

Spl S.CNo.	17/2022 (CC No.3/2018)	Deposition of	PW. 76 (LW. 216)
Name	Tr. L. R. Kumar	Date	21.05.2026

1 முதல் 5 எதிரிகள் நீதிமன்றத்தில் ஆஜராகியுள்ளார்கள்.

2 மற்றும் 3ம் எதிரிகளுக்கான குறுக்கு விசாரணையின் தொடர்ச்சி தொடங்கிய

நேரம் 11.13 A.M.

Q. I suggest to you that in Ex. P157 the sentence "Call Pattern and behaviour of the accused during the period of occurrence" is framed by you?

A. No.

Q. Is it correct to state that even if the mobile phone is switched off it is possible to ascertain its tower location during the switch off period?

A. Not after the last location where the mobile phone was switched off.

Q. Is it possible to ascertain if a mobile phone / number is switched off by just looking at the CDR?

A. Yes.

Q. Is your answer is based on any literature on the subject or on your own inference?

A. It is based on the training received by me on CDR analysis.

Q. I put it to you that ping data also referred to as VLR data indicates tower location of a particular mobile phone even if it is on switched off mode?

A. Last tower location can be inferred from ping data.

Q. Did you get the ping data or VLR data from the service providers?

A. I do not know.

Q. I suggest to you that without providing the ping data or VLR data no one can give opinion that mobile phone was switched off?

A. It is incorrect.

Q. Is your answer is based on any literature on the subject or on your own inference?

A. It is based on the training received by me on CDR analysis.

Q. I put it to you that service provider can also provide VLR (Visiting location register) when the device is not in its HLR (home location register) and it is said to be roaming?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you obtain HLR and VLR data from the service providers in this case with reference to Exs. P157 and 158 ?

A. I do not remember.

Q. I put it to you that in Exs. P157 and 158 the word switched off is mentioned in more than 10 places as desired by you?

A. Not true.

Q. Was there any impediment for you to make a similar analysis for the

deceased mobile phone number?

A. Similar analysis for the deceased mobile phone number was not required in our investigation.

Q. Is it correct to state that trajectory analysis of the mobile number of the accused and the deceased in respect of degree of correlation in the movement of the victim and the accused mobile phones was possible?

A. It is not possible with respect to this case.

Q. Was there any impediment for you to make a similar analysis (Exs. P157 and 158) for the witnesses mobile phone number?

A. There was no impediment.

Q. Whether you have done such analysis (Exs. P157 and 158) for witnesses?

A. No.

Q. I suggest to you that you have intentionally not subjected the witnesses mobile numbers to similar analysis as that done in Exs. P157 and 158?

A. Not true.

Q. In the cross-examination you have deposed that you and your predecessors have analyzed more than 100 CCTV camera footages, did you find the presence of any of the witnesses in this case in those footages more particularly the presence of P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65 (Protected witnesses)?

A. We found certain witnesses during the analysis of the CCTV footages

running away from the SOC but not the presence of P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65 in the CCTV footages we analyzed.

Q. You deposed that You have analyzed more than 100 CCTV footages, whether you have analyzed the CCTV footages in the form of hard disk, DVR, Pendrive, CD, DVD and its cloned copy?

A. We have analyzed the CCTV footages from the copies obtained from the respective locations, and I don't remember the form in which the footages were received.

Q. I suggest to you that there was no impediment in taking screen shots from those footages and subjecting them to anthropological forensic analysis, digital forensic analysis for identification of the accused?

A. I do not agree as the screen shots taken from footages are not valid as admissible evidence. Wherever relevant we have taken copies of CCTV footages along with 65B certificates and sent for forensic analysis.

Q. In Ex. P305 (alteration report) there is no reference about P.W.s 62, 63, 64 and 65?

A. In Ex. P305 Para 8 the phrase "statement of the witnesses" includes P.W.s 62, 63, 64 and 65.

Q. Is it correct to state that Ex. P253 portrait was drawn as per the input given by P.W.65 (Protected witness)?

A. Yes.

Q. Whether portraits were drawn through P.W.62, 63 and 64 (Protected witnesses)?

A. No.

Q. I suggest to you that intentionally similar portraits were not drawn through P.W.62, 63 and 64 (Protected witnesses) ?

A. Not true.

Q. I suggest to you that portraits were not drawn through P.W.62, 63 and 64 (Protected witnesses) as these witnesses were procured through Hindu Munnani Party and they are not true witnesses?

A. I deny this suggestion.

Q. I put it to you that Ex. P253 (Portrait) as per the investigation, was that of the assailant ?

A. One of the assailants.

Q. As per Ex. P293 this notice (paper publication) was shared with the NIA?

A. Yes.

Q. I suggest to you that as on 08.02.2017 there were no clues regarding the assailants of the deceased Sasikumar?

A. Not true.

Q. I suggest to you that the 161 Cr.P.C. statements of P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65

were manipulated by you?

A. It is incorrect.

Q. I suggest to you that the 161 Cr.P.C. statements of P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65 were sent to this court only at the time of filing charge-sheet and not prior to that?

A. Yes.

Q. P.W.73 (Mr. Anandh Arockiyaraj) had not taken any acknowledgment from P.W.74 (Mr. Anandha Kumar) regarding forwarding of the 161 Cr.P.C. statements of P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65?

A. I cannot say.

Q. Whether you have given any acknowledgment for having the case diary files of this case with reference to 161 Cr.P.C. statements of P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65 from P.W.74 (Mr. Anandha Kumar) when you took over the investigation?

A. Yes.

Q. I suggest to you that this acknowledgment is not part of the charge-sheet?

A. Yes.

Q. I suggest to you that P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65 in their respective statements have not furnished the facial and physical features and descriptions (gait) like type of eyebrows, shape of the nose, lips, cheek, mustache and beard of those

unknown assailants?

A. Yes, not given, except P.W.65 who has given certain general descriptions and reasons.

Q. When you took the investigation there was no impediment for you to call these witnesses once again and ascertain the facial and physical features and descriptions (gait) like type of eyebrows, shape of the nose, lips, cheek, mustache and beard of those unknown assailants?

A. Yes, there is no impediment.

Q. But you did not do so?

A. It is incorrect.

Q. Your alleged examination stated above on those specific attributes is not filed along with the charge-sheet in the form of 161 Cr. P.C statement?

A. The examination of witnesses on those specific attributes were done but it was not recorded.

Q. P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65 did not speak about the specific overt act of each of the assailants as to which of the accused assaulted the deceased on which part of his body?

A. I can answer to this question only after perusing the 161 Cr.P.C statements of P.Ws 62, 63, 64 and 65.

Q. I suggest to you that weapons M.O. 1, 2 and 3 were not shown to the

doctor who conducted the postmortem of the deceased Sasikumar and it was asked whether such injury can be caused through M.O. 1, 2 and 3?

A. Not true.

2 மற்றும் 3ம் எதிரிகளுக்கான குறுக்கு விசாரணை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்ட நேரம் 1.30

P.M.

2 மற்றும் 3ம் எதிரிகளுக்கான குறுக்கு விசாரணை தொடங்கிய நேரம் 3.27 P.M.

Q. Did you notice the two motor bikes on 22.09.2016 alleged to have been involved in the crime in the 100 CCTV footages analyzed by you and your team members?

A. Yes.

Q. Whether those CCTV footages were filed along with the charge-sheet?

A. When I filed the charge-sheet the footages were sent for forensic analysis and the report was awaited and hence not filed along with the charge-sheet.

Q. The CCTV footages of the motor bikes referred to in 17.31.1 of the charge-sheet collected on 29.09.2016 from Rathi Industries are not the motor bikes referred to by you in your earlier answer?

A. Not true.

Q. From the 100 CCTV footages analyzed by you, did you note down the make, colour, registration number, model of the two motor bikes and submitted along with the charge-sheet?

A. Yes, I tried to note down the above mentioned details since it was not possible to determine through naked eye it was sent for video analytics through FSL. At the time of filing charge-sheet FSL report was awaited.

Q. Whether you have analyzed the CCTV footages in the form of hard disk, DVR, Pendrive, CD, DVD and its cloned copy?

A. We have analyzed the CCTV footages from the copies obtained from the respective locations, and I don't remember the form in which the footages were received.

Q. Respective locations means how many locations and can you name the specific locations where the CCTV cameras were installed?

A. Working CCTV footages along the exit and entry routes of the SOC and I don't remember the specific locations.

Q. Entry how far from SOC and exit how far from SOC?

A. We analyzed around 1 to 2 km radius along the exit and entry route from SOC.

Q. Did you examine the owners of the CCTV installations and record their statements?

A. We examined some owners of the CCTV installations and recorded some of their statements.

Q. I suggest to you that except L.W.134 statements of no other owners of

CCTV installations is filed along with the charge-sheet?

A. True.

Q. I suggest to you that you have not recorded the 161 Cr.P.C statements of any witnesses who have seen the CCTV footages wherein the assailants were allegedly seen entering and exiting from the SOC in the two motor bikes?

A. There were no 161 Cr.P.C. statements of the witnesses recorded who saw the footages of entry and exit of the motor bikes from SOC.

Q. What for Exs. P379 and 380 were marked?

A. Ex. P379 is the DVR containing CCTV Footage of one Shivakarhikeyan of Texmo Industries.

Q. I suggest to you that Exs. P379 and 380 are not connected to this case?

A. Not true.

Q. How Exs. P379 and 380 are connected to this case?

A. Ex. P379 is the CCTV footage collected on the entry route to the SOC.

Q. In Ex. P379 the footages of many two wheelers and four wheelers were seen moving towards the same direction?

A. Very few vehicles were seen moving on both sides.

Q. Whether you are aware that the ban on the organization PFI by Jharkhand Government (Ex. P387) was lifted by Hon'ble High court of Jharkhand on 27.08.2018?

A. The ban on the organization of PFI was still effective on the date of me filing the charge-sheet on 07.04.2018.

Q. I put to you that Ex. P390 is not in the letter head of any organization?

A. Yes, the letter was addressed by Anwar Hussain on 23.04.2018 at Covai who was the District Head, PFI, HMPR street, Kottaimedu, Covai to the recipient Mr. M. Mohammed Ismail State head, PFI, State office, Purasaiwalkam, Chennai with the signature of Mr. A. Anwar Hussain.

Q. Ex. P390 is fabricated by NIA and the signature of Mr. A. Anwar Hussain is not the signature of Mr. A. Anwar Hussain?

A. Not true.

2 மற்றும் 3ம் எதிரிகளுக்கான குறுக்கு விசாரணை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்ட நேரம் 5.00

P.M.

Typed down to my dictation in my presence and hearing and under my personal direction and read over to the witness in the presence of accused and admitted by the witness to be correct.

District and Sessions Judge.
Special Court under the National
Investigation Agency Act, 2008,
Chennai @ Poonamallee.