

**IN THE COURT OF ASSISTANT SESSIONS JUDGE,
MADURANTAKAM.**

**Present: Mr. T. GANESH, B.A., B.L.,
Assistant Sessions Judge,
Madurantakam.**

**Wednesday, this 10th day of June, 2026
Sessions Case No. 191/2022
(CNR.No.TNCG13000556-2022)**

State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Madurantakam Police Station.
(Crime No.1034/2021)

...Complainant

..Vs..

Pradeep @ Uthaman, (Aged about 26/2021 Years),
S/o. Aruljothi,
No. 47, Arunachalapuram Street,
Chunambedu Colony,
Cheyyur Taluk,
Chengalpattu District.

...Accused

**Case Summary appended as per the Circular of Hon'ble High Court,
Madras in ROC.No.814/2020/RG/F1 dated 07.04.2021, Rule 106 Cr.R.P.**

SL No.	The period of remand of the accused	Name of the accused	Date of Remand	Date of Surrender	Released on
(i)	A1	Pradeep @ Uthaman, (Aged about 26/2021 Years), S/o. Aruljothi	06.12.2021	--	15.02.2022

(ii)	Date of filing of the complaint/Final report in the court	Filing of Complaint	Filing of Final Report
		06.12.2021	30.03.2022
(iii)	Date of committal of the cases to the Court of Sessions:	DOC : 16.09.2022 PRC.No. 5/2022 On the file of District Munsiff cum Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur.	

(iv)	Date of questioning of the accused u/s 228, 240, 246 & 251 of the Cr.PC 1973 as the case may be	30.03.2023		
(v)	Filing of all miscellaneous petitions and their results including the results on challenge before superior Courts; except routine	CrI.M.P. No.	Date of Filing	Result
		1. CrI.M.P No. 97/2023 filed on 04.07.2023 under section 72(2) of BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 04.07.2023. 2. CrI.M.P No. 1/2024 filed on 02.01.2024 under section 72(2) of BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 02.01.2024. 3. CrI.M.P No. 213/2023 filed on 30.10.2023 under section 72(2) of BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 30.10.2023. 4. CrI.M.P No. 23/2025 filed on 03.03.2025 under section 72(2) of BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 03.03.2025. 5. CrI.M.P No. 10/2026 filed on 12.01.2026 under section 72(2) of BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 12.01.2026.		
	petitions like petitions under Section 317 of the Code;	1. CrI.M.P No. 2/2025 filed on 03.03.2025 under section 355 BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 03.03.2025. 2. CrI.M.P No. 5/2025 filed on 04.03.2025 under section 355 BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 04.03.2025. 3. CrI.M.P No. 6/2025 filed on 04.03.2025 under section 355 BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 04.03.2025. 4. CrI.M.P No. 7/2025 filed on 01.09.2025 under section 355 BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 01.09.2025. 5. CrI.M.P No. 11/2026 filed on 26.02.2026 under section 355 BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 26.02.2026. 6. CrI.M.P No. 12/2026 filed on 02.04.2026 under section 355 BNSS by Accused and this petition is allowed on 02.04.2026.		
(vi)	Date of examination in- chief and cross-examination of a witness;	Name of the Witness	Date of Chief	Date of Cross
		1. Vijay.	01.09.2025	01.09.2025
		2. Balasubramaniyan.	01.09.2025	01.09.2025

		3. D. Paripooranam.	07.02.2026	07.02.2026
	Witnesses from the side of Accused	Nil	NIL	NIL

(vii)	Date of examination of the accused under section 313 of the Code;	16.02.2026
(viii)	Details of abscondence of an accused and his appearance /production, as the case may be; and	--

(ix)	Grant of stay by superior courts and the results thereof	High Court No. and Date of Stay	Result
		NIL	
(x)	Details of victim compensation ordered	NIL	
Offences Complained of / reported		1. Section 4(1) (aaa) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act : For the act of possessing illicit liquor of more than one hundred liters. 2. Section 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act as against the accused: For the act of possessing liquor, which contains ingredient which is likely to cause death or grievous hurt to the consumer.	
Plea of the Accused Persons		Accused pleaded not guilty	
Findings of the Court		Accused is found not guilty	

The Final Order	In fine, the guilt against the accused under sections 4(1) (aaa) and 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act read with 6 & 11 of RS rules 2000 are not proved beyond reasonable doubt and he is acquitted U/s. 235(1) of Cr.p.c.
------------------------	--

This case coming on 08.06.2026 for final hearing in the presence of the Mr.G.S.Suresh Babu, Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for the State and of M/s.M.Prakash and R.Ramaraj,counsels for the accused and upon hearing the arguments of both sides and upon perusing the documents and evidences put forth in this case and having stood over till this day for consideration this Court delivered the following.

JUDGMENT

Prohibition Enforcement Wing, Madurantakam Police station's Inspector laid charge sheet against this accused in following indictment.

On 06.12.2021 at about 2.00 P.M., at the lakeside of Chunambedu, the accused was found in possession of 1050 sachets of water-mixed poisonous illicit arrack, each having a capacity of 100 ml, kept in three white bags for the purpose of sale and thereby the accused is alleged to have committed offences punishable under section 4(1)(aaa), 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act read with 6 & 11 of RS rules 2000.

3. Learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur on receipt of final report, took cognizance of offence in PRC No. 5/2022 under sections of 4(1)(aaa), 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act read with 6 & 11 of RS rules 2000 as against the accused. Upon the appearance of accused on service of summons, he was served with free case copies U/s 207 Criminal Procedure Code (herein after Crpc). The learned Magistrate, on considering the materials on record, has concluded that this case had to be tried by the court of sessions. Accordingly, it was committed U/s 209 of Crpc to

the Hon'ble Principal Sessions Court, Chengalpet where it was taken on file in S.C. No. 191/2022 and made over to this court for trial.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opened his case under Section.226 of the Code of Criminal Procedure by describing the charge brought against accused and stated by what evidence he proposes to prove the guilt of the accused on charge. Upon consideration of the records of the case and the documents submitted therewith, and after hearing the submissions of the accused and the prosecution in this behalf, the court considered that there is no ground to discharge the accused under Section.227 of Crpc. After such consideration and hearing as aforesaid, the court is of the opinion that there is ground for presuming that accused has committed the alleged offence. Therefore, the charges against the accused U/s. 4(1)(aaa), 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act read with 6 & 11 of RS rules 2000 were framed and read over to him. He however, pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5. At the trial, the prosecution called Pw1 to Pw3 with Exhibits P1 to P5 and Material Object M.O.1. Learned prosecutor dispensed from examining the official witnesses namely Lw3 and Lw4.

6. Prosecution case in essence as spoken by the witnesses is as follows:-

PW1, the then Head Constable of complainant station, deposed that on 06.12.2021 he along with Head Constable Bala Subramanian and Inspector Paripooranam went for a raid in Chunambedu Colony; that at that time, a person on seeing them attempted to run away, where they caught hold of him; that on search, they found that the said person was in possession of 1050 packets of 100 ml capacity each kept in three white bags; that on smelling the contents, he experienced eye irritation and nausea; that suspecting the same, they took a sample in a half liter water bottle and destroyed the remaining contraband on the spot; that since no independent witnesses from the public came forward, he and Head Constable Bala Subramanian stood as witnesses; they brought the accused to the police station, where a case was

registered against him and he was examined by the Inspector of Police; that the Seizure Mahazar and Destruction Mahazar marked as Ex.P1 and P2.

PW2, the then Head Constable of complainant station, deposed that on 06.12.2021 at about 11.00 hours, he along with his inspector, and PW1 were monitoring prohibition activities near lake bund at Chunambedu Colony, where the accused on seeing them tried to fled away; that they caught hold of him and upon search of the place, the accused was found with 1050 packets of 100 ml capacity of each containing water-mixed poisonous illicit arrack kept in three white bags; that on smelling the contents, they experienced eye irritation, nausea and a pungent smell, thereby confirming that it was poisonous illicit arrack; that the Inspector arrested the accused at about 14.00 hours for possession of the contraband; that since no independent witnesses from the public came forward, the Inspector recorded the confession statement of the accused in presence of him and PW1 between 14.15 hours and 15.15 hours, in which both of them signed as witnesses; that thereafter, at about 15.30 hours, samples were taken from the seized arrack in two bottles of 500 ml each, sealed and labelled; that at about 15.45 hours, the destruction mahazar was prepared and the remaining contraband, except the samples, was destroyed at the spot; that thereafter, at about 17.00 hours, they returned to the police station along with the accused and the seized properties, and a case in Crime No.1034/2021 was registered under Sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act read with Rules 6 and 11; and that he was examined by the Inspector of Police; that his signature in the Confession Statement is marked as Ex.P3.

As Lw3 and Lw4 are official witnesses, the learned prosecutor dispensed from examining them.

PW3, the then Investigating Officer, deposed that in 2021, while she was serving as Inspector of Police in the Madurantakam Prohibition Enforcement Wing, she along with Pw1 and Pw2, on 06.12.2021, were monitoring prohibition activities in Chunambedu Colony; that at that time, near Chunambedu lake bund, they noticed a

male person who attempted to run away on seeing them, and on suspicion they apprehended and enquired him and it was revealed that he was the accused; that on search of the place, he was found with 1050 packets of about 100 ml capacity each containing liquid kept in three white bags; that on opening and smelling the same, they experienced eye irritation, nausea and pungent smell, and thereby found that the liquid was water-mixed poisonous illicit arrack; that she arrested the accused at about 14.00 hours for possession of the said contraband; that since no independent witnesses from the public came forward, she recorded the confession statement of the accused between 14.15 hours and 15.15 hours in the presence of the accompanying Pw1 and Pw2 as witnesses; that thereafter, at about 15.30 hours, she seized the 1050 arrack packets under mahazar in the presence of the said witnesses; that she then took samples from the seized arrack packets from the three bags, separated small quantities and filled two bottles of 500 ml each, sealed and labelled them for chemical analysis; that at about 15.45 hours, she prepared the destruction mahazar and destroyed the remaining arrack at the place of occurrence in a safe manner in the presence of witnesses; that thereafter, at about 17.00 hours, she returned to the police station along with the accused and case properties and registered the First Information Report; that she produced the accused before the Court and remanded him to judicial custody; that on 16.12.2021, after obtaining permission from the Court, he sent the sample bottles through Pw1 to the Forensic Science Department; that she examined the Assistant Director of Forensic Science, Panchatcharam, and recorded his statement, and the said officer issued a chemical analysis report stating that the samples contained diluted illicit arrack mixed with atropine; that she obtained opinion from the Medical Officer, Dr. Parasakthi, who opined that consumption of such arrack would cause harm to the body and may be life-threatening if not treated promptly; and that after completion of investigation, she filed the final report against the accused under Sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act read with Rules 6 and 11; that the First Information

Report marked as Ex.P4; that the Forensic Analysis Report marked as Ex.P5; that the sample bottles were marked as MO1.

7. Thereafter, accused was examined under Section.313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. He denied all incriminating circumstances raised against him and pleaded innocence.

8. Heard the accused and the prosecution for the purpose of Section.232 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. But there were no sufficient reasons to acquit the accused. He was called upon to enter his defence under Section.233 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, where he stated that there is no defence evidence.

9. Heard both sides.

10. The following points were raised for consideration:-

- 1. Whether the accused was found in possession of the contraband namely the poisonous arrack in contravention of the provisions of the Tamilnadu Prohibition act?*
- 2. Whether the accused is found guilty for the offences punishable U/s. 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act read with Rules 6 and 11?*
- 3. If the accused is found guilty, what shall be the order as to sentence ?*

11. Point 1:

The prosecution case is that on 06.12.2021 at about 2.00 P.M., at the lakeside of Chunambedu, the accused was found in possession of 1050 sachets of water-mixed poisonous illicit arrack, each having a capacity of 100 ml, kept in three white bags for the purpose of sale without permission, and that the said contraband being of poisonous nature would endanger human life, and thereby the accused is alleged to have committed offences punishable under Sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of the

Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act read with Rules 6 and 11 of the Rectified Spirit Rules, 2000.

12. The learned counsel for prosecution argued that the prosecution has proved the case by examining witnesses and that their evidences are cogent and acceptable. Hence, he prays this court to convict the accused with major punishment.

13. On the other hand the counsel for the accused argued in length that there are lot of contradictions between the prosecution witnesses themselves and also with the case of prosecution, that there is no independent witnesses cited by the investigation officer and that mere keeping the evidence of interested witness namely the police officials, the accused cannot be held liable for the offence. He further argued that all the records were prepared by the investigation officer in the police station itself to register a case against the accused for statistical purpose and that the seizure of contraband was not as per law. Hence, he seeks to acquit the accused on the rule of benefit of doubt.

14. It is the case of the prosecution that on 06.12.2021 at about 2.00 P.M., at the lakeside of Chunambedu, the accused was in possession of 1050 sachets of water-mixed poisonous illicit arrack, each having a capacity of 100 ml, kept in three white bags for the purpose of sale without permission. Hence, this Court has framed charges under Sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act read with Rules 6 and 11 of the Rectified Spirit Rules, 2000, as against the accused.

At the outset, as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the accused, there is no single independent persons cited as witnesses, muchless examined by the prosecution. There is no reason set out by the prosecution for non-examination of independent witnesses.

Next it has to be seen whether the official witnesses help the prosecution to fix the liability upon the accused. Here all the eye witnesses are police officials namely Pw1 and Pw2. It has to be seen whether the evidence of them are cogent to prove the

prosecution case. At the outset none of the above said prosecution witnesses namely Pw1 and Pw2 deposed that they saw the accused at 14.00 hrs as per prosecution case. Pw1 and Pw3, the investigation officer nothing whispered in their evidence that at what time they saw the accused. Pw2 deposed that they saw the accused at 11.00 hrs. This would create a doubt over the case of prosecution.

Next Pw1 nothing deposed about the arrest of the accused and alleged confession of the accused in his evidence. It is the specific case of the prosecution that the accused gave confession in the presence of Pw1 and Pw2. For the reasons best known to the Pw1, there is nothing deposed about the same. It create a serious doubt over the case of prosecution. Next Pw1 deposed that the samples were taken in one half litre water bottle. But as per prosecution case samples were collected in two half litre bottles. It is the case of prosecution that the Pw3 collected samples from the said three bags in two bottles. But Pw1 didn't deposed that the Pw3 collected samples from three bags. Apart from that it is impossible to collect samples in three bags which contains 100 packets of liquid. Further it is the case of prosecution that the samples were sent to chemical analysis through Pw1. But no where the said Pw1 deposed that he alone took the samples for forensic department for chemical analysis. At this juncture there are lot of contradictions between the prosecution witnesses and also with the prosecution case. This would create a serious doubt over the case of prosecution, where the presence of Pw1 to Pw3 in the spot was doubtful.

Next it is pertinent to note that the seizure mahazar, destruction mahazar, confession statement etc, were taken print in a computer. There is no explanation that how they got computer in the spot and that how they took print out in the spot itself. Further in Seizure mahazar, Destruction Mahazar and confession statement, the crime number with specific offences was specifically mentioned. It is pertinent to note that as per prosecution case, after preparation of those documents by Pw3 in the spot alone, the First Information Report came to be registered. If it so the crime number

and offences reported find place in the said documents would create serious doubt over the case of prosecution. There is no explanation that how the crime number find place in the document which were prepared before registration of First Information Report, Ex P4. This itself enough to show that the case of prosecution lacks and it create a serious doubt over the case of prosecution.

Next as per case of prosecution, the samples were collected on 06.12.2021. But the samples were submitted to the court on 10.12.2021 only. The above said delay of **5 days** was not explained by the prosecution. Again it is pertinent to note that the samples were sent for chemical analysis to forensic department only on 16.12.2021 as per evidence of Pw3, who sent the samples to forensic department, which is after a delay of **11 days** and the samples were subject to chemical analysis only on 17.12.2021 which is after a delay of **12 days** from the date of seizure. Thus, there is inordinate delay in sending the samples for chemical analysis, due to which the sample will lose its character. No satisfactory explanation is given by the Pw3, the investigation officer or prosecution for the said delay.

Apart from that as per case of prosecution three white colour bags were seized by the Pw3 with arrack. But there is no explanation that how much from each bag was taken for chemical analysis. There is no evidence adduced or produced by the prosecution that how the investigation officer came to the conclusion that the seized arrack from the accused is poisonous one. Hence, it creates a doubt that the seizure of the arrack from the accused on 06.12.2021 is poisonous one.

Next the accused has specifically alleged that the entire prosecution is vitiated due to non-compliance with the mandatory provisions of Section 32 of the TamilNadu Prohibition Act, 1937. According to the accused, though a huge quantity of alleged illicit arrack, namely 1050 sachets, were said to have been seized, the prosecution has failed to establish that samples were drawn in the presence of a Prohibition Officer or a Police Officer not below the rank of Inspector, that a proper

certificate detailing the quantity seized, sampled, and destroyed was prepared, and that such certificate was forwarded to the jurisdictional Magistrate, as mandated under law.

The importance of strict compliance with Section 32 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act has been consistently emphasized by the our Hon'ble High Court in ***Selvi v. State rep. by Inspector of Police, Rasipuram Police Station [2011 (2) MWN (Cr) 623]***, where the Hon'ble High Court categorically held that drawing of samples and destruction of contraband must strictly adhere to the procedure prescribed under Section 32(c) of the Act, and that non-compliance with the mandatory safeguards would vitiate the prosecution. The Court therein observed that the presence of another responsible officer and the issuance of a proper certificate are mandatory requirements intended to prevent manipulation and abuse.

Similarly, the Division Bench judgment of our Hon'ble High Court in ***Jegannathan v. State of Tamil Nadu [Manu/TN/8992/2006]*** has clearly held that preparation of a destruction mahazar alone would not amount to compliance with Section 32 of the Act and that absence of a proper certificate as contemplated under the statute would render the proceedings legally infirm. The Division Bench further held that such non-compliance reflects non-application of mind and affects the very foundation of the case. Recently our Hon'ble High Court of Madras in ***Velu Chettiyar v. State rep. by Inspector of Police, PEW, Thiruchengode Police Station, Namakkal District in Crl.O.P. No.18761 of 2021 and Logesh and Velu Chettiyar v. State rep. by Inspector of Police, PEW, Thiruchengode Police Station, Namakkal District in Crl.O.P. No.18838 of 2021***, wherein the Hon'ble High Court reiterated that failure to comply with the mandatory provisions relating to seizure, sampling, and destruction of contraband under the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act would entitle the accused to appropriate relief, as the continuation of such proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law.

In the present case, the counsel for the accused has also raised a serious allegation about the registration of FIR and investigation conducted by the very same officer who registered case and also violation of section 32 of the act, thereby rendering the investigation prejudicial and biased. Coupled with the alleged failure to produce the seized contraband before the Court or to establish lawful destruction in accordance with Section 32, these infirmities strike at the root of the prosecution case. There is no explanation offered by the prosecution for the said procedural lapse.

In view of the settled legal position as laid down in the decisions stated supra and having regard to the uncontroverted allegations of mandatory procedural non-compliance, this Court is of the considered opinion that the case of prosecution fails.

Next the learned counsel for the accused argued that the Pw3 who registered the case cannot be investigation officer. In support of the same he relied upon a decision namely ***Rengasamy Vs State***, reported in **1995 – 1 – MWN-47**, where it is held that,

"naturally there was no chance for verification of the correctness of the allegations made in the FIR by an independent investigation officer and the officer who lodged the complaint would have been naturally interested in securing the evidence to support his version and it cannot be stated that his approach was unbiased. Therefore, the procedure followed in these cases is illegal."

Here our Hon'ble High Court has held that the complainant cannot be investigation officer and that the procedure followed is illegal. He also relied upon a decision of our Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Mohanlal Vs State of Punjab***, reported in **(2018) 17 Supreme Court Cases 627**, where it is held that, para 30 and 31

"30. In view of the conflicting opinions expressed by different two-judge Benches of this Court, the importance of a fair investigation from the point of view of an accused as a guaranteed constitutional right under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, it is considered necessary that the law in this regard be laid down with

certainly. To leave the matter for being determined on the individual facts of a case, may not only lead to a possible abuse of powers, but more importantly will leave the police, the accused, the lawyer and the courts in a state of uncertainty and confusion which has to be avoided. It is therefore held that a fair investigation, which is but the very foundation of fair trial, necessarily postulates that the informant and the investigator must not be the same person. Justice must not only be done, but must appear to be done also. Any possibility of bias or a predetermined conclusion has to be excluded. This requirement is all the more imperative in laws carrying a reverse burden of proof.

31. Resultantly, the appeal succeeds and is allowed. The prosecution is held to be vitiated because of the infraction of the constitutional guarantee of a fair investigation. The appellant is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless wanted in any other case. "

As per the above decision of our Hon'ble High Court and Apex Court, there is no doubt that the investigation done by the Pw3 is illegal and that the charge against the accused cannot be sustained.

Further it is pertinent to note that in order to prove the fact that the accused was engaged in the sale of contraband, no independent witness was examined. Though M.O.1 was placed in evidence, they have not taken any effort to find out from where the accused got the contraband of poisonous arrack. An overall analysis of the evidences of Pw1 to Pw3 only goes to show that they have conducted the seizure as well as investigation in a most shabby manner. As mentioned above, even though chemical analysis report shows that the sample was of poisonous liquor, is not at all safe to vest the liability upon accused.

In summation there is suspicious over the case of prosecution, contra evidences of Pw1 to Pw3, in respect of quantity of arrack collected for samples, preparation of mahazars, non examination of independent witnesses, delay in sending the samples

for chemical analysis, delay in sending the chemical report and finally the non-compliance section 32 of the act etc,. This being the situation, the accused is entitled to get the benefit of doubt.

By way of above said discussion the oral and documentary evidence of prosecution creates a doubt that the accused possessed poisonous arrack and that it was seized by Pw3 and send it to forensic department. Hence, it is unsafe to hold that the accused was found in possession of the contraband namely the poisonous arrack in contravention of the provisions of the Tamilnadu Prohibition act. Hence, the point is found against the prosecution.

15. Point No.2:-

In view of this court finding in point No.1, accused is not found guilty for the offences punishable under Sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act read with 6 & 11 of RS rules 2000 and this point is answered accordingly.

16. Point No.3:-

In view of this court finding in point No.2, this point does not require consideration.

17. For all these reasons, the court holds on the point that the accused is not guilty under sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act read with 6 & 11 of RS rules 2000.

18. In fine, the guilt against the accused under sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of Tamilnadu Prohibition Act read with 6 & 11 of RS rules 2000 are not proved beyond reasonable doubt and he is acquitted U/s. 235(1) of Cr.p.c.

19. Material object No.1 shall be confiscated to state, after the contents therein shall be destroyed. That shall be carried out after the expiry of appeal time as prescribed under law.

20. The bail bond of the accused on record treated as the bail bond secured U/s. 437(A) of Cr.P.C to secure the appearance of accused before the higher court in case of any appeal or petition against the judgment of this court and the same shall be in force for six months from 10.06.2026, thereafter the same shall stands cancelled.

Directly typed in my personal lap top, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, on this 10th day of June, 2026.

Assistant Sessions Judge,
Madurantakam.

LIST OF WITNESSES :

Prosecution side:

Name of the Witness No.	Name of the Witness.	Description
PW1	Vijay.	Seizure Mahazar Witness.
PW2	Balasubramaniyan.	Seizure Mahazar Witness.
PW3	D. Paripooranam.	Investigating Officer.

Defence side: Nil.

LIST OF EXHIBITS:

Prosecution side:

Sl.No.	Date	Description of documents	Proved by/ Attested by
Ex.P1	-	Seizure Mahazar.	PW - 1
Ex.P2	-	Destruction Mahazar.	PW - 1
Ex.P3	-	Signature of Pw2 in the Confession Statement.	PW - 2

Ex.P4	-	First Information Report.	PW - 3
Ex.P5	-	Forensic Analysis Report.	PW - 3

Defence side: Nil.

MATERIAL OBJECTS:

Prosecution side:

Sl.No.	Date	Description of documents	Proved by/ Attested by
M.O.1		500 ML Sample Bottles (2 counts).	PW - 3

Defence side: Nil

Assistant Session Judge,
Madurantakam.

TNCG130005562022



Fair / Draft Judgment

SC No. 191/2022

D.D: 10.06.2026

Sub Court, MKM