

STATE OF TAMIL NADU
Judicial Form No. 61
(Cr.R.P 106)
IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHALIR NEETHIMANDRAM
ALLIKULAM, CHENNAI - 600 003.

Present : Thiru.G.PRABAGARAN
Sessions Judge,
Mahalir Neethimandram, Chennai.

Dated Monday the 27th day of July, 2026

2057 - திருவள்ளூர் ஆண்டு, பராபவ ஆடி திங்கள் 11 ம் நாள் திங்கட்கிழமை

JUDGMENT IN SESSIONS CASE No: 207/2024
(CNR NO. TNCH01 - 026702 - 2022)

ON TH FILE OF MAHALIR NEETHIMANDRAM, CHENNAI

(P.R.C. No.6/2024 in (Crime No.197/2023, C-3, Law and Order Police Station, Chennai-01) on the file of the Learned VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, committed to the Court of Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai for the offences against the accused under Section 307 of IPC and made over to this Court for enquiry and trial)

Complainant	The Inspector of Police, C-3, Seven Well Police Station Chennai – 01. (Crime No. 197/2023)
Name of the Accused	Honestraj, M/A. 31/2023 S/o. Munivel, CS Sandhu, 5 th Cross Street, Chrompet, Chennai-44.
Offence charged	U/s. 307 of IPC
Plea of accused	Not guilty
Finding	In the result, the accused is not found

	guilty for the charges levelled against them under Sections 307 of IPC and the accused is acquitted under section 235(1) Cr.P.C. The bail bond executed by the accused shall be in force for six months under Section 437A Cr.P.C., and he shall appear before the higher Court as and when such Court issues notice in respect of any appeal or petition filed against the judgment of this Court.					
Sentence		NIL				
Order U/s. 452 Cr.P.C.		The case property M.O.1 was ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of appeal time, if there be any appeal, after the disposal of appeal.				
Compensation Order U/s. 357 or 357A Cr.P.C		Perused the oral and documentary evidence. PW1 injured person and defacto complainant did not support the case of prosecution. Considering the facts and circumstances no orders recommending compensation under Section 357A Cr.P.C. is passed in this case.				
Description of the accused						
Sl. No.	Name	Father's Name	Caste or race	Occupation	Residence	Age
1.	Honestraj	Munivel	--	Painter	CS Sandhu, 5 th Cross Street,	31/2023

					Chromepet, Chennai-44.	
Date of	Occurrence	08.12.2023				
	Complaint-Final Report	08.12.2023				
	Apprehension or appearance of accused	01.08.2024				
	Release of accused on bail	14.08.2024				
	Commitment	04.07.2024				
	Commencement of Trial	11.02.2026				
	Close of trial	15.07.2026				
	Sentence or Order	27.07.2026				
	Service of Copy of Judgment or finding on accused	Judgment : 27.07.2026				
Explanation for delay		Delay in producing witnesses.				
Counsel for the Complainant		Ms.V.Vinnoli Special Public Prosecutor.				
Counsel for the Accused		M/s. B.R. Jayaprakash Narayanan, C.Raja, C.Vignesh,				

Sessions Judge,
Mahalir Neethimandram,
Chennai.

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHALIR NEETHIMANDRAM
ALLIKULAM, CHENNAI - 600 003.**

CASE SUMMARY

Sessions Case No.207/2024

(i)	The period of remand of the accused :	15.12.2023-30.10.2024: 27.01.2025-17.07.2026			
(ii)	The date of filing of the complaint/final report in the Court :	09.12.2023			
(iii)	The date of questioning of the accused under Sections 228, 240, 246 and 251 of the Code, as the case maybe;	11.02.2026			
(iv)	Filing of all miscellaneous petitions and their results including the results on challenge before superior Courts, except routine petitions like petitions under section 317 of the Code, etc	Crl.M.P. No.	U/s CrPC/ BNSS	Result	Appeal
		--	--	--	--

(v)	Date of examination in-chief and cross-examination of a witness;		Witnesses	Chief	Cross
		1	Tmt Priya (Victim/Defacto complainant)	10.04.2026	--
		2	Tr. Pandian	10.04.2026	10.04.2026
		3	Th. Jothibass	10.04.2026	--
		4	Dr.Tr.Ranjith James Babu	14.05.2026	14.05.2026
		5	Tr.Chandrasekar	05.06.2026	--
		6	Tmt.Manonmani, Investigation	01.07.2026	01.07.2026

			Officer		
		7	Tr.Muruganandam, Officer	Investigation 15.07.2026	15.07.2026

(vi)	Date of examination of the accused under section 313 CrPC;	20.07.2026	
(vii)	Details of absconding of the accused and his appearance/production, as the case may be;	<u>Date of absconding</u>	<u>Date of appearing</u>
		30.08.2024	30.10.2024
		27.01.2025	20.08.2025
(viii)	Grant of stay by superior Courts and the results thereof:	Nil	
(ix)	Details of victim compensation ordered:	Nil	

Sessions Judge,
Mahalir Neethimandram,
Chennai.

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MAHALIR
NEETHIMANDRAM
ALLIKULAM, CHENNAI - 600 003.**

**Present : Thiru.G.PRABAGARAN
Sessions Judge,
Mahalir Neethimandram, Chennai.**

Dated Monday the 27th day of July, 2026

2057 - திருவள்ளூர் ஆண்டு, பராபவ ஆடி திங்கள் 11 ம் நாள்
திங்கட்கிழமை

**JUDGMENT IN SESSIONS CASE No: 207/2024
(CNR NO. TNCH01 - 026702 - 2022)**

The Inspector of Police,
C-3, Seven Well Police Station
Chennai – 01.

(Crime No. 197/2023)

... Complainant.

- Vs.-

Honestraj, M/A. 31/2023
S/o. Munivel,
CS Sandhu, 5th Cross Street,
Chrompet, Chennai-44.

... Accused

This Sessions case is taken on file on 09.07.2024 and came up on 27.07.2023 before this court for final hearing in the presence of Tr.V.Vinnoli, Learned Special Public Prosecutor for the Complainant and M/s.B.R. Jayaprakash Narayanan, C.Raja, C.Vignesh, Learned counsel

for the Accused and upon hearing the arguments on both sides and perusing the material records, having stood over till this day for consideration, this Court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

2. Final Report:

2(i) The Inspector of Police, C-3, Seven Well Police Station, Chennai, has laid a Final Report in Cr. No.197/2023 before the Learned VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai for an offences u/s. 307 of IPC alleging that the accused and husband of defacto complainant are brothers, the accused has got marriage with sister of defacto complainant, he used to took quarrel with his wife and used to involved in the theft offences and assault cases and used to abused the family members of LW1 in alcoholic mood, therefore LW1 and her family members used to sleeping in the visitors area at Stanley hospital, before four days from the date of occurrence, the husband of LW1 had quarrel with accused and LW1 scolded the wife of accused in filthy language, the accused threatened the LW1 and her husband with dire consequences, in the meantime on 08.12.2023 when the LW1 sleeping in the visitors hall at Stanley Hospital along with her child, the accused also sleeping nearby LW1, on 09.12.2023 at about 2.30 a.m., the accused

assaulted the LW1 saying that get lost with blade on her face, right shoulder and caused grievous injuries to her in order to kill her, therefore the act of the accused is offence punishable under section 307 of IPC.

3. Cognizance and Committal: Upon taking cognizance of the offence by the Committal Court and on appearance of the accused, all the copies of documents relied on the side of the prosecution was furnished to the accused by the Committal Court in compliance of section 207 of Code of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973. Thereafter, as the offences alleged to have been committed by the accused are exclusively triable by the Court of Sessions, the Learned VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai vide Order dated 04.07.2024 in P.R.C. No.06/2024 has committed the case u/s. 209 Cr.P.C. to the Hon'ble Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai, and committed the accused to be produced before the Sessions Court. The same is taken on file as Sessions case by the Learned Principal Session Judge, Chennai and in turn it was made over to this Court for trial in accordance with law.

4. Appearance of accused and Framing of Charges: Upon appearance of the accused and their Counsel, the learned Special Public Prosecutor opened the case of the prosecution U/s.226 Cr.P.C. by

describing the charge levelled against the accused and the evidence based on which the charge is proposed to be proved. After hearing both sides and perusing the material records, as there were grounds for presuming that the accused has committed offence which is exclusively triable by this Court of Sessions, charge was framed against the accused under Section 307 of IPC. When the charge was read over and explained to the accused and questioned, he pleaded not guilty. Hence, proceedings were issued for trial.

5. Prosecution side evidence:

In order to prove the charge as against the accused, out of 13 witnesses cited, 7 witnesses were examined as P.W.1 to P.W.7 and Exhibits Exs-P.1 to P11 and MO1 were marked on the side of the prosecution.

6. The facts evident from the oral and documentary evidence produced on the side of the prosecution are as follows:-

6(i) P.W.1 is the defacto complainant and victim woman. She has deposed that, she residing at Perumbakkam. She knows the accused. The signature found in the statement of complaint

belonged to her. Before two years, she was injured and admitted in Stanley Hospital. At that time the police came and took her signature, she don't know why she put it. She did not know the content of statement of complaint. The signature was marked as Ex.P.1. She did not know anything about the case. She did not examined by police. She was treated as hostile and cross examined by the public prosecutor.

6(ii) P.W.2 Pandian has deposed that he residing at Madurai, Kadanery. He is working in Canteen. The signature found in the observation mahazer belonged to him. On 09.12.2023 the Inspector of Police prepared the observation mahazer and rough sketch in his presence. the police took the signature and saying that the incident had already happened. The observation mahazer was marked as Ex.P2. He examined by police.

6(iii) PW3 Jothibas has deposed that he residing at Perumbakkam. He is working as cooli. PW1 is his wife. The accused is her brother. He did not know anything about the case. He came back from work and his wife had an injury on her face. The police asked for his signature, he signed it. He asked his wife how she got injured and

she said she did not know. He examined by police. He was also treated as hostile and cross examined by the public prosecutor.

6(iv) PW4 Dr.Tr.Ranjith James Babu has deposed that while he was working as Assistant Professor at Stanley Hospital, on 09.12.2023 at 7.20 a.m.,one Priya was admitted in the casualty and from casualty seeking opinion from him, he rushed to the casualty and examined injured person Priya and he found that laceration injuries found on her right face, CT-scan was taken and there is fracture in her right eye bone and there is fracture on her face and upper jaw, therefore he opinion that the injuries sustained to her are grievous in nature and issued wound certificate the same was marked as Ex.P3. The accident register of Priya was marked as Ex.P4.

6(v) PW5 Chandrasekaran was treated as hostile.

6(vi) PW6 Tmt.Manonmani, the Inspector of Police has deposed that while she working as Inspector of Police, C3 Seven Wells Police station, on 09.12.2023 an early morning at 4.30 am., information received from Stanley hospital, she went to hospital and examined the Priya who was inpatient and recorded her statement. The statement of complaint was marked as Ex.P5. Thereafter she registered a case in Cr.No. 197/2023 u/s. 307 of IPC. The FIR

registered was marked as Ex.P.6. PW6 has further deposed that she went to occurrence place and prepared the observation mahazer and rough sketch in the presence of witnesses Pandian and Salima Banu. The rough sketch was marked as Ex.P7. Thereafter she examined the witnesses Priya, pandian, Salima Banu, Jothibasu, Christy and recorded their statements. Thereafter she transferred to other police station.

- 6(vii) P.W.7, Tr.Muruganandham the Inspector of Police has deposed While he was working as Inspector of police, Seven Wells Police Station (Law and Order) Chennai, his predecessor Inspector of Police Tmt. Manonmani has received the statement of complaint from P.W.1 and then she has registered a case in Cr.No. 197/2023 u/s. 307 of IPC. Then on 15.12.2023 he took the case for further investigation, he searched the accused, at 9.00 a.m., he arrested the accused nearby Stanley Hospital Rountana and he gave confession statement in the presence of witnesses Chandrasekar and Niyas and recorded his confession statement. Based on the confession statement accused produced the blade which was used for commission of crime and blue activa vehicle. The admissible portion of confession statement was marked as Ex.P8. Then he

seized the blade and blue colour activa two wheeler from the place of occurrence in the presence of the above same witnesses through seizure mahazer. The said seizure mahazer was marked as Ex.P9. PW7 has further deposed that he seized 13 item of silver ornaments related to another case through seizure mahzer and the same was marked as Ex.P10. Then the accused was brought into the police station along with material object, thereafter the accused was sent to court for judicial custody. The material object sent to court through Form 95. The said Form 95 was marked as Ex.P11.

6(iv) PW7 has further deposed that he examined the witnesses Chandrasekar and Niyas and recorded their statements. Then he examined the Dr.Harini who treated the victim and obtained Accident register copy. Thereafter he examined the Dr.Ranjith James Babu and recorded his statement and obtained medical report of victim. Thereafter he examined the other witnesses. After completion of investigation he filed final report as against the accused U/s. 307 of IPC.

7. Examination of accused and his defence:-

Upon closing the prosecution evidence, the incriminating circumstances found in the prosecution side evidence against the accused

was put to him and examined U/s.313(1)(b) Cr.P.C. He stated that those evidence are false and the accused reported no witnesses on his side and closed his defence.

8. Now the point that arise for determination is: Whether the prosecution has proved the guilt of the accused under Section 307 of IPC beyond all reasonable doubt or not?

On the Point :

9. The Learned Special Public Prosecutor has submitted that though the PW1, PW3 and PW5 were turned hostile and not supported the case of prosecution, PW2, PW4, PW6 and PW7 have clearly deposed about the prosecution case, Medical evidence supported the case of prosecution, hence the accused may be convicted.

10. Per contra the the learned counsel for the accused has submitted that PW1, PW3 and PW5 have not supported the case of prosecution, PW1 who is the victim and defacto complainant was turned hostile and not supported the case of prosecution. the victim woman (P.W.1) failed to implicate the accused in this case, P.W.3 and PW5 also did not incriminate the accused. There is no material as against the accused to prove the charges, that the earlier statement of PW1 is not

supported by her in the trial, thus the prosecution has failed to prove the case as against the accused beyond reasonable doubt, hence he prays to acquit the accused.

11. PW1 victim woman and PW3 husband of victim have not supported the case of prosecution, the victim has not stated anything about the accused and the medical evidence produced by prosecution is not corroborated by P.W.1 and P.W.3. PW1 victim of the case did not depose anything about the case. PW3 who is the husband of victim also agreed the decision taken by his wife not to depose the matter as against the accused.

12. Though the medical records of the victim were marked as Ex.P3 and Ex.P4 through PW4, which are not supported by by PW1 injured witness.

13. PW6 and P.W.7 are the investigation officers. When the key witnesses P.W1 and P.W.3 have not supported the prosecution case, it is not safe to rely upon the evidence of the investigation officers alone to hold that the charges against the accused are proved, especially when there is nothing in her evidence to implicate the accused with the offence.. Therefore, the offence under section 307 of IPC is not proved.

14. Owing to the discussions aforesaid and from the examination of the oral and documentary evidence produced on the side of the prosecution, the complicity of the accused with the offences charged against him is held as not proved. In short this court holds that the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the charges levelled against the accused . Accordingly, the point for determination is answered in the negative.

Result: In the result, the accused is found not guilty for the charges levelled against him committed under Sections 307 of IPC and the accused is acquitted under section 235(1) Cr.P.C. The bail bond executed by the accused shall be in force for six months under Section 437A Cr.P.C., and he shall appear before the higher Court as and when such Court issues notice in respect of any appeal or petition filed against the judgment of this Court.

Order under Section 452 Cr.P.C.: The case property M.O.1 was ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of appeal time, if there be any appeal, after the disposal of appeal.

Compensation Order U/s 357a or 357A Cr.P.C.:- Perused the oral and documentary evidence. PW1 injured person and defacto

complainant did not support the case of prosecution. Considering the facts and circumstances no orders recommending compensation under Section 357A Cr.P.C. is passed in this case.

//Dictated be me to the Steno-typist and directly typed by her in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, this the 27th day of July, 2026//

Sessions Judge,
Mahalir Neethimandram,
Chennai.

Annexure:

List of Witnesses examined:

On the side of the prosecution :-

P.W.1	Tmt (Victim/Defacto complainant)	Priya	Defacto complainant/Injured person
P.W.2	Tr. Pandian		To speak about the Observation mahazer and rough sketch and seizer mahazer prepared by the Inspector of police
P.W.3	Th. Jothibass		Husband of PW1
P.W.4	Dr.Tr.Ranjith James Babu		Medical Officer who treated the victim/PW1
P.W.5	Tr.Chandrasekar		To speak about the arrest of accused and the confession statement recorded by

		Inspector of police
P.W.6	Tmt.Manonmani, Investigation Officer	Investigation officer who investigated the case
P.W.7	Tr.Muruganandam, Investigation Officer	Investigation Officer who laid the final report

List of Exhibits Marked:

On the side of the prosecution :

Exhibit No.	Date	Particulars	
Ex-P1	09.12.2023	Signature of PW1 found in the statement of complaint	PW1
Ex-P2	09.12.2023	Observation Mahazar	PW2
Ex-P3	09.12.2023	Wound certificate of PW1	PW3
Ex-P4	09.12.2023	Copy of the Accident Register of PW1	PW3
Ex-P5	09.12.2023	Statement of Complaint	PW6
Ex-P6	09.12.2023	First Information Report	PW6
Ex-P7	09.12.2023	Rough Sketch	PW6
Ex-P8	15.12.2023	Admissible portion of confession statement given by accused	PW7
Ex-P9	15.12.2023	Seizer Mahazar (Blade produced), (Blue colour Active two wheeler (not produced),)	PW7

Ex-P10	15.12.2023	Seizer Mahazar (13 items of silver ornaments, not produced before this court)	PW7
Ex-P11	15.12.2023	Form-95	PW7

On the side of the accused :

List of Witness and Exhibits:- Nil

List of Material Objects Marked:

On the side of the prosecution :

MO1	Blade
-----	-------

On the side of the Accused: Nil

Sessions Judge,
Mahalir Neethimandram,
Chennai.

Draft/Fair Judgment
S.C.No.207/2024
Dated: 27.07.2026
Magalir Neethimandram,
Chennai.