

IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, THRISSUR
Present:

Sri. K. KAMANEEES, I Additional Sessions Judge
Saturday the 6th day of June, 2026/ 16th Ashadha, 1948

Sessions Case No.980/2017
(CP No.43/2017 of JFCM No.I, Thrissur)

Complainant : State – represented by
The Circle Inspector of Police,
Thrissur Town East Circle,
Thrissur Town East Police Station.
(Crime No.842/2017 of Thrissur Town East
Police Station)

By Public Prosecutor Sri. K. P. Ajayakumar

Accused : 1. Mariyappan. C, aged 47 years,
S/o Chinnayya, Ward 4,
Nertheruvu, Sreeramapuram,
Athoor Taluk, Oddanchatram Police Station,
Dindigal, Tamilnadu.

By Adv. Sri. V. Vijayakumar

Offences : Under Section 302 of IPC.
Plea of the accused : Not guilty.
Finding of the Judge : Not guilty.
Sentence or Order : The accused person is acquitted of the offence
under section 302 of IPC, under section 235
Cr.P.C. His bail bond is cancelled and he is set
at liberty.

The Sessions Case having been finally heard on 03.06.2026 in the presence of counsel appearing for either side and having stood for consideration till this day, the court delivered the following.

Table of Contents

The Prosecution Allegations.....	2
Proceedings Generally.....	3
The Charges.....	3
The Evidence for the Prosecution.....	3
Statements under section 313(I)(b) Cr.P.C.....	4
The Points.....	4
The Evidence Generally.....	5
Table 1.....	9
The Points Discussed.....	11
Recovery aspects.....	11
Table 2.....	13
The witnesses Produced Later.....	14
The Other Ocular Witness.....	15
Another argument.....	16
On Recovery aspects.....	17
Defence Arguments and Finding on recovery.....	18
Conclusions and Finding.....	19
Conviction / Acquittal.....	20

JUDGMENT

The accused person stands indicted for the offence punishable under section 302 of IPC final report being laid by the Investigating Officer – the Circle Inspector of Police, Town East Circle, Thrissur Town East Police Station.

The Prosecution Allegations

2. The allegation of the prosecution is that the accused person on 23.04.2017 at 8.30 p.m, following an altercation between the deceased Panchamoorthy @ Panchi and the deceased Panchamoorthy @ Panchi beating the accused Mariyappan with a PVC pipe, the accused person wielded a chopper which he used for harvesting coconuts, which struck on the left chest and severed the right arm of the deceased. There was a very serious injury to his left chest, as a result of which, Panchamoorthy @ Panchi died and therefore the offence under section 302 of IPC.

Proceedings Generally

3. The case was investigated by the Circle Inspector of Police, Town East Circle,

Thrissur Town East Police Station and was committed to the Hon'ble Sessions Court as per order in CP No.43/2017 of Judicial First Class Magistrate Court No.I, Thrissur. The case was numbered as SC 980/2017 by the Sessions Court and later made over to this court as this court is earmarked and designated exclusively for the trial of murder cases.

4. The accused person appeared on summons. The copies of all relevant documents had been served on him. The accused person is represented by the lawyer of his own choice who defended his case very well.

The Charges

5. The accused person appeared before the court. With respect to the evidence to prove the indictments relied on and produced, the prosecution generally addressed the court. The accused person also heard and a formal charge was framed against him under section 302 of IPC. When the charge was read over and explained to the accused person, he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

The Evidence for the Prosecution

6. The evidence for the prosecution would include the oral testimonies of PW1 to PW13 and Exts.P1 to P21 marked from their side, besides, the Material Objects 1 to 13 series marked. After the closure of the prosecution evidence, the accused person was examined under section 313(1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, generally touching various aspects of incriminating evidence against him.

Statements under section 313(l)(b) Cr.P.C

7. The accused person generally denied the queries based on positive evidence tendered, put to him while questioning under section 313(1)(b) Cr.P.C. The accused person moved for delivering the questionnaires upto him, which was allowed and the questionnaire was handed over to him.

8. After the closure of the questioning under section 313(1)(b) Cr.P.C, the prosecution as well as the accused person was heard. The accused person was ordered

to enter on his defence evidence. He did not opt to adduce any separate defence evidence. The matter was finally heard.

9. After the matter was finally heard, the prosecution wanted to reopen the evidence and to secure the presence of witnesses remaining. The petition was nevertheless allowed, even though the matter was being finally heard. The prosecution later produced CW28 as well as CW2 who were examined as PWs12 and PW13. Then, the evidence was closed as no other witnesses were produced and the matter was finally heard, after questioning the accused person under Section 313(1) (b) Cr.P.C. This time also, there was no specific defence evidence.

The Points

10. The following points would arise for consideration.

1. Did the accused person commit murder of the deceased Pancharatnam alias Panchi as alleged by the prosecution?
2. If so, what offences are made out and what sentences to follow?

The Evidence Generally

11. The PW1 Jayachandran had been a witness to the inquest report prepared by the police marked Exhibit P1. He also deposes about the MO1 and MO2 pieces of PVC pipes and the blood-stained mundu marked MO3. Besides, the underwear recovered from the locality is MO4, and the pieces of cardboard are the MO5 series. The PW2 Praveen Kumar, while working as Village Officer-Chiyyaram, inspected the locus of the crime and prepared Exhibit P2 sketch along with the Special Village Officer who was present with him. In the sketch, he has marked the locus, with the picturisation of a dead body lying there.

12. In 2017 PW3 Satheesh and deceased Panchamurthy who had been his uncle had worked together. In 2017 he was residing in a place called Chiyaram and was engaged in construction of wells. He was residing in a place called Koorkanjeri. Mariyappan had been residing with him in the rented premises. On the day when Panchamurthy was attacked, he had gone for having food from a restaurant and he

heard that Panchamurthy had died. According to him, he had shown the place of incident to police and he had the same level of affection with accused Maryappan as well as deceased Panchamurthy. The police had prepared a statement Exhibit P3, in which he was made to sign. PW4 Ramalingam knew the deceased Panchamurthy, but he pleaded ignorance of the incident. Both these witnesses were permitted to be cross-examined by the Learned Prosecutor. Despite being cross-examined, these witnesses stood by their stand and no incriminatory statements would come forth from them.

13. PW5 Dr. Sheik Shakeer Hussain S, on 24.04.2017, while working as Assistant Professor & Assistant Police Surgeon in the Department of Forensic Medicine at Medical College Thrissur, conducted the postmortem examination of the body of a male by name Panjatcharam @ Panji , aged 35 years and issued Ex P4 postmortem certificate.

14. He noted 2 anti mortem injuries in the body, and the injuries had been fatal in nature. The body was received in two pieces. The pieces were 1) the right upper limb amputated at mid arm level and 2) rest of the body.

15. These were the injuries (Ante-mortem)

1. Incised penetrating wound 22cm long, with gaping edges, oblique, on left side of front of chest, upper outer end, 6cm below top of shoulder and 17cm outer to midline having sharply cut ends. Underneath the muscles and the front chest wall from III rib to the costal margin were seen cleanly cut. The lower lobe of left lung was seen cut obliquely for a length of 8cm through and through. The pericardium, the front wall of left ventricle, part of the interventricular septum and the right ventricle were seen obliquely cut for a length of 8cm. The wound track was directed obliquely downwards backwards and to the right for a total minimum depth of 5cm. The left chest cavity contained 500ml of fluid blood.

2. Incised amputating wound 12x10cm horizontal on right arm 18cm below tip of shoulder.

16. Opinion as to cause of death was that the death was due to injuries sustained to chest and right upper limb. These injuries mentioned above can occur due to the use of the weapon that is the MO6. The packets he had collected and handed over to the civil police officer accompanying were the MO7 and MO8.

17. PW6 Aravindakshan He is a witness to Exhibit P5 scene mahazar prepared by the investigation officer upon visiting the property.

18. PW7 Jeevan, while working as a City Shadow Police Officer on 24.04.2017, went to a place called Sugaramapuram in Dindigal District in order to find out Maryappan, the accused., along with other members of the party ie, Sub Inspector Ansar, Palani Swami and Likesh. He identified the accused person and at 03.00 p.m. and the accused was brought to Thrissur East Police Station on 24.04.2017 at 09.00 p.m. The accused was identified by the witness. PW8 Palaniswami He is yet another member of the shadow police unit, proficient in Handling Tamil. PW9 Sunil Kumar was responsible for the guard duty of body of deceased Panchajathnam. The body was taken for post mortem, and after that, the forensic surgeon had handed over three sealed covers to him, which were nail clippings, blood-stained gloves, and hairs collected from various parts of the body. Exhibit P6 was prepared by witness Satish Puthissery, the Sub-Inspector, when he handed over these covers to him and he can identify the signature of Satish Puthissery, who is no more. The covers he handed over were identified as MO7 and MO8.

19. PW10 Shibu is a witness to Exhibit P7 arrest memo whereupon, accused Maryappan was arrested by the investigation officer at 10.15 p.m. The accused handed over the mundu and shirt he was wearing to the East Police Station's Sub-Inspector Sethu, after getting substitutes to wear, Upon preparing Exhibit P8 seizure mahazar, in which he signed as a witness, those dresses were taken to custody. When the accused was taken for medical examination, the nail clippings, blood sample, etc. were handed over to him in sealed covers MO9 and MO10, which he handed over to

the Investigation Officer.

20. PW11 K. C. Sethu has been the investigation officer who prepared the Exhibit P1 inquest report. At the time of the inquest report preparation he identified MO1 PVC pipe, which was seen as sharpened towards one end, MO5 series four cardboard pieces, MO2 one torn PVC piece, MO3 Lungi having blood in it and another underwear MO4 and those were taken to custody. At the time when the inquest was done, the scientific assistant took the cellophane impression of his right thumb which he took into custody after preparing Exhibit P9 mahazar. The cellophane impression is Exhibit P10. Accused Mariyappan was arrested on 24.04.2017 at 10.00 p.m., as per Exhibit P7 arrest memo and Exhibit P7 inspection memo, and the arrest was informed to his son. At the time of the arrest, the accused had been wearing certain dresses (MO 11 and MO 12) which were also taken to custody. The mahazar prepared is Exhibit P8. He preferred Exhibit P12 address report, and took into custody the MO9 and MO10 nail clippings as well as blood samples, after preparing Exhibit P13 mahazar. As per Exhibit P14 remand report, he was produced before the court. At the time when accused was arrested, he confessed as follows "വെട്ടുകത്തി ഞാൻ ഡിണ്ടിഗൽ ശ്രീരാമ പുരത്തുള്ള ഒരു സ്ഥലത്ത് വെച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട് . എന്നെ കൂട്ടിക്കൊണ്ടു പോയാൽ വെട്ടുകത്തി വച്ച സ്ഥലം ഞാൻ കാണിച്ചു തരാം, വെട്ടുകത്തി ഞാൻ എടുത്തു തരാം" Upon this confession statement of the accused, he was taken on 26.04.2017 to his residence and on the south eastern corner of that house there were certain cement bags seen. The cement bags were lifted by the accused to take a plastic bag , and from that bag, the MO6 chopper had been produced, which was taken to custody as per the seizure mahazar Exhibit P15.

21. The extract of his confession statement is Exhibit P16 and the bag accompanying the chopper is MO13. After preparing a forwarding note Exhibit P17, those properties had been sent to the court. As part of the investigation, he collected Exhibit P2 location sketch and Exhibit P18 ownership certificate from the authorities concerned. The Forensic Science Laboratory report is Exhibit P19, and another report from the Regional Forensic Science Laboratory is Exhibit P20. The FIR of the case is

Exhibit P21 and the witnesses have been questioned by him for the purpose of laying the final report. The following table represents details of records marked by him, marked through him.

Table 1

Sl.No.	Marked as	Description
1.	P9	Seizure Mahazar
2.	P10	Cellophane impression
3.	P11	Inspection Memo
4.	P12	Full address report of accused
5.	P13	Seizure Mahazar (blood & nail clippings of accused)
6.	P14	Remand Report
7.	P15	Seizure Mahazar (chopper)
8.	P16	Confession extract of accused
9.	P17	Forwarding Note
10.	P18	Ownership Certificate
11.	P19	Property List
12.	P20	RFSL report
13.	P21	FIR

22. After the matter was finally heard, the prosecution wanted to reopen the evidence and to secure the presence of witnesses remaining and thus the CW28 as well as CW2 were examined as PWs12 and PW13. PW12 Joseph would say that he had been working as a grade assistant sub-inspector at the time of recovery of the weapon, and he had assisted the Investigating Officer in getting the confession statement recorded, Ex P15 mahazar prepared in his hand and He had also gone to

Tamil Nadu to get the recovery of the MO6 weapon and MO13 bag bearing it done.

23. The other witness examined - PW.13 Chakravarthi - did not at all support the prosecution case, even though he had been cited as an ocular witness.

The Points Discussed

24. The points are discussed together. This is a case where, despite stout cross-examination from the side of the prosecution, the occurrence witness secured and examined, turned hostile to the prosecution.

25. The proposed ocular witnesses are PW3 Satheesh, Chakravarthi, Ramalingam and CW4 Janakiraman. Among them, despite a series of processes to compel appearance, the prosecution could not produce CW2, Chakravarthi, CW3 Ramalingam and CW4 Janakiraman. The first informant Satheesh was examined as PW3. No other occurrence witnesses could be produced and cited by the prosecution.

26. When examined, PW3 Satheesh gave the version which is mentioned supra. Even though the learned Prosecutor tried to cross examine the witness, no incriminating evidence would come forth from him. Therefore from the side of the occurrence witnesses there is no mention to connect the accused person. All the other occurrence witnesses cited did not turn up on repeated processes, nor was the prosecution successful in securing their presence.

Recovery aspects

27. There are other circumstances also brought out in this case like the recovery of the offending weapon based on the confession statement of the accused person. The relevant confession abstract goes as follows. "വെട്ടുകത്തി ഞാൻ ഡിണ്ടിഗൽ ശ്രീരാമ പുരത്തുള്ള ഒരു സ്ഥലത്ത് വെച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. എന്നെ കൂട്ടിക്കൊണ്ടു പോയാൽ വെട്ടുകത്തി വച്ച സ്ഥലം ഞാൻ കാണിച്ചു തരാം, വെട്ടുകത്തി ഞാൻ എടുത്തു തരാം."

28. The investigating officer examined as PW11 states that the accused was taken to his residence at Sreeramapuram, Dindigul. The recovery mahazar is marked Ext.P15 and that also contains the confession extract. The mahazar reads that on the

basis of this confession statement, after getting the accused person in police custody, on 26.04.2017, they reached a place called Oddanchatram and travelled through Oddanchatram- Madurai road to reach Sreeramapuram Nertheruvu. There, in Ward No.4, the accused person took out a plastic bag containing a chopper in it from among cement bags collected there. It was described as follows.

"അലകും, പിടിയും സഹിതം സുമാർ 49 ½ cm നീളം വരുന്നതും റബ്ബർ പിടീക്ക് 16 cm നീളവും, ഇരുമ്പിൽ നിർമ്മിതമായ അലകിന് 33 ½ cm നീളവും, അഗ്രം ഉള്ളിലേക്ക് വളഞ്ഞതും, ഒരു വശം മുർച്ചയുള്ളതും, അലകിന് മധ്യഭാഗം സുമാർ 4.6 cm വീതിയുള്ളതും P S എന്ന് അലകിൽ മാർക്ക് ചെയ്ത് കാണുന്നതുമായ വെട്ടുകത്തി എണ്ണം - 1 (ഒന്ന്)"

29. The learned counsel for the accused principally would show that the chopper is not described to have contained blood stains in it. However, the Forensic Science Laboratory report marked Ext.P20 confirms that the Item No.11 that is, MO6 chopper is described as follows.

One dark brown stained, rusted metallic chopper with black coloured handle. It had a maximum length of 49.5 cm. The blade was sharp at one edge, curved and tapering towards the tip.

30. It has to be seen that the dark brown stains were visible with the expert, but that had not been the investigating officer. It needs an expert to identify dark brown stains from a rusted metallic chopper. Viewed in that perspective, non mentioning of dark brown stains in the metallic chopper assumes lesser importance. Had the aspect of dark brown stains in the Chopper been mentioned in the Mahasar prepared while taking into custody the weapon, the same would have been an added advantage for the prosecution. At the same time, it has to be seen that the mahazar has been prepared in a very amateurish way by the investigating officer.

31. In the DNA report filed it is clear that DNA had been isolated from Item No.2, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 11. The DNA profiling result is as follows.

Table 2

Sl.No.	Locus Tested	Stains in items 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 11		Sample blood of deceased person [Item No.7]		Sample blood of C. Mariyappan [Item No.10(a)]	
1	D3S1358	15	15	15	15	15	18
2	vWA	16	19	16	19	15	16
3	D16S539	11	11	11	11	9	11
4	CSF1PO	11	12	11	12	11	12
5	TPOX	8	9	8	9	10	12
6	Yindel	2		2		2	
7	AMELOGENIN	X	Y	X	Y	X	Y
8	D8S1179	14	15	14	15	15	16
9	D21S11	29	31.2	29	31.2	28	33.2
10	D18S51	14	17	14	17	14	15
11	DYS391	11		11		10	
12	D2S441	11	11	11	11	11	16
13	D19S433	12	13	12	13	13	14
14	TH01	8	9	8	9	6	9.3
15	FGA	23	23	23	23	20	22
16	D22S1045	15	16	15	16	15	15
17	D5S818	10	11	10	11	10	11
18	D13S317	10	12	10	12	9	9
19	D7S820	8	8	8	8	8	12
20	SE33	23.2	32.2	23.2	32.02	31.2	32.2
21	D10S1248	13	16	13	16	14	16
22	D1S1656	12	15	12	15	13	15.3
23	D12S391	19	22	19	22	18	23

24	D2S1338	19	22	19	22	18	18
----	---------	----	----	----	----	----	----

32. From the DNA profiling discussed above, the MO6 chopper had blood stains, DNA of which corresponded to the blood sample of the deceased taken by the Forensic Surgeon. It would have gone a long way in connecting the accused person with the crime, but for the lack of proof of authorship of concealment.

The witnesses Produced Later

33. The witnesses later produced are the PWs12 Joseph and PW13 Chakravarthi. Among them, the first witness by name Joseph would say that he had been working as a grade assistant sub-inspector at the time of recovery of the weapon, and he had assisted the Investigating Officer in getting the confession statement recorded, Ex P15 mahazar prepared in his hand and he had also gone to Tamil Nadu to get the recovery of the MO6 weapon and MO13 bag bearing it done. This witness states in the box that he had extracted the confession statement in the Seizure mahazar prepared, as per the statement of the witness himself, and that nothing had been supplied or deleted by him while recording it. Later, when specifically asked by the Learned Prosecutor, he stated that he had omitted to mention the details of the place where the weapon had been hidden. Therefore, he had written only the words 'Oru Sthalath'

This, according to him, had not been intentional, and it so happened due to oversight. However, this witness does not seem to have a clear point to stand in that respect. Even according to him, he was recording the statement in the way given by the accused himself. There is yet another question possible whether the Circle Inspector of Police, who had been responsible for recording of such statements, had been a mute spectator alone. It seems that the Investigating Officer did not bestow any attention to such statement appearing in the seizure mahazar, and if that is so, the same is sheer failure of duty. In fact, examination of this witness has only worsened the situation.

The Other Ocular Witness

34. The other witness examined - PW.13 Chakravarthi - did not at all support the prosecution case, even though he had been cited as an ocular witness. According to him, he did not personally know the deceased Pancharatnam alias Panchi and had not resided together with him. In the cross-examination, he stated that he had seen the deceased pancharathnam and had been frequenting the place where Satheesh and Ramalingam were staying. He came to know about the injury happened to pancharathnam in the morning, and had been there at the time when the quarrel occurred. However, this witness is very particular that he had not seen the quarrel. Anyway, this witness stated that Marimuthu had fallen there seeing blood and that instance was seen by him, but clarifies that he had not witnessed the incident where Mariyappan was seen stabbing Pancharatnam. He also did not identify the weapon that was shown to him. He identified the accused's Mariyappan in the box.

Another argument

35. Another argument revealed by the accused is that the accused had given his confession in Tamil and the witnesses could not understand Tamil. He relied on **Karuppaswamy vs. State of Kerala : MANU/KE/2768/2025**. There it was held that,

“46. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, we are of the view that the alleged confession made by the appellant is not proved by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt. The accused is a Tamilian, and he made the alleged confession in Tamil, but the witnesses are Malayalis. PW1 would state that he did not know Tamil and later added that he knew some Tamil. He would further state that the accused used to speak in Tamil. In such circumstances, the prosecution has to prove that the alleged confession made by the appellant in the Tamil language was properly understood by the witnesses.”

36. Going by the evidence that is tendered here, there is no proof that the accused

person spoke only Tamil. It is true that he belongs to Tamilnadu. As evidence reveals, he had been working in Kerala for quite a long time and he is able to understand Malayalam. He may not be able to write Malayalam, but his understanding level in Malayalam is found to be good in the course of the trial. Therefore, there is no merit in such contention.

On Recovery aspects

37. However, as I have already stated supra, the Investigating Officer terribly lacked professionalism in getting the possible evidence done. As I have extracted supra, the confession statement he recorded had been thoroughly bereft of essential details. It does not even mention the name of the village or district where the chopper was concealed. It does not mention whether the chopper had been concealed in a house in a village. The manner of concealment - that is, whether it was properly hidden from the view of others, is unspoken of. In such circumstances, it cannot be stated that the prosecution is able to pinpoint the accused with this sort of evidence.

38. In **Ramanand vs. State of Uttar Pradesh : MANU/SC/1324/2022**, a like situation was dealt with by the Honorable apex court as follows.

“68. What emerges from the evidence of the investigating officer is that the Accused Appellant stated before him while he was in custody, "I may get discovered the murder weapon used in the incident". This statement does not indicate or suggest that the Accused Appellant indicated anything about his involvement in the concealment of the weapon. It is a vague statement. Mere discovery cannot be interpreted as sufficient to infer authorship of concealment by the person who discovered the weapon. He could have derived knowledge of the existence of that weapon at the place through some other source also. He might have even seen somebody concealing the weapon, and, therefore, it cannot be presumed or inferred that because a

person discovered the weapon, he was the person who had concealed it, least it can be presumed that he used it. Therefore, even if discovery by the Appellant is accepted, what emerges from the substantive evidence as regards the discovery of weapon is that the Appellant disclosed that he would show the weapon used in the commission of offence.”

39. Here also the description is too generalised, vague and does not give an assurance that the information had been known to the accused alone until the point it was revealed to the police officer, and it doesn't get confirmed by the subsequent act of recovery of the weapon.

Defence Arguments and Finding on recovery

40. It was argued by the defense that, for the shortcomings or amateurish approach of the Investigating Officer in the preparation of the mahazar, the evidence may not be rejected altogether. They placed their reliance on **R. Baiju vs. The State of Kerala (16.04.2025 - SC) : MANU/SC/0494/2025**, in which case it was held as follows.

"The High Court rightly relied on **State of Karnataka v. K. Yarappa Reddy MANU/SC/0633/1999 : 1999:INSC:456 : (1999) 8 SCC 715**, to find that even when the probity of investigation is suspect, the rest of the evidence must be scrutinised meticulously to ensure that criminal justice is not rendered a causality."

41. The factual situation presented in that case does not apply to the frame of this case, as it is obvious from the reading of the decision. This is a case wherein the one and only evidence is the one based on this recovery, and the defect is the one affecting the core of admissibility of the evidence, as the same touches the very principle of authorship of concealment.

42. Another judgment relied on had been **Paramjit Singh vs. State of Punjab Through Secretary (Home) MANU/SC/8084/2007**, and in that case it was held as follows.

"This avoidable controversy need not detain us any further since it is well settled that even a defect, if any, found in investigation, however, serious has no direct bearing on the competence or the procedure relating to the cognizance or the trial. A defect or procedural irregularity, if any, in investigation itself cannot vitiate and nullify the trial based on such erroneous investigation."

43. The latches here cannot be equated to a mere defect in the mode of investigation which is liable to be ignored. As this Court has observed supra, the defect was to the very root of admissibility of the evidence., more to say, the only evidence. Hence the recovery cannot be used to find guilt with the accused.

Conclusions and Finding

44. The conclusion of the discussion is that the prosecution is not at all in a position to point towards the accused, and there is a dearth of valid evidence to connect him. Consequently, he is found not guilty of the offence under section 302 of IPC.

Conviction / Acquittal

45. In the result, the accused person is acquitted of the offence under section 302 of IPC, under section 235 Cr.P.C. His bail bond is cancelled and he is set at liberty. The material object No.6 - the chopper - shall be broken and sold. The other material objects, being valueless, shall be destroyed.

(Dictated partially to the Confidential Assistant, and partially to the appropriate dictation software, transcribed by her/it, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on the 6th day of June 2026).

Sd/-

K. KAMANEES
I ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE, THRISSUR

APPENDIX

Prosecution witnesses:

PW1	-	21.01.2026	-	Jayachandran	CW8
PW2	-	22.01.2026	-	Praveen Kumar	CW17
PW3	-	05.05.2026	-	Satheesh	CW1
PW4	-	05.05.2026	-	Ramalingam	CW3
PW5	-	07.05.2026	-	Dr. Sheik Shakeer Hussain	CW19
PW6	-	07.05.2026	-	Aravindakshan	CW4
PW7	-	07.05.2026	-	Jeevan	CW21
PW8	-	07.05.2026	-	Palani Swamy	CW22
PW9	-	07.05.2026	-	Sunilkumar	CW23
PW10	-	07.05.2026	-	Shibu	CW24
PW11	-	18.05.2026	-	K. C. Sethu	CW30
PW12	-	02.06.2026	-	Joseph	CW28
PW13	-	02.06.2026	-	Chakravarthi	CW2

Prosecution Exhibits:

<u>Date</u>			<u>Exhibits</u>		
P1	-	24.04.2017	-	Inquest Report	PW1
P2	-	08.06.2017	-	Scene Sketch	PW2
P3	-	23.04.2017	-	First Information Statement	PW3
P4	-	24.04.2017	-	Postmortem Certificate	PW5
P5	-	24.04.2017	-	Scene Mahazar	PW6
P6	-	24.04.2017	-	Seizure Mahazar (MOs collected)	PW9
P7	-	24.04.2017	-	Arrest Memo of accused	PW10
P8	-	24.04.2017	-	Seizure Mahazar (dress of accused)	PW10
P9	-	24.04.2017	-	Seizure Mahazar (Cellophane impression)	PW11
P10	-	No date	-	Cellophane impression	PW11
P11	-	24.04.2017	-	Inspection Memo	PW11

P12	-	24.04.2017	-	Full address report of accused	PW11
P13	-	25.04.2017	-	Seizure Mahazar (blood & nail clippings of accused)	PW11
P14	-	25.04.2017	-	Remand Report	PW11
P15	-	26.04.2017	-	Seizure Mahazar (chopper)	PW11
P16	-	26.04.2017	-	Confession extract of accused	PW11
P17	-	06.06.2017	-	Forwarding Note	PW11
P18	-	08.06.2017	-	Ownership certificate	PW11
P19	-	24.04.2017	-	Property list	PW11
P20	-	25.01.2022	-	RFSL report	PW11
P21	-	23.04.2017	-	FIR	PW11

Defence Witness: Nil

Defence Exhibits: Nil

Material objects:

MO1	-	24.04.2017	-	PVC pipe	PW1
MO2	-	24.04.2017	-	Small piece of PVC pipe	PW1
MO3	-	24.04.2017	-	Lungi (green, black & white colour)	PW1
MO4	-	24.04.2017	-	Underwear	PW1
MO5 series	-	24.04.2017	-	Card board pieces	PW1
MO6	-	24.04.2017	-	Chopper	PW5
MO7	-	24.04.2017	-	1 packet	PW5
MO8	-	24.04.2017	-	1 packet	PW5
MO9	-	24.04.2017	-	1 packet	PW10
MO10	-	24.04.2017	-	1 packet	PW10
MO11	-	24.04.2017	-	Lungi of accused	PW11

MO12	-	24.04.2017	-	Half sleeve shirt of accused	PW11
MO13	-	26.04.2017	-	Plastic bag (സഞ്ചി)	PW11

FOOT NOTE

Crime No.& Name of Station: Crime No.842/2017 of Thrissur Town East
Police Station

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACCUSED

Sl. No	Name of accused	Father's name	Occupation	Residence	Age
1.	Mariyappan. C	Chinnayya	Coolie worker	Tamilnadu	47

DATE OF

Occurrence	:	23.04.2017
Complaint	:	23.04.2017
Apprehension	:	24.04.2017
Release on bail	:	13.11.2017
Commencement of trial	:	21.01.2019
Close of trial	:	03.06.2026
Judgment pronounced	:	06.06.2026
Explanation for delay	:	No delay

Sd/-
**I ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
THRISSUR.**

(True copy)

By Order,

Sheristadar.

Copy of Judgment in
S.C 980/2017
Dated: 06.06.2026