

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
COIMBATORE.**

**Present: Tmt. G. VIJAYA, B.A., M.L., PGDCFS,  
Principal District & Sessions Judge, Coimbatore.**

**Monday, this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026**

(திருவள்ளூர்வராண்டு, 2057, விசுவாவசு ஆண்டு பங்குனி திங்கள் 2-ஆம் நாள் திங்கட்கிழமை)

**M.P.No.14/2026 in S.C.No.183/2017**

Venkatesh @ Venkatasubramaniam  
S/o.Venugopal

... Petitioner / Accused

//vs//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,  
Singanallur Police Station,  
Coimbatore.  
(Crime No.964/2009)

... Respondent / Complainant

This petition came up for final hearing before this Court in the presence of **Tvl.P.Sundarabalan, S.Pavithra, R.Magesh, S.Shalini, M.Gopika, S.Preethi and B.Gururaj**, Advocates for the respondent / A-1, and of **Thiru.V.Ravichandran, Public Prosecutor**, represented the State upon hearing both side arguments, perusing petition, counter and other relevant records, having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court passes the following:-

## **ORDER**

The petitioner / Accused has filed the present petition, u/s.207 of Cr.P.C., praying to direct the respondent police to furnish the petition mentioned documents.

### 2. **BRIEF AVERMENTS CONTAINED IN THE PETITION:-**

(i) The respondent police had filed the above case against the petitioner on the allegation that he had committed the offence u/s.302 and 201 of IPC and the case is posted for further evidence and in this case, the respondent police filed additional charge sheet.

(ii) It is alleged that during the further investigation L.W.7 Senthilkumar (Special Sub-Inspector of Police, E-1 Singanallur Police Station) have collected the FTA Card from the Forensic Science Laboratory, Chennai and taken it to CMCH. Thereafter, L.W.8 Baby Rossy (Special Sub Inspector of Police, E-1 Singanallur Police Station) had taken the deceased's daughters to CMCH and collected the blood sample through Doctor. The blood sample collecting process was vide graphed through senior photographer L.W.3 Suresh Babu and copied in a 64 GB Pen Drive and 8 GB Pen Drive and the same has been submitted before this Court.

(iii) Thereafter, the respondent police filed supplementary final report and copy of the same has been given to the accused, wherein that annexure of the enclosed DNA Report, L.W.3 says about the pen drive collection of blood sample not furnished to the accused. These documents are vital to this case. The entire process of blood sample collection, storing the sample and sending the same to the FSL for analysis were all done by the respondent police and not under the supervision of the Court or not in the presence of any independent witnesses. Under the above said circumstances, the copies of the 64GB Pen Drive and 8GB Pen Drive are to be furnished to the accused. The said pen drives are essential in this case, to ascertain the genuineness of the blood sample collecting process and storing the collected samples. Therefore, the petitioner / accused has filed the present petition.

**3. Averments contained in the counter filed by the respondent / complainant are as follows:-**

(a) The petition filed by the petitioner / accused is not maintainable either under law or facts. The prosecution side filed further investigation petition u/s.173(8) of Cr.P.C. to grant permission for the specific purpose of conducting DNA comparison between the right femur bone of the deceased and blood samples of P.W.1 and P.W.2 who are daughters of the deceased and they same was numbered as CrI.M.P.No.5/2025 and this Court allowed the same on 13-08-2025, by granting permission and in accordance with the said order, the

Investigation Officer followed proper procedures and sent to blood sample collected FTA cards to FSL, Chennai for DNA analysis through this Court and hence, the respondent police done the above steps under the supervision of this Court.

(b) The blood samples collected from P.W.1 and P.W.2 were videographed through senior photographer of Tamil Nadu Police Department L.W.3 namely Suresh Babu (L.W.3 in the supplementary Final Report) from the commencement to concluding the collecting blood samples from them and the said recording was submitted to this Court by storing in the electronic storage device, before sending the blood samples collected FTA Cards to FSL Chennai from this Court. The said recording was submitted before this Court before filing the supplementary final report itself and since the respondent was sent with a copy of the DNA report, received by the investigation office.

4. **Point for consideration in this petition is**, as to whether copy of the petition mentioned pen drives are to be furnished to the petitioner / accused or not?

**POINT:-**

5. Heard both sides and perused the relevant records. The petitioner / accused has filed the present petition u/s.207 of Cr.P.C., praying to direct the

respondent police to furnish copies of the petition mentioned electronic storage device.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner / accused argued that, the respondent police had filed the above case against the petitioner on the allegation that he had committed the offence u/s.302 and 201 of IPC and the case is posted for further evidence and in this case, the respondent police filed additional charge sheet. The learned counsel for the petitioner / accused has further argued that, during the further investigation L.W.7 Senthilkumar (Special Sub-Inspector of Police, E-1 Singanallur Police Station) have collected the FTA Card from the Forensic Science Laboratory, Chennai and taken it to CMCH. Thereafter, L.W.8 Baby Rossy (Special Sub Inspector of Police, E-1 Singanallur Police Station) had taken the deceased's daughters to CMCH and collected the blood sample through Doctor and the blood sample collecting process was vide graphed through senior photographer L.W.3 Suresh Babu and copied in a 64 GB Pen Drive and 8 GB Pen Drive and the same has been submitted before this Court.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner / accused has further argued that, the respondent police filed supplementary final report and copy of the same has been given to the accused, wherein that annexure of the enclosed DNA Report, L.W.3 says about the pen drive collection of blood sample not furnished to the

accused. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that, these documents are vital to this case and the entire process of blood sample collection, storing the sample and sending the same to the FSL for analysis were all done by the respondent police and not under the supervision of the Court or not in the presence of any independent witnesses and hence, the copies of the 64GB Pen Drive and 8GB Pen Drive are to be furnished to the accused and the said pen drives are essential in this case, to ascertain the genuineness of the blood sample collecting process and storing the collected samples and prays to allow the petition.

8. Whereas the learned Public Prosecutor argued that, the prosecution side filed further investigation petition u/s.173(8) of Cr.P.C. to grant permission for the specific purpose of conducting DNA comparison between the right femur bone of the deceased and blood samples of P.W.1 and P.W.2 who are daughters of the deceased and they same was numbered as CrI.M.P.No.5/2025 and this Court allowed the same on 13-08-2025, by granting permission and in accordance with the said order, the Investigation Officer followed proper procedures and sent blood sample collected FTA cards to FSL, Chennai for DNA analysis through this Court and hence, the respondent police done the above steps under the supervision of this Court. The learned Public Prosecutor has further argued that, the blood samples collected from P.W.1 and P.W.2 were videographed through senior photographer of Tamil Nadu Police Department

L.W.3 namely Suresh Babu (L.W.3 in the supplementary Final Report) from the commencement to concluding the collecting blood samples from them and the said recording was submitted to this Court by storing in the electronic storage device, before sending the blood samples collected FTA Cards to FSL Chennai from this Court. The said recording was submitted before this Court before filing the supplementary final report itself and since the respondent was sent with a copy of the DNA report, received by the investigation office and prays to dismiss the petition.

9. This Court has considered the submissions of both side and perused the records. The petitioner / accused has filed the present petition, u/s.207 of Cr.P.C., praying to direct the respondent police to furnish copies of the petition mentioned electronic storage device.

10. Admittedly, in this case, the accused has been charged for the offence u/s.302 and 201 of IPC and on the side of the prosecution, four witnesses have been examined and three documents marked and 9 material objects have been marked. At this stage, the petitioner / accused has filed the present petition, u/s.207 of Cr.P.C. praying to furnish the pen drives which were mentioned in the petition. However the learned Public Prosecutor vehemently objected and contended that the Investigation Officer followed proper procedures and sent

blood sample collected FTA cards to FSL, Chennai for DNA analysis through this Court and hence, the respondent police done the above steps under the supervision of this Court. The learned Public Prosecutor has further argued that, the blood samples collected from P.W.1 and P.W.2 were videographed through senior photographer of Tamil Nadu Police Department L.W.3 namely Suresh Babu (L.W.3 in the supplementary Final Report) from the commencement to concluding the collecting blood samples from them and the said recording was submitted to this Court by storing in the electronic storage device, before sending the blood samples collected FTA Cards to FSL Chennai from this Court. The said recording was submitted before this Court before filing the supplementary final report itself and since the respondent was sent with a copy of the DNA report.

11. Admittedly, if the prosecution relied on any document, that has to be given to the accused without petition. Now the case in hand, the petitioner has filed the present petition u/s.207 of Cr.P.C., praying to furnish the copies of documents which the respondent police relied in supplementary final report.

12. On perusal of records, it appears that as per the order passed by this Court, on 25-08-2025, the daughters of the deceased Raju, namely Tmt.Saranjya and Sathiya @ Bharathi were brought to Coimbatore Medical College Hospital

for collecting their blood samples and their blood samples have been collected and the same has been videographed by a senior photographer. After collecting the blood samples, the same has been sent to Forensic Laboratory and report has been directly sent to this Court by FSL, Chennai. Thereafter, the respondent police filed supplementary final report before this Court along with list of witnesses and statement of the witnesses. However no document was enclosed or filed along with the supplementary final report which is / are to be mandatorily given to the petitioner / accused.

13. On perusal of the 161(3) statement of Thiru.Suresh Babu, Senior Photographer, it appears that he has stated that he had videographed the process of collecting blood samples in his Sony Camera and subsequently he copied the same in 64 GB Pen drive and 8 GB Pen drive and handed over the same to the respondent police. Whereas the respondent police submitted before this Court two numbers of electronic storage devices i.e., i.e., one 8GB Pen drive and 32 GB Memory Card along with Hash Values of the electronic / digital records. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner / accused has filed the present petition, stating that the respondent police filed two pen drives which is not correct one. Since the above said two electronic devices have been produced with hash values, if the said electronic devices are allowed to be opened and perused, there is every possibility for change of hash values, which will cause

prejudice to the further proceedings of the case. Taking into consideration of all the above, this Court is of the considered view that the this petition deserves dismissal since no document is enclosed along with supplementary final reprot, with liberty to the petitioner / accused to peruse the electronic storage devices which were submitted by the respondent police, at the time of trial while marking the said devices. Point is answered accordingly.

**In the result, this petition is dismissed and the petitioner / accused is at liberty to peruse the electronic storage devices which were submitted by the respondent police, at the time of trial while marking the said devices.**

Dictated to Steno-Typist, typed by her directly, and corrected and pronounced by me in open Court this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
COIMBATORE.

**//True copy//**

**Draft Order in**  
M.P.No.14/2026 in  
S.C.No.183/2017  
Dated:16-03-2026.