

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DIVISION

Present Sri. K.P. Anilkumar, Additional Sessions Judge -I

On Tuesday 31st day of March 2026 / 10th Chaithra 1948

SESSIONS CASE No. 648/2018

(Crime No. 946/2017 of the Maranallor Police Station)

Complainant	: State of Kerala, represented by Maranallor Police Station. By Special Public Prosecutor B L Manesh
Accused	Sunil, aged 41 years, : S/o. Njana Das, Sujith Bhavan, Near Navakkodu CSI Church, Puthenkavuvila, Maranallor Desom, Maranallor Village, Thiruvananthapuram. By Adv. S. H. Muhammed Shafeek
Charge	: Offence punishable U/s 8(b) r/w 20(a) (i) of NDPS Act.
Plea	: Not guilty
Finding	: Not guilty
Sentence/Order	: The accused is not found guilty of the offence punishable U/s.20(a) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act and is acquitted of this offence U/s.235 (1) CrPC. The bail bond executed by the accused stands cancelled and he is set at liberty.
Date on which trial commenced	: 08/11/2024
Date on which trial closed	: 25/03/2026

No of days the case stood posted for trial	: (26 days) 08/11/2024, 03/12/2024, 04/12/2024, 13/01/2025, 30/01/2025, 18/02/2025, 12/03/2025, 08/04/2025, 09/06/2025, 26/06/2025, 22/07/2025, 25/08/2025, 18/09/2025, 15/10/2025, 31/10/2025, 25/11/2025, 08/12/2025, 13/01/2026, 27/01/2026, 23/02/2026, 26/02/2026, 27/02/2026, 28/02/2026, 05/03/2026, 12/03/2026, 25/03/2026
--	---

This sessions case having been finally heard on 25/03/2026 and the court on the 31/03/2026 delivered the following:-

JUDGMENT

The prosecution has initiated proceedings against the accused on the basis of a final report submitted by the Sub-Inspector of Police, Maranallur Police Station under Section 173 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, in Crime No. 946 of 2017. The report alleges commission of an offence punishable under Section 20(a)(i) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as “the NDPS Act”).

II. The prosecution Scenario

2. On 08.09.2017 at about 6:15 p.m., PW1 V. Shibu, Sub-Inspector of Police, Maranallur Police Station, received credible information that the accused was engaged in the cultivation of ganja on the terrace of his residential house, Sujith

Bhavan, situated near the CSI Church, Maranallur Village, Navakkottu. Acting upon the said information, PW3, accompanied by the police party, proceeded to the location and, at about 6:50 p.m., detected the cultivation of five ganja plants on the terrace, in contravention of the provisions of the NDPS Act. Consequently, the accused is alleged to have committed the aforementioned offence.

3. The accused was arrested at the spot and produced, along with the contraband articles, case records, and FIR, before the Judicial First Class Magistrate, Kattakada (hereinafter referred to as the Magistrate). Following this, PW3 initiated proceedings under Section 52(A) of the NDPS Act, obtaining certification of the inventory, drawing sample, and certifying photographs of the contraband with the Magistrate's endorsement. Subsequently, he continued the investigation. The sample drawn was analyzed by the Scientific Officer, who confirmed it as ganja plants. After recording the statements of witnesses and completing the investigation, PW3 filed the final report before this Court, alleging the commission of the aforementioned offence. The accused remained in judicial custody until his release on bail on 25.09.2017.

III. Cognizance of Offence, Inquiry and Trial

4. After taking cognizance of the aforesaid offence, the final report was received on file in the above number. On appearance of the accused on summons, he was provided with the copies of relevant records u/s.207 Cr.P.C. The learned Public Prosecutor has opened the prosecution case u/s.226 of Cr.P.C.

5. Upon consideration of the records of the case and the documents submitted therewith, and after hearing the submissions of the learned Counsel for the accused and the learned Prosecutor in this behalf, framed the charge for the offence punishable u/s.8(a) r/w 20(a)(i) of the NDPS Act. The charge was thereafter, read over and explained to the accused in Malayalam to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed for trial.

6. On the side of the prosecution, altogether 3 witnesses were examined as PWs1 to 3, marked documentary evidence Exts.P1 to P12 (Exts P1 and P2 series), Ext.C1 and identified material objects, MO1 and MO2. Ext.P12 was marked as per the application filed by the Prosecutor u/s.294 Cr.P.C. Witnesses, CWs1 and 4 reported dead.

Examination U/s.313(1)(b) Cr.P.C.

7. The accused was examined u/s.313(1)(b) Cr.P.C regarding the incriminating circumstances that emerged against him in the prosecution's evidence, and he denied all those circumstances. He further stated that he had suffered injuries in an accident about one to two months prior to the alleged incident. Following his discharge from hospital, while he was lying unconscious at his residence, he was arrested by the police. It is further contended that certain employees, who had quarreled with him and thereafter left his service, had placed the ganja plants at his house during the absence of his family members, who had gone to Velankanni

Church. During this period, the accused was being looked after by his brother. On the day in question, when his brother returned home after work, the police were found present at the house. The accused was then informed that he would be released after questioning at the police station. However, contrary to that assurance, he was taken to the police station and thereafter remanded to judicial custody. With these statements, the accused continued to assert his innocence.

8. Thereupon, both sides were heard under Sec. 232 Cr.P.C. Since it is not a case in which there is no evidence against the accused warranting his acquittal, he was called upon to enter on his defence and to adduce any evidence he might have in support of his defence.

9. The learned counsel appearing for the accused has submitted that the accused has no evidence to adduce.

Points for Consideration

10. After hearing both sides, the following points arise for consideration:

1) Whether the accused, in contravention of the NDPS Act, cultivated cannabis plants ?

2) Whether compliance with Sections 42 and 57 of the NDPS Act was mandatory in the present case, and if so, has the prosecution established such compliance?

3) Whether the accused committed the offence with which he is charged ?

4) If the accused is found guilty, what should be the proper sentence ?

Witnesses , Documents and Material Objects

11. Out of the witnesses, PW1 Ushakumari was examined as an independent witness to the arrest of the accused and seizure of the contraband, who admitted her signature in Ext.P1 mahazar. But she turned hostile to the prosecution. The contradictory portions of her statement recorded u/s.161 (3) CrPC have been proved as Ext.P2 series. PW2 Sunilkumar, SCPO attached to Maranalloor police station, was the accompanying officer and he supported the prosecution in regard to the detection of offence, arrest of accused and seizure of the contraband. He proved Exts. P3 and P4 labels in respect of MO1 Ganja plant and MO2 packet of plastic covers. PW3, Sub Inspector, (detecting officer) gave evidence about the detection of the offence, seizure of contraband, sampling, arrest of accused, registration of the FIR, and investigation, through whom the remaining documents and material objects were marked. The details of the documents and materials will be considered during the analysis of evidence.

IV. Compliance and Contravention of the NDPS Act

12. **Point Nos.1 & 2:-** With regard to the detection of the offence, the seizure of the contraband articles and the arrest of the accused, the prosecution mainly relied on the testimony of PW3, the detecting officer, and PW2 the accompanying officer.

13. Before discussing these points, a brief overview of the witness depositions is required, as follows:

14. On 08.09.2017, while on duty, PW3 received information over the station phone from an individual that one Sunil, (the accused), was cultivating ganja on the terrace of his residential house at Navakkode. PW3 immediately reported the matter to his superior officer, CI Kattakkada, and, accompanied by PW2 and GSI Abdul Vahab, proceeded to the location. On arrival, they found the accused, Sunil, present. PW3 informed him of the purpose of their visit, and upon questioning regarding the cultivation of ganja, the accused gave contradictory answers. Considering the delay involved in obtaining a search warrant, PW3 forwarded the Ext.P5 search memorandum to the court. A search of the terrace of the house revealed five plants, planted and nurtured in four polythene covers. On verification by the Excise party of Kattakkada Excise Office, PW1 confirmed that these were ganja plants, a conclusion also endorsed by the accompanying officials.

14(a). PW3 then plucked off the ganja plants. The first plant was packed and labeled, the packet bearing the signatures of PW3, the accused, and the witnesses, and was marked as S1. The remaining plants were similarly packed together, sealed, and marked as P1. The polythene covers in which the plants had been cultivated were also packed in like manner and marked as P2.

14(b). After seizing the contraband and arresting the accused, PW3 prepared Ext.P1 and registered the FIR (Ext.P6) upon reaching the station with the accused. He then produced the accused (as per Ext.C1 remand report) and the contraband (as per Ext.P7 property list). PW3 also testified about the preparation of an inventory of the contraband, drawing one plant out of the P1 packet ganja plants as a sample, keeping the remaining another packet, and taking photographs of these, which were certified by the Magistrate. He proved these documents as Exts.P8, P9 series (inventory and photos), and P10 label on the sample. He identified MO1 as the said sample and MO2 as the packet containing polyethyne covers.

14(c). In cross-examination, PW3 stated that in the First Information Report, the nature of the information was mistakenly recorded as written, the witness clarifying that the information had in fact been received through a phone call. With regard to the transmission of such information to his superior officer, it is further stated that the said fact was omitted in the report, and neither the original nor a copy thereof was produced before the Court. Likewise, he omitted to produce the statement of the excise officials, who allegedly visited the scene of occurrence at his request. He also failed to mention the duration for which the ganja plants had remained at the spot. However, he denied the suggestion that, without conducting any investigation, he had filed a false charge against the accused.

15. PW2 fully supported the testimony of PW3 regarding the information received, detection of the offence, arrest of the accused, and seizure of the contraband articles. He confirmed his signature on Ext.P1 mahazar, Exts. P3 and P4 labels and identified MO1 and MO2 as the ganja plant and the polyethylene covers seized from the location. In cross-examination, PW2 stated that there is another house situated close to the residence of the accused, and since both are of the same height, access to the terrace of the accused is possible from there. He further deposed that he had not noticed any trace of evidence or marks to indicate whether the plants had been present for a long period or had been recently placed. He admitted that the label containing his signature on the MO1 packet is not available thereon. Likewise, the newspaper used for packing the said material has also not been produced before the Court. However, he denied the suggestion that MO1 is not the ganja plant seized from the place of occurrence. He also refuted claims that he provided false evidence under the instruction of his superior officer.

16. PW1 categorically denied being present at the place of occurrence when PW3 detected the offence, arrested the accused, and seized the contraband. Upon the prosecutor's request, permission was granted to invoke Section 154 of the Evidence Act and the proviso to Section 162(1) of the Cr.P.C., allowing the introduction of her previous statement recorded by the investigating officer, in which she claimed to have been present at the scene and witnessed the entire process, including the signing

of the mahazar. These relevant portions were marked as Ext.P2 series. PW1 denied the suggestion that she was providing false evidence and deviating from her previous statement only to help the accused.

Submission for the Prosecution

17. The learned Public Prosecutor argued that the evidence of the detecting officer, corroborated by the testimony of the accompanying officer, clearly proved the guilt of the accused in the offence. The prosecution is also entitled to a presumption under Section 54 of the NDPS Act regarding the accused's culpability. Despite PW1 turning hostile, the evidence from official witnesses remains reliable.

Submission for accused

18. The defence contends that the prosecution has failed to prove the guilt of the accused, arguing that he is entitled to acquittal. The learned defence counsel asserts that the prosecution did not comply with mandatory statutory provisions, especially Sections 42(2) and 57 of the NDPS Act. Additionally, there is no evidence to establish that the accused had cultivated the ganja plants and that the independent witness did not support the prosecution.

Analysis

19. The evidence concerning the presence of the accused in the residence where the contraband Ganja plants were seen cultivated, as well as the detection, seizure, and arrest made by PW3, was extensively detailed by him during his testimony. This testimony is further supported by the account of PW2, who accompanied him and also witnessed and was involved in the entire process including packing and labelling of the contraband and arrest of the accused. As argued by the learned Public Prosecutor, the evidence on these matters mutually supports each other.

20. The independent witness PW1, a neighbour of the accused who was allegedly present throughout the proceedings, denied witnessing the incident though admitted her signature on the mahazar. The prosecution successfully proved her previous contradictory statements recorded by PW3.

21. As submitted by the learned Public Prosecutor, the hostility shown by the independent witness may not be a ground for disbelieving the testimony of official witnesses. In this respect, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *JagWinder Singh v. State of Punjab* (2023 Live Law SC 990, 2023 ICO 2141) has held that law does not require only an independent witness to prove a charge attracting the provisions of NDPS Act. It is well established that the Court can rely on the testimony of official witnesses regarding the detection of an offence, the arrest of the accused, and the seizure of contraband articles, even if independent witnesses are not examined or do not support the prosecution, as long as the evidence of the official witnesses inspires confidence. However, the fact that the independent witnesses did not support the prosecution undermines the credibility of the prosecution's case and may be a circumstance raised as grounds for rebutting the statutory presumption for the accused in certain cases.

Compliance with Sec. 42 of NDPS Act

22. The section confers the power of entry, search, seizure, and arrest without warrant or authorization. From its very language, it is evident that a written record is required where contraband or any illegally acquired property is kept or concealed in any building, conveyance, or enclosed place. It is only when such a writing is mandated under sub-section (1) that the requirement of forwarding a copy thereof to the immediate official superior, as provided under sub-section (2), becomes obligatory. In the present case, the information received by PW3 pertained to the

concealment or keeping of contraband in a building. Therefore, compliance with Section 42 is mandatory.

23. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its Constitution Bench in *Karnail Singh v. State of Haryana* (**2009 KHC 864 : 2009 (8) SCC 539**) clarified that compliance with Section 42 of the NDPS Act is mandatory when information relates to concealment of contraband in a building, conveyance, or enclosed place, but allowed limited flexibility in urgent situations. Paragraph 18 of the judgment reconciles earlier conflicting views and sets out the binding principles.

18. In conclusion, what is to be noticed is Abdul Rashid did not require literal compliance with the requirements of S.42(1) and 42(2) nor did Sajan Abraham hold that the requirements of S.42(1) and 42(2) need not be fulfilled at all. The effect of the two decisions was as follows:

(a) The officer on receiving the information (of the nature referred to in sub-s.(1) of S.42) from any person had to record it in writing in the concerned Register and forthwith send a copy to his immediate official superior, before proceeding to take action in terms of clauses (a) to (d) of S.42(1).

(b) But if the information was received when the officer was not in the police station, but while he was on the move either on patrol duty or otherwise, either by mobile phone, or other means, and the information calls for immediate action and any delay would have resulted in the goods or evidence being removed or destroyed, it would not be feasible or practical to take down in writing the information given to him, in such a situation, he could take action as per clauses (a) to (d) of S.42(1)

and thereafter, as soon as it is practical, record the information in writing and forthwith inform the same to the official superior .

(c) In other words, the compliance with the requirements of S.42(1) and 42(2) in regard to writing down the information received and sending a copy thereof to the superior officer, should normally precede the entry, search and seizure by the officer. But in special circumstances involving emergent situations, the recording of the information in writing and sending a copy thereof to the official superior may get postponed by a reasonable period, that is after the search, entry and seizure. The question is one of urgency and expediency.

(d) While total non compliance of requirements of sub-s.(1) and (2) of S.42 is impermissible, delayed compliance with satisfactory explanation about the delay will be acceptable compliance of S.42. To illustrate, if any delay may result in the accused escaping or the goods or evidence being destroyed or removed, not recording in writing the information received, before initiating action, or non sending a copy of such information to the official superior forthwith, may not be treated as violation of S.42. But if the information was received when the police officer was in the police station with sufficient time to take action, and if the police officer fails to record in writing the information received, or fails to send a copy thereof, to the official superior, then it will be a suspicious circumstance being a clear violation of S.42 of the Act. Similarly, where the police officer does not record the information at all, and does not inform the official superior at all, then also it will be a clear violation of S.42 of the Act. Whether there is adequate or substantial compliance with S.42 or not is a question of fact to be

decided in each case. The above position got strengthened with the amendment to S.42 by Act 9 of 2001.

Therefore, it is clear that S.42(1) and (2) of the NDPS Act is mandatory, and the total non - compliance of the same will vitiate the trial. Here, the prosecution has failed to prove the compliance of this provision.

Compliance with Sec.57 of NDPS Act

24. This Section says about the **Report of arrest and seizure**

Whenever any person makes any arrest or seizure, under this Act, he shall, within forty-eight hours next after such arrest or seizure, make a full report of all the particulars of such arrest or seizure to his immediate official superior.

According to PW3, he had submitted a report regarding the incident, the arrest of the accused, and the registration of the FIR to his superior officer. However, no material has been produced before the Court to substantiate this assertion. In the absence of such documentary proof, it is evident that there was no compliance with the statutory requirement under Section 57 of the NDPS Act. The failure to adhere to this requirement casts serious doubt on the credibility of the prosecution case. The omission not only weakens the evidentiary foundation but also reflects a lapse in procedural safeguards intended to ensure transparency and accountability in the exercise of powers under the Act.

Punishment for contravention in relation to cannabis

25. According to the prosecution, four plants collected by PW3 from the house of the accused were sent for analysis. As per Exhibit P12, the report of the Scientific Officer, Director of the Forensic Science Laboratory, Thiruvananthapuram, dated 17.05.2018, it was declared that these four plants were ganja (cannabis) plants.

26. Now when coming to the offence with which the accused is charged, Sec.8 provides prohibition of certain operations like cultivation of coca plant or gathering any portion of coca plant; cultivating the opium poppy or any cannabis plant and also production, manufacture, possession, sale transportation etc. of any narcotic drug or psychotropic substance, except for medical or scientific purposes and in the manner and to the extent provided by the provisions of this Act or the rules. Sec.20 provides the punishment for contravention in relation to cannabis plant and cannabis. As per this

Whoever, in contravention of any provisions of this Act or any Rule or Order made or condition of license granted thereunder;

(a) cultivates any cannabis plant; or

(b) produces, manufactures, possesses, sells, purchases, transports, imports inter-state, exports inter-state or uses cannabis shall be punishable,-

(i) where such contravention relates to clause (a) with rigorous imprisonment for a term which may extend to ten years and shall also be liable to fine which may extend to one lakh rupees;

xxx

27. Thus the prosecution must prove that the ganja plants were not naturally occurring but that the accused was directly involved in their cultivation. In this respect the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Alakh Ram v. State of U.P.* (**AIR 2004 KHC 410 : AIR 2004 SC 2907**) held that

In order to prove the guilt, it must be proved that the accused had cultivated this prohibited plant. There must be supporting evidence to prove that the accused cultivated the plant and it is not enough that few plants were found in the property of the accused. It is quite reasonable to assume that sometimes the plants may sprout up, if seeds happened to be embedded in earth due to natural process. If plants are sprouted by natural growth, it cannot be said that it amounts to cultivation.

28. The accused has claimed that he had no knowledge of the presence of the ganja plants on the terrace of his house, asserting instead that he had quarreled with his employees and that they might have placed the plants there. It is true that, apart from his statement under Section 313 CrPC, there is no independent evidence to support this contention. However, the testimony of PW2 reveals that there is another house situated in close proximity to the residence of the accused, and given that both houses are of the same height, access to the terrace of the accused's house from the adjoining compound is possible. This circumstance weakens the inference of

exclusive possession and raises doubt as to whether the accused alone was responsible for the presence of the plants.

29. Furthermore, there is no acceptable evidence to establish that the accused himself cultivated the alleged ganja plants seized by the detecting officer. PW2 was unable to confirm whether the plants had been growing there for a long period or had been recently placed, and PW3's evidence also does not disclose any material to prove cultivation by the accused. The prosecution has not advanced a case of exclusive possession of the house by the accused, nor has it ruled out the possibility of other occupants. In the absence of such proof, the prosecution has failed to establish that the accused was the cultivator of the ganja plants seized, and the benefit of doubt must necessarily enure to him.

30. In the circumstance of case, the foundational requirements for drawing the statutory presumption under Section 54 of the NDPS Act are absent. The prosecution has not established that the accused was in conscious or exclusive possession of the illicit articles, nor has it produced reliable evidence to show that he was cultivating the ganja plants. In the absence of proof of possession, the presumption of culpability embodied in Section 54 cannot be invoked against him. The mere recovery of plants from the terrace, without establishing his knowledge or control, is insufficient to shift the burden onto the accused.

31. Similarly, the presumption of culpable mental state under Section 35 of the Act is not attracted in this case. That provision operates only when the prosecution has first proved the foundational facts necessary to establish possession or involvement in the prohibited activity. Here, neither PW2 nor PW3 could confirm that the accused was responsible for cultivation, nor was there evidence of exclusive occupation of the premises. Without such proof, the statutory presumptions under Sections 54 and 35 cannot be applied, and the benefit of doubt must necessarily go to the accused. Therefore, the prosecution has failed to establish violation of the provisions of the NDPS Act by the accused so as to constitute an offence punishable under Section 20(a)(i). Accordingly, both points are answered in favour of the accused.

Findings

32. **Point No.3 & 4:-** As per the findings in point No. 1 & 2, the accused is not found guilty of the offence punishable u/s. 8 (a) r/w 20(a)(i) of the NDPS Act and he is entitled for an acquittal of this offence.

Conclusion

In the result,

- 1. The accused is not found guilty of the offence punishable U/s.20(a) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act and is acquitted of this offence U/s.235 (1) CrPC.***

2. *The bail bond executed by the accused stands cancelled and he is set at liberty.*
3. *MO 2 plastic covers being valueless shall be destroyed after the period provided for the appeal and in case of any appeal filed, after its disposal.*
4. *MO 1 Ganja shall be sent to the Drugs Disposal Committee through SHO, Cantonment Police Station for disposal as per law.*

Dictated in Adalth Ai , corrected and pronounced on this the 31st day of March, 2026.

Sd/-
K.P. Anilkumar.
Addl. Sessions Judge -I

APPENDIX

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Witnesses

A. PROSECUTION WITNESS

Rank	Date	Name	Whether Eye Witness, Police Witness, Expert Witness, Medical Witness, Other Witness
PW1	04/12/2024	Ushakumari. S	Independant witness
PW2	13/01/2025	Sunil Kumar	Police witness
PW3	23/02/2026	V Shibu	Detection and Investigation

B. DEFENCE WITNESS

Rank	Name	Whether Eye Witness, Police Witness, Expert Witness, Medical Witness, Other Witness
Nil		

C. COURT WITNESS

Rank	Name	Whether Eye Witness, Police Witness, Expert Witness, Medical Witness, Other Witness
Nil		

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Exhibits

A. PROSECUTION EXHIBITS

Sl.No.	Exhibit Number	Date	Description
1.	P1/PW1	08/09/2017	Search list
2.	P2/PW1	---	Portion of 161 statement
3.	P2(a)/PW1	---	Portion of 161 statement
4.	P3/PW2	---	Label
5.	P4/PW2	---	Label
5.	P5/PW3	08/09/17	Search memorandum
6.	P6/PW3	09/09/17	FIR
7.	P7/PW3	08/09/17	Property list
8.	P8/PW3	15/09/17	Inventory mahazar
9.	P8(a)/PW3	15/09/17	Report
10.	P8(b)/PW3	---	Certificate of Magistrate
11.	P9, P9(a) to P9(c)/PW3	---	Photographs (4 nos)
12.	P10/PW3	---	label
13.	P11/PW3	17/10/2017	Forwarding note
14.	P12/PW3	17/05/2018	FSL report

B. DEFENCE EXHIBITS

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
Nil		

C. COURT EXHIBITS

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Date	Description
1	C1/PW3	09/09/2017	Remand Report

D. MATERIAL OBJECTS

Sl. No.	Material Objects	Description
1	MO1	Ganja Plant
2	MO2	Packet contains 4 plastic cover

(Copies-4)
Typed by : Soumya
Compared by :Rifa

(True Copy)

F.C.S.:

Id/-
Addl. Sessions Judge -I
(By Order)

SHERISTADAR

**CALENDAR STATEMENT IN SESSIONS CASE No.648/2018 OF
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS COURT – I, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

Serial No.	:	SC. No.648/2018
Name of Police Station & Crime No. of Offences	:	Crime No. 946/2017 of the Maranallor Police Station
<u>Description of Accused</u>		
Name	:	Sunil
Father's Name	:	Njana Das
Occupation	:	--
Residence	:	Sujith Bhavan, Near Navakkodu CSI Church, Puthenkavuvila, Maranallor Desom, Maranallor Village, Thiruvananthapuram.
Age	:	41 years
<u>Date of</u>		
Occurrence	:	08/09/2017
Complaint	:	10/05/2018
Apprehension	:	08/09/2017
Release on bail	:	26/09/2017
Commitment	:	--
Commencement of trial	:	08/11/2024
Close of trial	:	25/03/2026
Sentence or Order	:	31/03/2026
Name of Committing Magistrate	:	--
Explanation for delay	:	--

Addl. Sessions Court – I,
Thiruvananthapuram,
Dated: 31/03/2026

//True Copy//

Sd/-
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE – I
By Order

SHERISTADAR

Copy of Judgment
in Sessions Case No.648/2018
Dated: 31/03/2026