

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-II,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
PRESENT: SHRI. RAJIV JAYARAJ, ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-II**

Friday the 5th day of June 2026/16th Jayishta 1948

SESSIONS CASE No. 821/2015

(Crime No. 790/2014 of Nemom Police Station)

Complainant:

State of Kerala represented
by Inspector of Police, Nemom

By Additional Public Prosecutor Hareesh Kumar K. L

Accused :

Shoukath Ali, aged 36/14 years,
S/o Shahul Hameed, residing at
TC 39/1467 No. House, Karimadam Colony,,
Puthiya Road, Chala Ward, Manacaud Village.

By Adv: Anuji. M.S (Legal Aid Defence Counsel)

Charge: Offence Punishable U/s 20(b)(ii)B of NDPS Act

Plea: Not Guilty

Finding: Guilty

Sentence or Order:

The accused is found guilty of the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) NDPS Act. Accused is sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year and to pay a fine of ₹.25,000/-. In default of payment of fine, accused shall undergo rigorous imprisonment for three months. Accused is entitled for set off under S.428 Cr.P.C. The material object, MO1, MO3 and MO4 shall be forwarded to the Drugs Disposal Committee for disposal after the expiry of the period of appeal. MO2 series shall be destroyed after the expiry of period of appeal.

Trial Commenced on : 19.12.2023

Trial Closed On: 02.06.2026

Number of days case stood for trial: (7 Days)

19.12.2023, 13.11.2024, 20.01.2025,
05.11.2025, 11.11.2025, 16.02.2026,
and 02.06.2026

This Sessions case having been finally heard on 02.06.2026 and the court on 05.06.2026 delivered the following.

J U D G M E N T

This case arises out of Crime No. 790/2014 registered by the SI of Police, Nemom, for offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

2. The sole accused in this case was indicted by the Circle Inspector of Police, Police Station, Nemom, on the allegation that he was found in unlawful possession of 1.100 kilograms of ganja, in contravention of the provisions of the NDPS Act(for short the ACT). The prosecution case is that on 31.05.2014 at about 9:15 p.m., PW1, the Sub-Inspector of Police, Nemom, while on duty, received reliable information that the accused was in possession of ganja at Pappanamcode, Estate Road. Upon receipt of such information, PW1 reduced the same into writing and forwarded Ext.P1 report in compliance with Section 42(1) of the Act, to the Circle Inspector of Police, Vizhinjam, who was in charge of the Circle Inspector of Police, Nemom. Thereafter, PW1, along with his police party, proceeded to the said place and reached there at about 9:20 p.m. At that time, the accused was found holding a plastic carry bag in his hand.

He was intercepted by the police party. PW1 informed the accused of his right under Section 50 of the Act, that he had the option to be searched in the presence of a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate. The accused, however, did not choose to exercise the said right and expressed his willingness to be searched by PW1 himself. On search of the plastic carry bag in the possession of the accused, it was found to contain ganja. On weighing, the total quantity of the contraband was found to be 1.100 kilograms. The seizure was effected in the presence of independent witnesses. The accused was arrested on the spot. From the contraband so seized, two samples of 10 grams each were taken in separate covers. The samples were properly packed, sealed, and labeled. Labels containing the signatures of the accused, PW1, the Civil Police Officer Sri Pramod, and one of the independent witnesses were affixed on the sample packets. The plastic carry bag and the newspaper used for wrapping were also separately packed, sealed, and labeled. The remaining quantity of ganja was likewise properly sealed and labeled in accordance with the procedure. Evidencing the arrest of the accused, the seizure of ganja, and the preparation of samples, PW1 prepared a seizure mahazar at the spot in the presence of witnesses. Thereafter, the accused was taken to the Nemom Police Station, where a crime was registered by PW1 himself under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) of the Act. PW1 also prepared and forwarded a report under Section 57 of the

NDPS Act to the Circle Inspector of Police, Nemom, detailing the particulars of the arrest and seizure effected on that night. Subsequently, the investigation of the case was taken over by the Circle Inspector of Police. The accused was produced before the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court-1, Neyyattinkara, and was remanded to judicial custody. The material objects seized in the case were produced before the court. The Investigating Officer submitted a forwarding note for sending the samples for chemical analysis. Accordingly, the samples were forwarded to the Chemical Examiner's Laboratory for examination. The successor Circle Inspector of Police continued the investigation, completed the necessary formalities, and ultimately laid the final report before the committal court. After hearing the learned counsel for the accused and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, this Court framed charge against the accused for the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. The charge was read over and explained to the accused, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

3. In order to prove the prosecution case, PWs 1 to 6 were examined and Exts. P1 to P13 were marked. MOs 1 to 4 were identified and marked as material objects on the side of the prosecution. After the closure of the prosecution evidence, the accused was questioned under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure with regard to the incriminating circumstances

appearing in evidence against him. The accused denied all such incriminating circumstances. While doing so, he set up a defence contending that the case is false and concocted. According to him, he was taken into custody on 31.05.2014 from a place called Kattakkada and was brought to the Nemom Police Station, where he was falsely implicated in the present case. He further contended that the arrest records, labels, and other documents were manipulated by the police. He denied that he was in possession of ganja or that he was apprehended from Pappanamcode, Estate Road as alleged by the prosecution. The accused claimed that he is a scrap vendor by occupation and has been leading a lawful life. Though he was called upon to enter upon his defence, he did not adduce any evidence.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the accused and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

5. The following points arise for determination in this case :

1. Did the accused possess 1.100 kilograms of ganja on 31.05.2014 at about 9:20 p.m. at the place of occurrence, as alleged by the prosecution?
2. Did the accused commit the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985?
3. What is the sentence or order to be passed?
6. **Point Nos.1 and 2** :- Since Points Nos. 1 to 3 are interconnected,

they are considered together and are being disposed of by this common discussion. The detecting officer, the Sub-Inspector of Police, was examined as PW1. PW5 is the Civil Police Officer, Sri Pramod, who was a member of the police party that allegedly conducted the search and seizure. PW2 was cited as an independent witness to Ext.P4 seizure mahazar alleged to have been prepared at the place of occurrence. However, PW2 did not support the prosecution case and was declared hostile. He did not depose in support of the alleged seizure of ganja or the arrest of the accused from the place of occurrence. PW1 and PW5 deposed that on 31.05.2014 at about 9:15 p.m., while they were on patrol duty within the limits of Nemom Police Station, PW1 received reliable information that the accused was in possession of ganja at Pappanamcode Estate Road. According to PW1, the said information was reduced into writing and Ext.P1 report was prepared in compliance with Section 42(1) of the Act. PW1 further deposed that Ext.P1 report was forwarded to PW3, the Circle Inspector of Police, Vizhinjam, who was in charge of the Circle Inspector of Police, Nemom, through a Civil Police Officer by name Srijith, who was also a member of the raiding party. This aspect of the prosecution case is corroborated by the testimony of PW5.

7. PW3, the Circle Inspector of Police, Vizhinjam, testified that he received Ext.P1 report on the date of occurrence itself. Ext.P1 shows that it

bears the signature of PW3 with an endorsement indicating receipt at about 10:00 p.m. on 31.05.2014. PW1 and PW5, deposed that, acting upon the information received, they alone with other members reached Pappanamcode Estate Road at about 9:20 p.m. on 31.05.2014 and found the accused at the place indicated in the information. The accused was seen holding a white plastic carry bag in his hand. He was intercepted by the police party. PW1 deposed that he informed the accused that he was to be searched and that he had a right to be searched in the presence of a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate, as contemplated under Section 50 of the NDPS Act. However, the accused did not choose to exercise the said right and expressed his willingness to be searched by PW1 himself. On search of the plastic carry bag, it was found to contain ganja wrapped in a newspaper. Thereupon, the accused was arrested on the spot. PW1 and PW5 further deposed that the contraband, along with the plastic cover and newspaper, was weighed and found to be 1.100 kilograms. After removing the plastic cover and the newspaper, the net weight of the ganja was found to be 1.060 kilograms. From the contraband so seized, two samples of 10 grams each were taken in separate covers. The samples were properly packed, sealed, and labeled. Labels containing the signatures of the accused, PW1, PW5, and an independent witness were affixed on the sample packets. The remaining quantity of ganja was also properly sealed and labeled. The contraband was

identified by PW1 and PW5 before the Court as MO1. The plastic carry bag and the newspaper were separately sealed and labeled, and were identified as MO2 series.

8. PW1 and PW5 further deposed that Ext.P4 seizure mahazar was prepared at the place of occurrence evidencing the arrest of the accused and the seizure of ganja from his possession. Exts.P2 and P3 arrest records were also prepared at the relevant time, which contain the signatures of the accused, witnesses, and the officials concerned. The evidence of PW1 and PW5 would further show that the accused was taken to Nemom Police Station, where Ext.P5 First Information Report was registered by PW1 without delay. PW1 also prepared Ext.P6 report under Section 57 of the NDPS Act and submitted the same to PW4, the Circle Inspector of Police, Nemom. PW4 took over the investigation of the case on 01.06.2014. He produced the accused before the jurisdictional Magistrate along with Ext.P10 remand report, and the accused was remanded to judicial custody.

9. PW1, the detecting officer, produced MO1 and MO2 series before the committal court by incorporating the same in Ext.P7 property list, without any unreasonable delay. PW4 submitted the necessary forwarding note before the court for sending the samples for chemical analysis. Accordingly, the samples were sent to the Chemical Examiner's Laboratory. PW6, the successor

Circle Inspector of Police, continued the investigation, questioned the witnesses, completed the investigation, and laid the final report before the committal court.

10. During trial, PW1 and PW5 identified the accused in court. They also identified their signatures in the labels affixed on the material objects. Exts.P8 and P9 are the labels affixed on MO1 and MO2 series, and Exts.P11 and P12 are the labels affixed on MO3 and MO4. The MO3 and MO4 are the sample packets returned from the Chemical Examiner's Laboratory after analysis. The chemical analysis report confirmed that the samples contained ganja. The fact that the samples forwarded from the court to the Chemical Examiner's Laboratory contained ganja is not in dispute. Ext.P13 Chemical Analysis Report clearly shows that the samples, on examination, were found to contain ganja. No argument has been advanced on the side of the defence challenging the correctness or reliability of the chemical analysis. Therefore, the chemical nature of the seized substance stands conclusively established. In such circumstances, if the prosecution succeeds in proving that the samples tested in the laboratory formed part of the very same contraband allegedly seized from the possession of the accused on 31.05.2014 from the place of occurrence, and if the evidence adduced in that regard is found to be reliable and convincing, it can safely be concluded that the accused was in possession of

ganja and thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) of the NDPS Act.

11. The defence contention is one of total denial. According to the accused, he was not in possession of any contraband and was taken into custody from another place, namely Kattakkada, and falsely implicated in this case. It is further contended that the arrest records, labels, and even the contraband were manipulated by the police.

12. The learned counsel for the accused advanced various arguments to contend that the alleged arrest and seizure are not trustworthy. One of the principal contentions raised is that Ext.P1 report does not satisfy the mandatory requirements under Section 42(1) of the NDPS Act and that the same is a concocted document. On a perusal of Ext.P1, it is seen that the same bears the signature of PW3, the Circle Inspector of Police, who was in charge of the Circle Inspector of Police, Nemom, with an endorsement showing receipt at about 10:00 p.m. on 31.05.2014. PW1 and PW5 have consistently deposed that upon receipt of reliable information during patrol duty, PW1 reduced the same into writing and forwarded Ext.P1 report through a Civil Police Officer by name Srijith, who was a member of the raiding party. Their evidence is consistent and mutually corroborative in this regard. PW3 has also deposed that he received Ext.P1 report on the same night. Though PW3 was cross-examined

regarding the absence of documentary proof to show that he was holding charge of the Circle Inspector of Police, Nemom, no material contradictions or infirmities could be elicited so as to discredit his testimony. There is no reason to discard the evidence of PW3 on that ground alone. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that there is any procedural irregularity in complying with Section 42(1) of the NDPS Act, it is to be noted that the present case pertains to a search effected in a public place. The accused was allegedly found on a public road carrying a plastic bag, and the search conducted was essentially of his person and the bag carried by him. The search was not of any building, conveyance, or enclosed place. In such circumstances, the provisions of Section 42 of the NDPS Act would not be attracted, and the case would fall within the ambit of Section 43 of the NDPS Act. Therefore, the contention raised by the defence regarding non-compliance of Section 42(1) is liable to be rejected.

13. Another contention raised by the learned counsel for the accused is that there was non-compliance with the mandatory provisions of Section 50 of the NDPS Act. On a careful consideration of the evidence on record, I find it difficult to accept the said contention. Ext.P4 seizure mahazar would indicate that the accused was informed of his right to be searched in the presence of a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate. The evidence of PW1 and PW5 also clearly establishes that such information was duly conveyed to the accused prior to the

search. Both PW1 and PW5 have consistently deposed that the accused was apprised of his right under Section 50 of the NDPS Act and that he declined to exercise the said right, expressing his willingness to be searched by PW1 himself. Despite effective cross-examination, nothing has been brought out to discredit their version on this aspect. There is no material on record to suggest that the accused was either misled or that the right under Section 50 was not properly communicated to him. The evidence available would indicate substantial compliance with the requirement of Section 50 of the NDPS Act. Hence, the contention raised by the defence regarding non-compliance of Section 50 is liable to be rejected.

14. In any view of the matter, even otherwise, I am of the considered opinion that Section 50 of the NDPS Act has no application to the facts of the present case. The evidence on record would show that what was recovered is not pursuant to a personal search of the body of the accused, but from a plastic carry bag which he was allegedly holding in his hand. The search, therefore, was confined to the bag carried by the accused and not to his person. It is well settled that the provisions of Section 50 of the NDPS Act are attracted only in the case of a personal search of the accused. Where the recovery is effected from a bag, container, or other article carried by the accused, and not from his body, the compliance of Section 50 is not mandatory. In the present case, the

alleged recovery being from a plastic cover held by the accused, the requirement of informing him of his right under Section 50 does not arise. Therefore, even assuming that there was any deficiency in compliance, the same would not vitiate the prosecution case. Accordingly, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the accused regarding non-compliance of Section 50 of the NDPS Act is liable to be rejected. Insofar as Ext.P6 report prepared under Section 57 of the NDPS Act is concerned, the same has been proved through the evidence of PW4. PW1 has testified that he prepared and forwarded the said report, and a perusal of Ext.P6 would show that it contains the details of the arrest and seizure as well as the procedural steps taken by him. On scrutiny, I am satisfied that Ext.P6 report substantially complies with the requirements of Section 57 of the NDPS Act and does not suffer from any infirmity. Even otherwise, it is well settled that the provisions of Section 57 are directory in nature, and any minor irregularity in compliance would not, by itself, vitiate the prosecution case. Coming to the appreciation of oral evidence, the testimonies of PWs 1 and 5 are consistent, cogent, and mutually corroborative with regard to the seizure of ganja from the possession of the accused and his arrest from the place of occurrence. Their evidence inspires confidence. Though the defence has suggested that the case is a fabricated one and that the accused has been falsely implicated, no material has been brought on record to probalilise

such a contention. There is nothing to indicate that PWs 1 and 5 had any prior enmity or animosity towards the accused so as to falsely implicate him in a serious offence of this nature. Mere allegation of false implication, without any supporting material, is not sufficient to discard the otherwise reliable testimony of official witnesses. It is also pertinent to note that the acts of public officials performed in the discharge of their official duties carry with them a presumption of regularity, unless the contrary is established. In this context, it is also relevant that the accused was promptly produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate. Ext.P5 First Information Report, along with Ext.P6 report, reached the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court without undue delay, which further lends assurance to the prosecution version.

15. It is to be noted that Ext.P10 remand report, along with Ext.P5 First Information Report, reached the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court, Neyyattinkara, on 01.06.2014 at about 8:10 p.m. This would clearly indicate that there was no delay in producing the accused before the Magistrate or in forwarding the FIR to the court. A perusal of Ext.P10 remand report would show that it contains detailed particulars regarding the arrest of the accused, seizure of the contraband, and the procedure adopted for sampling, sealing, and affixture of labels. These essential details having been brought to the notice of the Magistrate at the earliest point of time lends assurance to the prosecution

version. Ext.P2 arrest memo also bears the endorsement and signature of the learned Magistrate on 01.06.2014, which further establishes that the arrest records reached the court promptly. Though Ext.P7 property list bears the date 3.6.2014, the same cannot be treated as an unexplained delay in producing the material objects before the court. This is for the reason that all vital details regarding the seizure, sampling, sealing, and labeling had already been incorporated in the remand report and FIR, which were before the Magistrate on 01.06.2014 itself. Thus, the prompt production of the accused and the timely forwarding of the FIR and remand report to the court effectively rule out any possibility of manipulation or fabrication in respect of the seizure and the material objects.

16. The learned counsel for the accused contended that the seal impression allegedly affixed on the samples was not specifically described in Ext.P4 seizure mahazar, and therefore the prosecution case is vitiated. I am unable to accept the said contention. There is no statutory requirement mandating that the specimen of the seal used at the time of seizure must be described in detail in the seizure mahazar. In the present case, Ext.P13 Chemical Analysis Report would show that the seals affixed on the sample packets were verified by the Chemical Examiner with the specimen seal forwarded along with the samples, and it was found that the seals were intact

and tallied. This clearly establishes that there was no tampering with the samples. Hence, it can safely be concluded that the samples taken at the spot reached the court and thereafter the laboratory in an untampered condition. With regard to the alleged discrepancy in weight, the evidence shows that the total weight of the contraband along with the plastic cover and newspaper was 1.100 kilograms, and after removing the cover and newspaper, the net weight was found to be 1.060 kilograms. Only 10 grams each were taken as samples, and as per Ext.P13 report, only one gram thereof was used for analysis. The minor variation, if any, in weight can reasonably be attributed to the nature of the substance and passage of time, and does not affect the prosecution case.

17. The learned counsel further contended that the presence of the crime number on the labels creates suspicion that the labels were prepared subsequently at the police station. This argument also does not merit acceptance. The mere presence of the crime number on the labels, without anything more, cannot lead to an inference of fabrication. It is quite probable that the crime number was written for the purpose of proper identification and to avoid confusion. Notably, PW1 was not specifically cross-examined on this aspect. Another contention raised was that PW1 was not questioned by the Investigating Officers (PW4 and PW6). In my view, such omission is not fatal to the prosecution case. Examination of the detecting officer during

investigation is not an inflexible requirement in all cases, especially when the evidence otherwise on record is consistent and reliable. On a comprehensive appreciation of the entire evidence on record and the circumstances brought out in the case, I find no reason to doubt the prosecution version. The testimonies of PWs 1 and 5 are reliable and inspire confidence. The defence has not been able to probabalise its case of false implication. Therefore, I am of the considered opinion that the prosecution has succeeded in establishing that the accused was in possession of 1.100 kilograms of ganja on the date, time, and place alleged, and that he has thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) of the NDPS Act. Accordingly, Point Nos. 1 and 2 are answered in favour of the prosecution.

In the result, accused found guilty and convicted for offence punishable under S.20(b)(ii)(B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 and convicted under S.235(2) Cr.P.C.

For hearing the accused on question of sentence, the case is adjourned for a while.

Point No.3 :- I have heard the convict and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the question of sentence.

The convict submitted that he is coming from poor financial background and maxiumum leniency might be shown in the matter of sentence.

The learned counsel appearing for the accused reiterated the said aspects and pleaded for leniency.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that maximum sentence has to be awarded.

I have considered all facts and circumstances of the case. The sale and use of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substance is a social menace and it would ruin the society especially persons of adolescence age. It would largely affect the entire society and it has to be eradicated at any cost. Taking into consideration of the social importance, stringent punishment has been provided by the statute. Coming to the facts of this case it is seen that the accused had possessed 1.100 kg ganja. To attain the maximum small quantity of ganja, it would be one kilogram. To attain the commercial quantity it would be 20 kg. Though the quantity is intermediate quantity, it is just above the small quantity. The maximum punishment provided for the offence involving small quantity of ganja would be imprisonment upto a period of one year or fine of ₹.1,00,000/- or both. In the case on hand, the accused had possessed 1.100 kg ganja in his possession and no previous conviction is proved. Hence I am of the view that imprisonment for one year together with imposition of mandatory fine of ₹.25,000/- would meet the ends of justice.

- (1) The accused is found guilty of the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) NDPS Act.

- (2) Accused is sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year and to pay a fine of ₹.25,000/- in default of payment of fine, accused shall undergo rigorous imprisonment for three months.
- (3) Accused is entitled for set off under S.428 Cr.P.C.
- (4) The material object, MO1, MO3 and MO4 shall be forwarded to the Drugs Disposal Committee for disposal after the expiry of the period of appeal. MO2 series shall be destroyed after the expiry of period of appeal.

Dictated to the CA, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me, in open court on this the 5th day of June, 2026.

Sd/-
RAJIV JAYARAJ
Additional Sessions Judge-II

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	13.11.2024	K. Dhanapalan	Police Witness
PW2	13.11.2024	Santhosh	Other Witness
PW3	14.11.2024	V.J.Joshy	Police Witness
PW4	14.11.2024	Vidyadharan	Police Witness
PW5	20.01.2025	Pramod	Police Witness
PW6	05.11.2025	S.Ajayakumar	Police Witness

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. Exhibits for the Prosecution**

Exhibit Number	Date	Description
P1/PW1	31.05.2014	Report u/s 42 of NDPS Act
P2/PW1	31.05.2014	Arrest memo
P3/PW1	31.05.2014	Inspection memo
P4/PW1	31.05.2014	Seizure mahazar
P5/PW1	31.05.2014	FIR
P6/PW1	31.05.2014	Report u/s 57 of NDPS Act
P7 /PW1	-	Property List
P8/PW1	24.10.2005	Outside label in MO -1
P9/PW1	24.10.2005	Outside label in MO -2 Series
P10/PW4	01.06.2014	Remand Application
P11/PW5	-	Label in MO -3
P12/PW5	-	Label in MO-4
P13/PW6	28.01.2015	FSL Report

B. DEFENCE EXHIBITS

Sl.No	Exhibit No	Description
Nil		

C. COURT EXHIBITS

Sl.No	Exhibit No	Description
Nil		

D. MATERIAL OBJECTS

Sl No	Material Objects	Description
1.	MO.I	Ganja
2.	MO.2 series	Plastic cover and News paper
3.	M.O.3	Sample Ganja (S1)
4.	M.O.4	Sample Ganja(S2)

Id/-
Additional Sessions Judge-II

(Copies : 5)
 Typed by : Manjusha
 Compared by :Soumya
 FCS :

True copy

By Order

SHERISTADAR

<u>CALENDAR STATEMENT IN SESSIONS CASE No. 821/2015 OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS COURT-II, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM</u>	
Serial No.	SC No 821/2015
Name of Police Station & Crime No.of Offences	(Crime No. 790/2014 of Nemom Police Station)
<u>Description of Accused</u>	
Name	Shoukath Ali
Father's Name	Shahul Hameed,
Religion and Caste	-
Occupation	-
Residence	TC 39/1467 No. House, Karimadam Colony,, Puthiya Road, Chala Ward, Manacaud Village.
Age	36/14 years,
<u>Date of</u>	
Occurrence	31.05.2014
Complaint	31.05.2014
Apprehension	31.05.2014
Release on bail	05.07.2014
Commitment	Nil
Commencement of trial	19.12.2023
Close of Trial	02.06.2026
Sentence or Order	05.06.2026
Name of Committing Magistrate	-
Explanation for delay	Nil

Addl. Sessions Court-II
Thiruvananthapuram
Date :05.06.2026

Id/-
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-II

True copy

By Order

SHERISTADAR

Copy of Judgment in
SC No 821/2015
Dated: 05.06.2026