IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL FIRST-CLASS MAGISTRATE, KADAKKAL.

Present: Sri. Amal. S. R, Judicial First-Class Magistrate

Thursday, 4th day of June 2026/ 14th Jyaishta, 1948

CALENDAR CASE. No. 863/2017

Complainant	:	State represented by the Sub Inspector of Police, Chadayamangalam Police Station in Crime No.1600/2016. (By APP Gr II, Kadakkal)
Accused	:	A1 Vishnupriya, aged 23/16, D/o Ambili, Vishnu Bhavanam, Near Post Office, Elamballoor, Kundara. **(Case refiled)** A2 Ramachandran Pillai, aged 62/16, S/o Gopala Pillai, Rakesh Sadanam, Thottathara, Arkkannoor, Elamadu Village. (By Adv. G. Biju)
Charge	:	Offence punishable U/ss.419, 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
Plea	:	Not guilty
Finding	:	Not guilty
Sentence	:	Accused No.2 is found not guilty of the offences punishable under S. 419, 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code. He is acquitted u/s 248(1) of the Cr.P.C. The case against the first accused is split up and refiled as CC 2621/2017.

Date of

Occurrence	Complaint	Apprehension	Release on bail	Commencement of trial	Commencement of evidence	Close of trial	Sentence or order	Period of detention undergone during investigation of trial for the purpose of Section 428 Cr.P.C
16.07.16	30.05.17	26.08.16 - A2	09.09.16 -A2	08.07.24 -A2	01.07.25	04.06.26	04.06.26	-

This case having been finally heard on 04.06.2026 today the court on the same day delivered the following: -

JUDGMENT

1. This case arose on a final report filed by the Sub Inspector of Police, Chadayamangalam Police Station in Crime No. 1600/2016. The offences alleged against the accused 1 and 2 are punishable u/ss. .419, 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. ***The gist of the prosecution case is as follows***: - The accused persons, who were on conditional bail, in connection with Crime No. 1290/2016 of Chadayamangalam Police Station with the intention of cheating PW1 and others and thereby making unlawful gain, committed personation by falsely representing that the 1st accused was an employee of Technopark. The 1st accused, in furtherance of the common intention with the 2nd accused, induced the first witness and others to believe that they could secure employment as Managers in Technopark, Kundara. On 16.07.2019 at about 11.00 a.m., the accused Nos. 1 and 2 went to the house of PW1 and obtained an amount of ₹15,000/- from PW1 on the promise of securing employment. Thereafter, the accused failed to provide the promised job and thereby cheated and deceived him and about 34 other persons. Thus, the accused committed the offences punishable under Sections 420, 419 and 34 of the IPC.

3. Final report was filed before this Court, and the case was taken on file. Cognizance was taken for the offences punishable U/s. 419, 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code,1860. Then the Accused no.2 was enlarged on bail on his appearance. After hearing on framing of charge, charge was framed, read over and explained to Accused No.2 u/s.240(2) of Cr.P.C for the offences punishable U/s.419, 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code,1860 to which the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The 1st accused surrendered during the fag end of trial and hence she was split up for the time being.

4. From the side of prosecution PW1 to PW25 were examined and Exts. P1 and P28 series were marked. On the basis of the prosecution evidence, the accused persons were examined u/s. 351 (1) (b) of BNSS. Exts. D1 and D2 were marked from the side of defence.

5. Both sides were heard.

6. Following points came up for consideration in this case are,

   1) *Has the 2nd accused, in furtherance of their common intention with 1st accused, committed the offence punishable under Section 419 of the IPC by falsely personating as persons capable of securing employment in Technopark and thereby deceiving PW1 and others.?*

   2) *Has the 2nd accused, in furtherance of their common intention with 1st accused, committed the offence punishable under Section 420 of the*

IPC by dishonestly inducing PW1 and others to part with money on the promise of securing employment in Technopark?

3) *If found guilty, what should the punishment if any, be to be awarded?*

7. ***Point Nos. 1 and 2***: - To avoid repetition and for brevity, these points are considered together. The prosecution case was set in motion on the basis of Ext.P1 furnished by PW1 alleging that the accused had dishonestly induced him and several others to part with money on the promise of securing employment in Kundara Technopark. Acting upon the said information, PW25, the then Sub Inspector of Police, registered Crime No.1600/2016 for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 419 and 34 IPC and commenced investigation. During investigation, PW25 prepared the scene mahazar, arrested the accused, collected receipts allegedly issued by the 1st accused acknowledging receipt of money from several witnesses and, upon completion of investigation, filed the final report before the court.

8. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor argued that the prosecution has succeeded in establishing the offences alleged against the 2nd beyond reasonable doubt through the consistent and cogent oral testimony of the prosecution witnesses coupled with the documentary evidence marked in the case. It was contended that several witnesses have consistently deposed that the 2nd accused approached them, introduced the 1st accused, promised employment in Kundara Technopark and actively participated in collecting

money from them. The learned APP further submitted that the evidence of the witnesses would clearly show that the amounts entrusted by them were received by 2nd accused and handed over to the 1st accused in their presence and that such acts would sufficiently establish the common intention shared by both accused in cheating the witnesses. It was also argued that the receipts marked through the respective witnesses corroborate the prosecution case regarding receipt of money and that mere issuance of receipts by the 1st accused alone would not absolve the 2nd accused from criminal liability. According to the learned APP, the defence contention that the 2nd accused himself was a victim has not been probabilise by any reliable evidence and therefore he is liable to be convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 419 and 420 IPC.

9. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing for the 2nd contended that the entire prosecution evidence would only reveal that the 1st accused was the person who actually received the money and issued receipts to the witnesses and that no document whatsoever evidences receipt of money by the 2nd accused. It was argued that almost all prosecution witnesses admitted in cross-examination that the receipts were signed only by 1st accused and that the amount allegedly entrusted through the 2nd accused were immediately handed over to the 1st accused in their presence. The learned counsel further submitted that the evidence on record would

probabilise the defence case that the 2nd accused had merely introduced the 1st accused, believing her representations to be true, and that even 2nd accused had allegedly entrusted money to the 1st accused for securing employment for his own son. It was further argued that most witnesses admittedly knew the 2nd accused as their neighbour and trusted him because of his good reputation in the locality and therefore mere introduction of the 1st accused or presence at the time of transactions cannot by itself establish dishonest intention or common intention on the part of the 2nd accused. The learned counsel also pointed out the contradictions and omissions brought out during cross-examination and contended that the essential ingredients of Sections 419 and 420 IPC have not been proved against the 2nd beyond reasonable doubt. Hence, it was argued that the 2nd accused is entitled to the benefit of doubt and acquittal.

10. I have carefully considered the arguments advanced by the learned APP and the learned counsel for the accused. I have meticulously gone through the oral and documentary evidence adduced by the prosecution. The 2nd accused is alleged to have committed the offence under Section 419 and 420 of IPC. Section 419 IPC deals with punishment for cheating by personation. In order to constitute the said offence, the prosecution must establish not merely cheating but cheating by pretending to be another person or by knowingly substituting one person for another or by falsely

representing oneself to be some other person. Thus, the element of personation is the very foundation of the offence under Section 419 IPC. Unless there is reliable evidence to show that the accused falsely assumed the identity or character of another person, a conviction under Section 419 IPC cannot legally stand.

11. Keeping the above legal position in mind, the evidence adduced in the present case has to be carefully appreciated. The prosecution examined PW1 to PW25 and marked Exts.P1 to P28. The oral evidence of the prosecution witnesses would show that most of the witnesses were neighbours or acquaintances of Accused No.2 and that they came into contact with Accused No.1 through Accused No.2. Several witnesses have deposed that Accused No.2 introduced Accused No.1 to them and informed them that employment could be secured in Technopark. Certain witnesses have also stated that the amount was first entrusted to Accused No.2 and thereafter handed over to Accused No.1.

12. However, when the evidence of the witnesses is carefully scrutinized, it becomes evident that there is absolutely no specific evidence to show that Accused No. 2 impersonated any employee or representative of Technopark. None of the witnesses has stated that Accused No.2 falsely represented himself to be an employee or official connected with Technopark. No witness has deposed that Accused No.2 pretended to hold

any post in Technopark or falsely assumed the identity of any particular individual. There is also no allegation that Accused No.2 used any forged identity card or false official document in order to deceive the witnesses.

13. The entire prosecution evidence, even if accepted in its entirety, would only show that Accused No.2 acted as an intermediary who introduced Accused No.1 to the witnesses and was present during the transactions. Such conduct by itself cannot amount to cheating by personation within the meaning of Section 419 IPC. The documentary evidence produced in the case also assumes importance in this regard. Exts.P3 to P21 are the receipts allegedly issued at the time of receiving money from the witnesses. A careful reading of the evidence would show that almost all witnesses admitted during cross-examination that the said receipts were signed only by Accused No.1. The prosecution has no case that any receipt was written, signed or executed by Accused No.2. In fact, several witnesses categorically admitted that the money allegedly entrusted to Accused No.2 was immediately handed over by him to Accused No.1 in their very presence.

14. PW2 admitted that the receipt was signed by Accused No.1 and that she had personally seen Accused No.2 handing over the amount to Accused No.1. PW3 admitted that Ext.P4 receipt showed only Accused No.1 as the recipient of money and did not contain any acknowledgment by Accused

No.2. PW5 admitted that Ext.P6 contained only the signature of Accused No.1, and that Accused No.2 was neither a signatory nor a witness therein. PW6 also admitted that Ext.P7 contained only the signature of Accused No.1. Similar admissions were made by PW10, PW11, PW12, PW13, PW14, PW15, PW16, PW17 and PW18 during cross-examination. Thus, the consistent evidence emerging from the prosecution witnesses themselves is that Accused No.1 was the person who acknowledged receipt of money.

15. Another significant circumstance brought out in evidence is that many of the witnesses admittedly trusted Accused No.2 because he was their neighbour and was considered a respectable and trustworthy person in the locality. Certain witnesses specifically stated that Accused No.2 had a good reputation in the locality and that they believed the representations made regarding employment because of such trust reposed in him. Some witnesses even stated that Accused No.2 had earlier earned public appreciation for returning lost money or valuables to their rightful owner. These aspects probabilise the defence case that Accused No.2 was not projected before the witnesses as a false employee or officer of Technopark, but only as a person known to them in the locality.

16. The defence has consistently contended that even Accused No.2 himself had been deceived by Accused No.1 and that he had entrusted money to

Accused No.1 for securing employment for his own son. Though the prosecution denied the said contention, suggestions to that effect were put to several witnesses during cross-examination. Certain witnesses admitted that they had heard about such transactions involving the son of Accused No.2. PW23 specifically deposed that he paid money only because he had seen Accused No.2 entrusting money to Accused No.1 for securing employment for his own son. PW25 admitted during cross-examination that he does not remember whether any complaint had been submitted alleging that the son of Accused No.2 had also paid money to Accused No.1.

17. These circumstances become relevant while considering the existence of mens rea on the part of Accused No.2. In order to constitute the offence of cheating, dishonest intention must exist at the inception of the transaction itself. The materials brought out during cross-examination create a reasonable possibility that Accused No.2 himself might have acted under the belief that Accused No.1 was capable of securing employment. If such possibility exists, the benefit arising therefrom must necessarily go in favour of the accused. It is a settled principle of criminal law that the prosecution has to stand on its own legs and prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Suspicion, however strong, cannot take the place of proof. A criminal court cannot convict an accused merely on the basis of

moral suspicion or probability. Where the evidence gives rise to two possible views, the one favourable to the accused has to be adopted.

18. In the present case, even assuming that Accused No.2 introduced Accused No.1 to the witnesses and participated in certain transactions, the evidence on record falls far short of proving the essential ingredient of personation required under Section 419 IPC. There is no convincing evidence that Accused No.2 pretended to be another person or falsely represented himself as an employee or representative of Technopark. The prosecution has therefore failed to establish the offence punishable under Section 419 IPC against Accused No.2 beyond reasonable doubt.

19. Another prosecution allegation is that the accused persons dishonestly induced the PW1 and several other witnesses to part with money by representing that employment could be secured in Technopark and thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 420 IPC. At the outset, it is necessary to bear in mind the legal requirements constituting the offence punishable under Section 420 IPC. In order to establish the offence of cheating punishable under Section 420 IPC, the prosecution must prove: -

(i) that the accused deceived the complainant,

(ii) that by reason of such deception, the complainant was dishonestly induced to deliver property or money;

(iii) that the accused had fraudulent or dishonest intention at the inception of the transaction itself;

(iv) that the delivery of property occurred because of such dishonest inducement.

20. Keeping the above legal principles in mind, the evidence adduced in the present case requires careful scrutiny. The consistent prosecution case emerging from the examination of the witnesses is that they paid amounts ranging from ₹10,000/- to ₹15,000/- believing the representation that employment could be secured in Kundara Technopark. Most witnesses stated that Accused No.2 was their neighbour or acquaintance and that they came into contact with Accused No.1 through Accused No.2. Several witnesses also deposed that Accused No.2 approached them, introduced Accused No.1 and informed them that jobs could be secured in Technopark.

21. Some witnesses further stated that the amount was initially entrusted to Accused No.2 who thereafter handed over the same to Accused No.1 in their presence. The evidence would therefore show that Accused No.2 admittedly participated in the transactions to a certain extent and facilitated the introduction of Accused No.1 to the witnesses.

22. However, the crucial issue before this Court is not whether Accused No.2 participated in the transactions, but whether the prosecution has succeeded in establishing beyond reasonable doubt that Accused No.2 possessed dishonest intention at the inception of the transactions and intentionally acted in furtherance of a fraudulent design to cheat the witnesses. In this regard, the evidence brought out during cross-examination becomes extremely material. Almost all prosecution witnesses admitted that the receipts acknowledging receipt of money were written and signed only by Accused No.1. Exts.P3 to P21 admittedly do not contain the signature of Accused No.2 either as recipient, executant or witness. PW2 admitted that Ext.P3 receipt was signed by Accused No.1. PW3 admitted that Ext.P4 contained only the signature of Accused No.1. PW5 admitted that Ext.P6 receipt contained only the signature of Accused No.1 and that Accused No.2 was neither signatory nor witness therein. Similar admissions were made by PW6, PW10, PW11, PW12, PW13, PW14, PW15, PW16, PW17 and PW18.

23. Thus, the documentary evidence relied upon by the prosecution itself points acknowledgment of money exclusively to Accused No.1. There is absolutely no documentary material showing that Accused No.2 executed any receipt, acknowledged receipt of money in writing or represented himself as a person authorized to appoint candidates in Technopark.

Further, a consistent feature emerging from the cross-examination of all witnesses is that whenever money was entrusted through Accused No.2, the same was immediately handed over by him to Accused No.1 in the presence of the witnesses themselves. PW2 admitted that she had personally seen Accused No.2 handing over the amount to Accused No.1.

24. This aspect assumes significance because the prosecution has failed to produce any evidence showing that Accused No.2 personally retained, appropriated or enjoyed the amounts allegedly paid by the witnesses. No recovery was effected from Accused No.2. No material object, bank transaction, account details or independent documentary evidence has been produced to establish that Accused No.2 derived financial benefit from the alleged transactions.

25. Another important aspect emerging from the evidence is the admitted relationship between Accused No.2 and the witnesses. Most witnesses admitted that Accused No.2 was their neighbour or acquaintance for several years. Several witnesses specifically stated that they trusted Accused No.2 because he was considered a respectable and trustworthy person in the locality. PW3 admitted that she believed the representations because Accused No.2 was regarded as an honest person. Certain witnesses stated that Accused No.2 had earned public appreciation in the locality for returning lost money or valuables to their rightful owners. PW14 admitted

that Accused No.2 was a public worker known in the locality. These aspects are relevant because the evidence itself indicates that the witnesses trusted the transaction not because Accused No.2 projected himself as an official of Technopark, but because he was personally known to them as a local resident enjoying a good reputation.

26. The defence has suggested throughout the cross-examination that even Accused No.2 himself had entrusted money to Accused No.1 for securing employment for his own son and that Accused No.2 too was deceived by the representations allegedly made by Accused No.1. Suggestions to that effect were put to almost all witnesses. Though some witnesses denied knowledge regarding the same, certain witnesses admitted awareness of such circumstances. PW23 specifically stated that he paid money only because he had seen Accused No.2 entrusting money to Accused No.1 for securing employment for his son. Similar suggestions were put to PW2, PW10, PW11, PW15, PW16, PW17 and PW18.

27. These circumstances considerably probabilise the defence version that Accused No.2 himself might have believed the representations allegedly made by Accused No.1 and acted under such belief. If Accused No.2 himself had entrusted money to Accused No.1 for securing employment for his own son, the possibility that he too was deceived by Accused No.1 cannot be lightly brushed aside.

28. The prosecution has not adduced any convincing evidence showing prior conspiracy, prior planning or sharing of illegal gain between the accused persons. Except the oral allegation that Accused No.2 introduced Accused No.1 and facilitated the transactions, there is no independent evidence establishing that Accused No.2 acted pursuant to a preconceived fraudulent scheme. It is also relevant to note that several witnesses admitted during cross-examination that they had not independently verified whether such jobs actually existed. Some witnesses admitted that they merely relied upon the representations made by Accused No.1 and the assurance given through Accused No.2. Certain witnesses also admitted that they understood the employment to be arranged through contacts rather than through any official recruitment process.

29. The prosecution is required to prove dishonest intention existing at the inception of the transaction. The evidence on record does not conclusively establish that Accused No.2 knew from the very beginning that no employment would be secured or that the representations allegedly made by Accused No.1 were false. On the contrary, the materials elicited during cross-examination create a reasonable probability that Accused No.2 himself may have believed the representations made by Accused No.1.

30. It is a cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that suspicion, however grave, cannot substitute legal proof. The prosecution must establish guilt

through cogent, reliable and convincing evidence satisfying the standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt. In the present case, though the evidence may create suspicion regarding the involvement of Accused No.2 in the transactions, the prosecution has failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that Accused No.2 possessed dishonest intention at the inception or that he intentionally participated in the alleged cheating with the requisite mens rea necessary to constitute the offence punishable under Section 420 IPC. When the evidence on record gives rise to two possible views, the view favourable to the accused has necessarily to be adopted. The materials brought out during cross-examination sufficiently probabilise the defence contention that Accused No.2 himself may have acted under a mistaken belief regarding the representations made by Accused No.1 and that he too may have been deceived by her. Thus, giving the benefit of doubt to Accused No.2, this Court holds that the prosecution has failed to establish the offence punishable under S. 420 IPC against Accused No.2 beyond reasonable doubt. Thus, I am of the view that the prosecution has failed to bring any evidence to link the 2nd accused with the offences in any manner so as to establish the guilt of the accused for the offences punishable U/s.419, 420 r/w 34 of Indian Penal Code. Hence, the above points are found against the prosecution.

31. ***<u>Point No. 3</u>****:* - On the basis of my finding on Point Nos.1 and 2, accused No.2 is found not guilty of the offences punishable under S.U/s.419, 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

In the result, the accused No.2 is acquitted of the offences punishable under Section 419, 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code u/s 248(1) of the Cr.P.C. His bail bond stood cancelled, and he is set at liberty. The case against the first accused is split up and refiled as CC 2621/2017.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this, the 4th day of June 2026.

Sd/-

Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kadakkal

APPENDIX

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Witnesses

A. Prosecution Witnesses

Rank	Name	Whether Eyewitness, Police Witness, Expert witness, Medical Witness, other witness
PW1	Bindu (CW1)	Complainant witness
PW2	Deepthi(CW7)	Occurrence Witness
PW3	Yamuna(CW8)	Occurrence Witness
PW4	Chandrika (CW10)	Occurrence Witness
PW5	Sandhya(CW11)	Occurrence Witness
PW6	Lekha (CW13)	Occurrence Witness
PW7	Akhil (CW15)	Occurrence Witness
PW8	Ushakumari(CW9)	Occurrence Witness
PW9	Unnikrishna Pillai(CW25)	Occurrence Witness

PW10	Aneesh(CW2)	Occurrence Witness
PW11	Gourikutty Amma(CW4)	Occurrence Witness
PW12	Sheelakumari(CW5)	Occurrence Witness
PW13	Vasantha (CW12)	Occurrence Witness
PW14	Ashraf(CW24)	Occurrence Witness
PW15	Arunkumar(CW27)	Occurrence Witness
PW16	Mini(CW29)	Occurrence Witness
PW17	Ajitha(CW30)	Occurrence Witness
PW18	Raji(CW33)	Occurrence Witness
PW19	Sarika(CW21)	Occurrence Witness
PW20	Rahul(CW23)	Occurrence Witness
PW21	Sindhu(CW31)	Occurrence Witness
PW22	Anil Kumar(CW34)	Occurrence Witness
PW23	Ambika(CW19)	Occurrence Witness
PW24	Manju(CW22)	Occurrence Witness
PW25	Saju Das (CW36)	Police witness

B. Defence Witness

Rank	Name	Whether Eyewitness, Police Witness, Expert witness, Medical Witness, other witness
	NIL	

C. Court Witnesses

Rank	Name	Whether Eyewitness, Police Witness, Expert witness, Medical Witness, other witness
	NIL	

<u>List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Exhibits</u>

A. Prosecution Exhibits

Sl.No	Exhibit Number	Description
1	P1	First Information Statement marked through PW1 on 01.07.2025.

2	P2	Relevant portion of First Information Statement marked through PW1 on 01.07.2025
3	P3	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW2 on 08.01.2026
4	P4	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW3 on 08.01.2026
5	P5	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW4 on 08.01.2026
6	P6	Receipt dated 28.05.2016 marked through PW5 on 08.01.2026
7	P7	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW6 on 08.01.2026
8	P8	Receipt dated 30.05.2016 marked through PW7 on 08.01.2026
9	P9	Receipt dated 17.07.2016 marked through PW10 on 30.03.2026
10	P10	Receipt dated 28.06.2016 marked through PW11 on 30.03.2026
11	P11	Receipt dated 26.05.2016 marked through PW12 on 30.03.2026
12	P12	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW13 on 30.03.2026
13	P13	Receipt dated 01.07.2016 marked through PW14 on 30.03.2026
14	P14	Receipt dated 01.07.2016 marked through PW15 on 30.03.2026
15	P15	Receipt dated 01.07.2016 marked through PW16 on 30.03.2026
16	P16	Receipt dated 01.07.2016 marked through PW17 on 30.03.2026
17	P17	Receipt dated 04.06.2016 marked through PW18 on 30.03.2026
18	P18	Receipt dated 31.05.2016 marked through PW19 on 22.04.2026
19	P19	Receipt dated 24.05.2016 marked through PW20 on 22.04.2026

20	P20	Receipt dated 18.07.2016 marked through PW22 on 22.04.2026
21	P21	Receipt dated 05.06.2016 marked through PW23 on 29.04.2026
22	P22	Receipt dated 01.07.2016 marked through PW24 on 29.04.2026
23	P23	First Information Report marked through PW25 on 05.05.2026
24	P24	Scene mahazar marked through PW25 on 05.05.2026
25	P25	Name and Address report marked through PW25 on 05.05.2026
26	P26	Custody memo marked through PW25 on 05.05.2026
27	P26(a)	Inspection memo marked through PW25 on 05.05.2026
28	P26(b)	Arrest memo marked through PW25 on 05.05.2026
29	P27	Form 15 document marked through PW25 on 05.05.2026
30	P28	Receipts dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
31	P28(a)	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
32	P28(b)	Receipt dated 26.05.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
33	P28 (c)	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
34	P28(d)	Receipt dated 28.05.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
35	P28(e)	Receipt dated 31.05.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
36	P28(f)	Receipt dated 02.07.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
37	P28(g)	Receipt dated 07.07.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
38	P28(h)	Receipt dated 05.06.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
39	P28(i)	Receipt dated 01.07.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026

40	P28(j)	Receipt dated 01.07.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
41	P28(k)	Receipt dated 05.06.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
42	P28(l)	Receipt dated 07.07.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
43	P28(m)	Receipt dated 02.07.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
44	P28(n)	Receipt dated 01.06.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
45	P28(o)	Receipt dated 07.07.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026
46	P28(p)	Receipt dated 11.06.2016 marked through PW25 05.05.2026

B. Defence Exhibits

Sl.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	D1	Relevant portion of 161 Cr.P. C. Statement of PW6
2	D2	Relevant portion of 161 Cr.P.C Statement of PW19

C. Court Exhibits

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
	NIL	

D. Material Objects

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
	NIL	

Sd/-

Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kadakkal

//True copy//

Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kadakkal