

IN THE COURT OF ADDL.SESIONS JUDGE-II (SPECIAL), KOTTAYAM

Present: Sri. Subash.S, Addl.Sessions Judge-II (Special), Kottayam

Friday, the 15th day of May, 2026

25th day of Vaisakha 1948

Crl.M.P. No.2/2026 in S.C. No.319/2019 Clubbed with S.C 424/2015

(Crime No.192/CR/1996 of CBCID- Ernakulam.)

Petitioner/1st Accused:

Suresh, Aged 54/2021, S/o. Shamsudeen,
Jubairia Manzil, Kattambally, Ittiva,
Kadakkal, Kollam.

By Adv. K.Vinod.

Respondent.:-

State of Kerala, Represented by
Special Public Prosecutor, Kottayam.
(Cr. No.192/CR/96 of CBCID, Ernakulam).

By Spl. Public Prosecutor Adv. Rajagopal Padipurackal.

This petition filed to read over the charge again.

This Crl.M.P having been heard on 15.05.2026 and the
court on the same day passed the following:-

ORDER

This is an application filed by the 1st accused in S.C.
No.319/2019 to allow him to withdraw his claim to be tried and
plead guilty.

2. 1st accused along with accused Nos.2 to 4 stand charge sheeted for offences punishable under sections 344, 372, 373, 342, 376(1) and 109 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code and sections 3(1) and 9(1)(d)(ii) of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956.

3. This court framed charge against the 1st accused herein for offences under sections 344, 372, 376(1) and 109 r/w 34 of IPC and sections 3(1), 5(1)(d)(ii) of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956. The petitioner herein pleaded not guilty to the charge framed against him.

4. Now the 1st accused has filed the above petition to allow him to plead guilty, contending that even though at the time of framing charge he pleaded not guilty, considering the delay occurred in the trial of all 23 cases, it is necessary in the interest of justice that he should be allowed to plead guilty. In support of his contention, he relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in Shyni Moolayil and Another v State of Kerala (2015(3) KLT 1963). In the said case, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala observed as follows;

“4. No doubt, there is no specific provision in the Cr. P.C. enabling the Court to permit an accused to withdraw his claim to be tried and convict him on a plea of guilty subsequently. But as contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, there is also no prohibition in the Cr. P.C. to record the plea of guilty in the course of the trial and convict the accused on his subsequent admission of guilt. The object of the trial is to investigate the offence and to find out the truth. When the guilt is admitted by the accused, and the admission is found to be voluntary, there is no reason why the Court should not allow him to withdraw his claim to be tried and plead guilty. In this connection, it is relevant to note the decision of the Patna High Court in Shyama Charan Bharthuar and Others v. Emperor, AIR 1934 Patna 330. It was held in that case that there is no implication that when an accused in the course of the trial withdraws his claim to be tried and plead guilty, the Court is not entitled to record the plea either accept it or continue the trial. An identical question came up for consideration before the Allahabad High Court in Ram Kishun v. State of U.P., 1996 CriLJ 440. The Allahabad High Court held that a plea of guilt can be taken at any stage of trial after framing charge. The court observed that the necessity of evidence would arise only if and when the charge is not accepted. There is no reason to restrict the applicability of S.229 of the Cr. P.C. to a particular date or occasion, but the purport of the section is obvious that the plea of guilt can be advanced by an accused at any stage of the trial after framing a charge. If an accused is allowed to withdraw his claim to be tried and plead guilty, an earlier termination of the trial can be secured, and wastage of the precious time of the Court can be avoided.”

**Copy of Order in
Crl. M.P. No.2/2026
in S.C. No.319/2019**

Dated:-15.05.2026

5. So, as held by the Hon'ble High Court in the aforesaid case, if the accused is allowed to withdraw his claim to be tried and plead guilty, an earlier termination of the trial can be secured, and wastage of the precious time of the Court can be avoided. So, this court is of the considered opinion that this petition is to be allowed and the petitioner is to be permitted to withdraw his claim to be tried and plead guilty.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in the open Court, on this the 15th day of May, 2026.

Sd/-
Subash S.
Addl. Sessions Judge-II (Spl.)
Kottayam.

Copied by:
compared by:

//True Copy//

By Order
Sd/-

Sheristadar