

Spl S.CNo.	17/2022 (CC No.3/2018)	Deposition of	PW. 76 (LW. 216)
Name	Tr. L. R. Kumar	Date	04.07.2026

1 முதல் 5 எதிரிகள் நீதிமன்றத்தில் ஆஜராகியுள்ளார்கள்.

Witness appeared through V.C from Office of the Joint Commissioner of Police (Law & Order), Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh.

1ம் எதிரிக்கான குறுக்கு விசாரணை தொடங்கிய நேரம் 11.41 A.M.

Q: Is it correct to state that Ex. P-320 was registered after the lapse of 7 days from the date of order of the MHA?

A: As per the record the order of MHA was on 22.01.2018. The FIR was registered on 29.01.2018.

Q: Were the case documents from SID CBCID taken over by you directly or by your team?

A: Taken over directly by me with my team.

Q: I suggest to you that on 30.01.2018 at the time of constituting your team for investigation you did not have any other document other than the FIR (Ex. P-320) registered by you?

A: Not true.

Q: I suggest to you that at the time of registering FIR you did not have in your possession any of the documents that were handed over to you by Mr. Anandha Kumar DSP, CBCID (P.W.74) on 21.02.2018?

A: True.

Q: I suggest to you that without verifying the case documents the team of investigation was constituted?

A: I cannot say.

Q: I suggest to you that the statements recorded and documents seized by the Inspector of police at the relevant time of filing charge-sheet on 07.04.2018 and 21.06.2018 are inadmissible documents in view of the bar Under Section 43 UA(P)A and as such there is no legal sanctity for all those materials?

A: I don't agree.

Q: I suggest to you that the alleged first attempt to murder was made on 21.09.2016 falsifies the theory of one year retaliation to the alleged flag pole incident?

A: It would have been true, if the murder has taken place on 21.09.2016.

Q: I suggest to you that as per your investigation no hate speech or any act were made or done by deceased Sasikumar against Islam?

A: I do not know.

Q: I suggest to you that in the charge-sheets (excluding the annexures therein) dated 07.04.2018 and 21.06.2018 there is no reference of vehicle TN 45 AJ 0302?

A: True.

Q: Is it correct to state that Ex. D-28 is also a part and parcel of the records received from Mr. Anandha Kumar DSP, CBCID (P.W.74) on 21.02.2018?

A: Yes.

Q: Is it correct to state that during your investigation period there is no search and seizure at the places connected to Ghani?

A: True.

Q: Is it correct to state that during your investigation period there is no search and seizure at the places connected to A5, Mohammed Rafiqul Hassan?

A: True.

Q: Is it correct to state that during your investigation period you did not peruse the CDR of Ghani?

A: Not correct.

Q: Is it correct to state that you have not submitted the CDR of Ghani along with the charge-sheet?

A: Not relevant, hence not submitted.

Q: Is it correct to state that during your investigation period you did not peruse the CDR of A5, Mohammed Rafiqul Hassan?

A: Not correct.

Q: Is it correct to state that you have not submitted the CDR of A5, Mohammed Rafiqul Hassan along with the charge-sheet?

A: Analyzed and handed over to the succeeding IO.

Q: Is it correct to state that in column 12 of both charge-sheets dated 07.04.2018 and 21.06.2018 A5, Mohammed Rafiquel Hassan was not shown as absconding accused?

A: True.

Q: I suggest to you that as per the FIRs in this case the deceased Sasikumar was shown as resident of Subramaniampalayam but no documents were seized by you to prove the same?

A: True.

Q: Is it correct to state that the case of the prosecution is that 4 assailants came in 2 two-wheelers and committed the alleged crime?

A: True.

Q: Is it correct to state that in Ex. P-111 there is no mention about the prosecution case that 4 assailants came in 2 two-wheelers and committed the alleged crime?

A: Not fully true.

Q: Is it correct to state that in Exs. P-12, 164 and 320 there is no mention about the prosecution case that 4 assailants came in 2 two-wheelers and committed the alleged crime?

A: Not fully true.

Q: I suggest to you that Exs. P-361, 362, 365 and 366 shows that there is no fear psychosis for the persons involved in those criminal cases mentioned in the above Exhibits?

A: All the above cases were reaction to the brutal murder of Sasikumar which was precisely what the murderers wanted to achieve. I cannot say about the fear psychosis.

Q: I suggest to you that the theory of fear psychosis mentioned in the charge-sheet is fabricated for the purpose of this case?

A: The fear psychosis in my investigation revealed to the eye witnesses who witnessed the brutal murder and also some section of the public including some members of the organization Hindu Munnani.

Q: I suggest to you that you are falsely deposing that the alleged witnesses to the brutal murder and also some section of the public including some members of the organization Hindu Munnani suffered from fear psychosis on account of the incident?

A: Not true, I examined some of the witnesses and also recorded their statements.

Q: I suggest to you that all those alleged recorded statements were sent to the court only at the time of filing charge-sheet?

A: Not true.

1ம் எதிரிக்கான குறுக்கு விசாரணை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்ட நேரம் 01.13 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.