:00 at Kallyani Mukku – Sri. Sathya Quarry Road at Kuttiyittavila as alleged?
6. What shall be the punishment if any to be awarded to the accused?

8. **Point No. 1 to 5:-** These points can be considered together. The prosecution case stated in paragraph 2 above in detail. As already stated 5 witnesses were examined and Ext.P1 to Ext.P11 and MO1 and MO2 were marked on the side of the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused. The injured was examined as PW1. His evidence is extracted below:-

He was injured on 15/08/2020 at about 2pm at Kuttiyittavila. Through him Ext. P1 was marked in evidence. PW1 is a JCB operator. He along with CW2 was on a motorcycle on the way of Sri. Sathya Quarry for entrusting some amount. Thereupon accused No. 1 uttered obscene words to him to PW1. Thereafter PW1 and CW2 after entrusting money returned on the motorcycle. Thereupon accused No. 1 and 2 along with on child in conflict with law waylaid the motorcycle and appealed others to kill PW1. The child in conflict with law handed over an iron bar to accused No.1. Meanwhile accused No.1 kicked on the motorcycle. Accused No. 2 attempted to hit on the head of PW1 with the iron bar, that was averted by him causing injury on the right hand. The child in conflict with law attacked PW1 with a stick. Thereupon people assembled and after sometime he went to Kadakkal Hospital on the motorcycle. During the attack half portion of the gold sovereign worn by him had lost. CW2 was also injured in the incident. He was also conveyed to Government Medical College Hospital and he identified accused No. 1 and 2 in the dock. Moreover the weapons which were used to attack PW1 was marked as MO1 and MO2.

9. PW1 was cross examined at length by the learned counsel for the accused in this case. He has demonstrated that as per the instruction of the father of PW1 he has been conducting the case. He had shown the remaining portion of the gold sovereigns to the police. It has come out in evidence that the road was not in a good condition and there are granite stones on the road. CW2 is no more after the incident. Though he was suggested that one Shibi brought him to hospital he turned down in the same stating one Riyas he brought him to the hospital. It has also come out in evidence that accused No. 2 used MO2 to attack him. He stated that he had a bleeding injury on his back of body. He was suggested that there was no injury on the right side of PW1 but that was declined by PW1. He was also suggested that he turned down from the motorcycle on the road causing injury and causing loss of the piece of the gold sovereign and causing abrasion. That was also rejected by PW1. He was also suggested that there is no mention about the conveyance of CW2 to Government Medical College by PW1 in Ext.P1 statement. However he stated that he gave such statement before the police. However on scrutiny of Ext.P1 it can be seen that no such statement was given to police by PW1 in Ext.P1. So it can be a material omission which amounts to contradiction. The delay of giving statement to police was explained by PW1 stating that he went to the medical college with CW2 and after the treatment he returned home in the morning thereafter as he was tired. He took rest and thereafter he gave Ext.P1 statement to police.

10. It is pertinent to note that there is delay in giving the statement to police by PW1. The offence alleged occurred on 15/08/2020 at 2pm whereas Ext.P1 was given on 16/08/2020 at 20:50 hours. That is after almost 28 hours. So the delay was explained by PW1. Anyhow no documents with regard to the treatment of CW2 from medical college hospital was produced before this court by the investigating agency to prove that CW2 was actually conveyed to Government Medical Collage Hospital for treatment. The utterance of obscene words and attack on the side of the accused after wrongfully restrained him allegedly by the accused does not inspire the confidence of the court on the premise that there are inconsistencies with regard to the evidence of PW1 and Ext.P1 statement. It was stated in Ext.P1 that accused No. 1 was injured on the right elbow. However that was found missing in the evidence of PW1 before the court.

11. PW2 and PW3 cited as occurrence witness did not support the case of the prosecution. PW4 the casualty Medical Officer of Taluk Hospital, Kadakkal, he examined PW1 on 15/08/2020 at 3.30pm. After the examination he issued Ext.P7 wound certificate as per the certificate the injuries sustained by the victim is the pattered abrasion on the back of body 10x5cms (4 in numbers). When MO1 and MO2 was confronted to him, he is of the opinion that those are sufficient to inflict the injuries as stated in Ext.P7. He was also cross examined by the learned counsel for the accused in this case. He was

suggested that MO1 being an iron bar if it is used to cause an injury whether or not the width of the injury has 5 cm. According to PW4 and such injury with MO1 is not possible. Moreover by using MO2 a shapeless wooden stick, by using MO2 it was suggested that the injury noted in Ext. P7 be possible. PW4 was of the opinion that she cannot rule out such possibility of sustaining the injury noted therein with MO2. The exact places where the injury happened was not noted in the certificate. She was suggested that the injury stated in Ext. P7 would be possible by sliding on the road from a motorcycle. That was conceded by PW4 while she was in the box.

12. On going through the evidence adduced by PW4 it can be seen that there is only a patterned abrasion on the back 10x5 cm on the person of PW1 was noted as injury. So as per the prosecution case PW1 averted the blow of accused No.2 with his right hand causing injury. However in Ext.P7 there was no mention about the injures in the right elbow of PW1. Moreover it has been seen that the accused attacked PW1 with MO1 on his back of body. However it is seen that there is only patterned abrasions on the back of body. If MO1 was used the injury would have been inflicted more than what is stated in Ext.P7. So there is discrepancy regarding the injury sustained by PW1 and the injury noted on the body of PW1 in Ext.P7.

13. The investigating officer was examined as PW5. He registered Ext. P8 FIR on the basis of Ext.P1 FIS and after preparing

Ext.P9 scene mahazer he prepared Ext.P1 (a) body note of PW1. Again he prepared recovery mahazer and recovered MO1 and MO2 which was produced before the committal court in view of Ext.P10. He recorded the statement of the witnesses and the address report of the accused was marked as Ext.P11. After correcting the necessary documents and after completing the investigation he filed final report before this court. During cross examination he was revealed that the column No. 8 of the Ext.P8 was not filled. As PW1 gave statement on the next day of the alleged incident. As per Ext.P1 (a) body note there was swelling and contusion on the right elbow and back of body. But PW5 is the opinion that those injuries were not stated in the wound certificate and it was only stated as abrasion on the back of body. He was asked regarding why he added Section 308 of the Indian Penal Code,1860 against the accused. He deposed that on the basis the statement he added Section 308 of the Indian Penal Code,1860 against the accused. Regarding Section 427 of the Indian Penal Code, the remaining portion of gold chain was not seized or prepared mahazer. He was suggested that MO1 and MO2 are planted for the purpose of this case. During investigation and after the arrest of the accused PW1 was not identified during the investigation. He was oblivious regarding the treatment of CW2 in any of the hospital. He was also suggested that while travelling on the motorcycle PW1 and CW2 skid and injured. That was repudiated by PW5. These are the evidence adduced by the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused. As

regards the scene mahazer which is marked in evidence as Ext.P9 shown that there is no discrepancy regarding the place of occurrence.

14. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has argued that PW1, PW4, PW5 are supported the case of the prosecution. Moreover the delay in lodging FIR was explained by PW1. So there is no discrepancy in the evidence adduced by the prosecution and it is categorically stated by the investigating officer before the court that as per the statement Section 308 was added and after the investigation he filed final report. So according to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor there is nothing to reject the evidence adduced by the prosecution the evidence of injured witness, the Medical Officer and the Investigating Officer can be taken into account. Therefore the learned Additional Public Prosecutor canvassed for the conviction against the accused in this case.

15. On the other hand, it was highlighted that the learned defence counsel that only 3 witnesses were loyal to the prosecution case and PW2 and PW3 are turned hostile pleading total ignorance of the alleged incident. So it was the argument on the side of the defence PW1 is not at all a trustworthy witness. Hence his evidence cannot be taken into account to enter into a conviction against the accused in this case. It was highlighted that no eye witnesses was examined in this case. It is true that CW2 , the one of the injured persons is no more. So that he could not be examined. Regarding the examination of other

witnesses that the prerogative of the prosecution. The only endeavor of this court is to see that whether or not the available evidence is sufficient to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. So evidence of PW1 as already stated there is no corroborative piece of evidence adduced on the side of prosecution to match the evidence of PW1. The evidence of PW1 as a result of the animosity between PW1 and accused argued by the learned defence counsel. So it is true that during the accident, a part of the gold chain of PW1 was lost. That was not recovered. That ignited the acrimony against the accused persons and that paved way for the prosecution against them argued by the learned counsel for the accused in this case. At this juncture it can be seen that the evidence of PW1 is not tallying with the evidence adduced by PW4 and in Ext.P8, several inconsistencies with regard to the injury sustained on the body of PW1 was noted. Moreover without corroboration of the evidence of PW1 it is not possible to place reliance of the evidence of PW1 in this case. As per Ext. P7 there is patterned abrasion which is having 3 injuries inclusive of contusion. However that was not stated by PW4 when he was in the witness box. The learned counsel for the accused placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Ram Narain v. State of Panjab (1975 KHC 815)** stating that if the prosecution case is inconsistent with the medical evidence and it is sufficient to discredit the evidence adduced by the prosecution. Obviously the medical evidence and the Ext.P1 (a) and Ext.P7 are not go together. Both are inconsistent version of the alleged incident. Therefore the

inconsistency could not be explained by the prosecution. The learned defence counsel also placed reliance of the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Solanki Chimanbhai Ukabhai v. State of Gujarat* (1983 KHC 379). The Hon'ble Apex Court in paragraph No. 12 held as follow *Ordinarily, the value of medical evidence is only corroborative. It proves that the injuries could have been caused in the manner alleged and nothing more. The use which the defence can make of the medical evidence is to prove that the injuries could not possibly have been caused in the manner alleged and thereby discredit the eye witnesses. Unless, however, the medical evidence in its turn goes so far that it completely rules out all possibilities whatsoever of injuries taking place in the manner alleged by eye witnesses, the testimony of the eye witnesses cannot be thrown out on the ground of alleged inconsistency between it and the medical evidence..* In short the medial evidence and the injuries sustained by the victim are not tallying . Therefore it cannot be considered and the prosecution has no proper explanation regarding the inconsistency. As regards the loss of a piece of gold chain from PW1, it has come out in evidence that the remaining piece of the gold chain was with PW1. That was not produced before the court. Nor a mahazer was prepared with the remaining portion of the chain by the prosecution. So no proper investigation was conducted in this regard by the investigating agency. No investigation was done by the police after the arrest of the accused which means PW1 and CW2 did not identify accused No. 1 and 2 during the investigation. So it is a mandate on the side of the investigating agency to investigate the matter under investigation in a proper and lawful manner as demanded. Therefore the dock

identification of accused No. 1 and 2 by PW1 also does not inspire the confidence of the court. Coming to Ext.P1 (a) the body note it is seen that on the right hand of PW1 there is swelling and contusion and edema on the back of body of PW1. In Ext.P7 there is only pattered abrasion was found on the back of body of PW1. Therefore the medical evidence are not tallying with the evidence adduced by PW1.

16. In order to prove the offence under Section 294 (b) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 the prosecution has to prove the following ingredients

Firstly, commission of an obscene act or utterance of obscene words in or near a public place. Secondly, as a result of the utterance there should cause of annoyance to others. It is seen that no elements cited proved by the prosecution. During the evidence of PW1 there is no whisper regarding the utterance of obscene words by any of the accused. Remaining occurrence witnesses did not state that the accused uttered profanity against PW1. However it was stated in Ext.P1 that PW1 was uttered vulgarism by the accused. On analyses of the evidence on record it can be seen that there is no proper evidence of utterance of obscene words brought out before this court. Merely it was stated as the accused uttered obscene words in Ext.P1 are not sufficient to prove the offence. In ***Latheef v State of Kerala (2014(2) KHC 604)***, ***the Hon'ble High Court*** held that to make obscene the alleged words must involve some lascivious elements arousing sexual thoughts or feelings or the words must have the effect

of depraving persons, and defiling morals by sex appeal or lustful desires. In *Madhanagopal N. S v K.Lathika* (2022 KHC 7202) the Hon'ble High Court held that *mere abusive, humiliating or defamative words by itself cannot attract an offence under S.294(b) IPC. To prove the offence under S.294 of IPC mere utterance of obscene words are not sufficient but there must be a further proof to establish that it was to the annoyance of others, which is lacking in the case. No one has spoken about the obscene words, they felt annoyed and in the absence of legal evidence to show that the words uttered by the appellants accused annoyed others, it cannot be said that the ingredients of the offence under S.294 (b) of IPC is made out.* So with the available evidence it is difficult to fasten the criminal liability of the accused Ergo, it can be held that the prosecution failed to prove the offence under section 294(b) of Indian penal Code 1860.

17. As regards the offence under Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 the prosecution has to prove the following ingredients:

For constituting the offence u/s 324 of Indian Penal Code 1860 the following criteria have to be satisfied by the prosecution.

Voluntary act: The accused must have voluntarily caused the hurt.

- **Dangerous weapon or means:** The accused must have used a dangerous weapon or means to cause the hurt. This includes:
 - 1) Any instrument for shooting, stabbing, or cutting
 - 2) Any instrument used as a weapon of offense that is likely

to cause death

- 3) Fire or any heated substance
- 4) Any poison or corrosive substance
- 5) Any explosive substance
- 6) Any substance that is harmful to the human body if inhaled, swallowed, or received into the blood
- 7) Any animal

On evaluation of the evidence adduced by the prosecution, especially the evidence of PW1, PW4 and PW5 , it can be seen that no proper evidence adduced to see that the accused in furtherance of common intention attacked PW1 with MO1 on 15/08/2020 at 14:00 hours at Kallyani Mukku - Sri Sathya Quarry Road at Kuttiyittavila So the prosecution could not prove that the offence alleged against the accused u/s 324 of Indian Penal Code 1860. So the offence under Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code will not attract in this case.

18. As regards the offence under Section 341 of the Indian Penal Code,1860 the prosecution has to prove the following ingredients to prove the offence. The accused must have voluntarily caused obstruction. The obstruction must prevent the person from moving in a direction where they have a legal right to proceed. The accused must have intended to cause the restraint, or known that their action would cause it. There is no proper and cogent evidence forthcoming to prove that accused wrongfully restrained PW1. In *Vaheed M A v K.K.*

Lathika (2024 (6) KHC 196) the Hon'ble High Court reiterated the conditions to attract the offence. The Hon'ble Court held *that in order to attract S.341 IPC, the following ingredients of S.339 IPC are necessary:*

i) The accused obstructed any person.

ii) The obstruction is so as to prevent that person from proceeding in any direction in which that person has a right to proceed.

If these two ingredients exist, there is wrongful restraint, which is punishable under S.341 IPC. Therefore, mere obstruction of any person alone will not attract wrongful restraint. The obstruction should be to prevent that person from proceeding in any direction in which that person has a right to proceed. So the ingredients cited could not be proved by the prosecution. Hence the offence under Section 341 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 will not attract in the facts and evidence of the case against the accused.

19. As regards under Section 427 of the Indian Penal Code 1860 it is the duty of the prosecution to prove that the offense of mischief causing damage amounting to ₹50 or more. Further the intention or knowledge of causing wrongful loss/damage to property has to be proved. Destruction or significant diminution of value/utility of the property is also to be proved. However on survey of the evidence adduced by the prosecution it can be seen that the evidence on record is insufficient to hold that the accused had committed the offence under section 427 of the Indian Penal Code 1860.

20. As regards under Section 308 of the Indian Penal Code the prosecution has to prove the following ingredients. The accused must have performed a physical act. The act must have been committed with the intention or knowledge that it was likely to cause death, but not with the intention to commit murder. The act must have been done in such a way that, if death had occurred, it would have amounted to culpable homicide not amounting to murder, as defined under Section 299 IPC. The prosecution must prove that an actual injury was caused to the victim. (See *Abdul Ansar v State of Kerala (2022 (4) KHC 390*). On analyzing the evidence on record it can be seen that the accused had not entertained knowledge that his act was likely to cause death. Necessary mensrea to commit offence under section 308 of the Indian Penal Code 1860 is lacking in the prosecution evidence. The evidence available does not speaks the accused had attempted to commit culpable homicide not amounting to murder of PW1 the available evidence is insufficient to hold that the accused had committed culpable homicide not amounting to murder. Indubitably clear that the prosecution has not succeeded in proving the ingredients of s.308 IPC.

21. On analysis of the entire evidence let in on the side of the prosecution, it can be seen that the evidence adduced by prosecution is insufficient to hold that the accused had committed the offence beyond reasonable doubt. No corroborative evidence was let in on the side of the prosecution regarding the evidence of PW1. So on scrutiny of the

entire evidence it is seen that the frailty of the prosecution than its strength. The prosecution has failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Hence Point No. 1 to 5 are found in favour of the prosecution.

22. **Point No. 6:-** In view of my discussion and findings point No. 1 to 5 the accused are not to be found guilty of the offences alleged against them.

In the result, the accused are found not guilty of the offence under Sections 294(b), 341,324,427, 308 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and they are acquitted under Section 235(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The bail bond of the accused persons stands cancelled and they are set at liberty. MO1 shall be confiscated and MO2 shall be destroyed after the period of appeal.

.Dictated to the confidential assistant, typewritten by her, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on this the 16th day of March 2026

Sd/-
Shanavas. A
Assistant Sessions Judge
Kottarakara

Appendix :-

Exhibits marked from the side of the Prosecution :-

P1 16/09/2025 FIS

P1 (a) 10/11/2025 Body note of CW1 proved by PW5

P2	14/10/2025	Relevant portion of 161 statement of CW4 proved by PW2
P3	14/10/2025	Relevant portion of 161 statement of CW4 proved by PW2
P4	14/10/2025	Relevant portion of 161 statement of CW4 proved by PW2
P5	15/10/2025	Relevant portion of 161 statement of CW5 proved by PW3
P6	15/10/2025	Relevant portion of 161 statement of CW5 proved by PW3
P7	27/10/2025	Wound certificate proved by PW4
P8	10/11/2025	FIR proved by PW5
P9	10/11/2025	Scene Mahazer proved by PW5
P10	10/11/2025	Property list proved by PW5
P11	10/11/2025	Address report proved by PW5

Exhibits marked from the side of Defence:- Nil

Witness for the Prosecution side:-

PW1	16/09/2025	Renjith (CW1)
PW2	14/10/2025	Riyas (CW4)
PW3	15/10/2025	Sangeeth (CW5)
PW4	27/10/2025	Dr. Saranya (CW7)
PW5	10/11/2025	Saju.V (CW8)

Witness for Defence side :- Nil

Material Objects :-

MO1 - കമ്പ്യൂട്ടർ

MO2 - കമ്പ്

TABULAR FORM AS PER RULE 132 OF THE CRIMINAL RULES OF PRACTICE

1	Serial No.	Sessions Case No. 344/2021
2.	Name of Station & Crime No. of Offence	Kadakkal Police Station in Crime No.2226/2020
Description of the accused		
3.	Name of the Accused	A1. Sudheer, A2. Ajas
4.	Father's Name	A1. Sulaiman, A2. Hussain
5.	Occupation	--
6.	Residence	A1. Ramsu Manzilil, Elambazhannoor P.O, Kadakkal Village, Residing at Rose Villayil, Near Thongatukonam, Elampazhannoor. A2. Charuvila Veedu, Kunnumpuram, Elambazhannoor P.O, Kadakkal Village. Residing at Rented House, Hayarinisa Near Muslim, Jumayath, Elampazhannoor .
7.	Age	A1. 33 years, A2. 27 years
Dates of		
8.	Occurrence	15/08/2020
9.	Complaint	15/08/2020
10	Apprehension	16/09/2020 (A1), 17/09/2020(A2)
11	Release on bail	16/09/2020 (A1), 17/09/2020 (A2)
12	Commitment	12/02/2021
13	Commencement of Trial	16/09/2025
14	Close of Trial	10/11/2025
15	Sentence or Order	16/03/2026

- 16 Service of copy of judgment 16/03/2026
or finding on accused
- 17 Explanation of Delay No delay

Sd/-
Assistant Sessions Judge,
Kottarakara.