

IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I COURT, PANRUTI.

Present: Thirumathi. S. Geetha M.A., L.L.M.,

Judicial Magistrate No.I, Panruti

Friday 15th day of May 2026

M.P.No.5/2026

in

PRC.No.39/2025

1. Gopi (A1),
2. George fernandes (A2),
3. Jeevanantham (A4),
4. Janarthanan (A5).

...Petitioner/Acused No 1, 2,
4 and 5.

//vs//

SHO,
Panruti PS,
Crime No.333/2023.

...Respondent/Prosecution

This Petition is coming before me on today in the presence of Advocate Mr.K.Baranichandar for Petitioner/Accused No 1, 2, 4 and 5 and Assistant Public Prosecutor Mrs.M.Karthigapriya, Grade-II, for Respondent/Prosecution and upon perusing the document and having stood over for consideration till this Court delivered the following.

ORDER

1. This petition has been filed by the Petitioner/Accused No 1, 2, 4 and 5 U/s.317(2) of Crpc to split up the Case as against A3.

2. Both side heard. Records perused. This petition has been filed by the Petitioner/Accused No 1, 2, 4 and 5 under Section 317(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking to split up the case as against A3.

3. The learned counsel for the Petitioner/Accused No 1, 2, 4 and 5 submitted that today the above said accused persons have been appeared, and it is submitted by the defense counsel, that the A3 is not appearing in court, causing a delay in the trial of the case. Therefore, request the court to split up the case against A3 from the above case and order the trial of the A1, A2, A4 and A5.

4. Counter not filed by the respondent. However, Considering the age and nature of the case, even though counter not filed, this court feels it necessary to decide the petition without any further delay. Hence, in the interest of justice, counter of respondent is closed.

5. Records perused. The case relates to offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 307 of IPC, Considering the facts that A3 is not appearing before this court and A1, A2, A4 and A5 also wants to proceed with the case quickly, this court feels that splitting of the case as against A3 and proceed further will not create any hardship to A3 and also no prejudice would be caused to the prosecution.

6. Hence the considering the facts and circumstances, this court is considerable view that by way of splitting of the case against A3 and proceeding the case of A1, A2, A4 and A5 without further delay would serve the ends of justice and would not prejudice the prosecution.

7. In view of the above circumstances, this court is of the opinion that splitting up the case as against A3 is necessary to ensure expeditious proceedings against A1, A2, A4 and A5.

8. Accordingly, In the result, this petition is allowed. The case as against A3– Saleem is hereby split up and a separate file shall be opened for A3. The proceedings shall continue against A1, A2, A4 and A5 in the main case.

Dictated by me, typed by the typist, mistakes corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on 15th day of May 2026.

**(Sd).S. Geetha,
Judicial Magistrate No-I,
Panruti.**

/True Copy/

**Judicial Magistrate No-I,
Panruti.**