



IN THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT, DINDIGUL.

Present : THIRU. SWARNAM J RAJAGOPALAN, B.A.,B.L.,(HONS.)
Additional District and Sessions Judge, Dindigul.

Wednesday, this the 05th day of August 2026

Sessions Case No. 89/2021
(CNR.No.TNDG01-001628-2021)

Complainant	:	The State, represented through the Inspector of Police, Nilakottai Police Station. (Crime No.310/2016)
Accused	:	1. P.Prabhakaran (Age 23/2016) S/o.Pothiraj Pommanampatti, Nilakottai Taluk, Dindigul District. 2. B.Muralitharan (Age 30/2016) S/o.Balasubramani Janaki Nagar, Poothumu Road, Sikkanthar Chavadi Madurai 3. K.Sangili Murugan (Age 37/2016) S/o.Kuppusamy Ponperumal Kovil Opposite, Kuttikaradu Road, T.Vadipatti, Madurai. 4. R.Muthupandi (Age 38/2016) S/o.Rasu Mettuperumal Nagar, 1st Street, Kachakatti Road, Vadipatti, Madurai.
Date of Occurrence	:	26.09.2016
Date of the Complaint given	:	26.09.2016

Date of the arrest and released of the Accused 1 to 4	:	1 st Accused arrested on - 04.10.2016 2 nd Accused arrested on - 03.10.2016 3 rd Accused arrested on - 08.01.2017 4 th Accused arrested on - 24.11.2016
Date of release of the accused on bail	:	1 st Accused Released on – 07.01.2017 2 nd Accused Released on – 21.12.2016 3 rd Accused Released on – 15.02.2017 4 th Accused Released on – 24.01.2017
P.R.C. No., and date of Committal	:	P.R.C. No.4/2017 Committed on 17.02.2021
Date of Commencement of trial of the Sessions Case	:	08.11.2023
Closure of Trial	:	10.02.2026
Date when the defence enquiry was closed	:	22.06.2026
<u>Crime :</u> 1. Charges pleaded in the charge sheet	:	1 to 4 Accused – U/sec. 147, 148, 341 and 302 read with Section 149 of IPC.,
2. Charges framed	:	1 st and 2 nd Accused – U/sec. 148, 302 r/w 149 of IPC 3 rd and 4 th Accused – U/sec. 148, 341, 302 r/w 149 of IPC
Reason for the delay	:	--
Prosecution witnesses particulars of enquiry	:	P.W.1 Chief Examination on – 10.10.2022 and Cross examination on -14.12.2022 P.W.2 Chief Examination and Cross examination on - 26.10.2022 P.W.3 Chief Examination and Cross examination on – 08.02.2022 P.W.4 Chief Examination and Cross examination on - 08.02.2022

		P.W.5 Chief Examination and Cross examination on – 08.02.2026 PW6, PW7 - Chief Examination and Cross examination on 08.02.2022 (Hostile) PW8 - Chief Examination and Cross examination on 22.02.2023 (Hostile) PW9 - Chief Examination and Cross examination on 12.04.2023 (Hostile) PW10 - Chief Examination on 12.04.2023 PW11- Chief Examination on 05.10.2023 PW12- Chief Examination on 05.10.2023 PW13- Chief Examination on 05.10.2023 PW14 - Chief Examination on 08.11.2023 PW15 - Chief Examination and Cross examination on 30.01.2024 PW16 - Chief Examination and Cross examination on 15.02.2024 (Hostile) PW17 - Chief Examination and Cross examination on 15.02.2024 PW18 - Chief Examination and Cross examination on 17.07.2025 (Hostile) PW19 - Chief Examination on 17.07.2025 PW20 - Chief Examination on 04.08.2024 PW21- Chief Examination and Cross examination on 10.02.2026
The date of enquiry of the accused U/S 313 (1)(b) of Cr.P.C.,	:	24.02.2026

Government Side Advocate	:	Thiru.T.Balaji
Advocate for the Accused A1	:	Thiru. M.Ganesan
Advocate for the Accused A2		Thiru. K.Arun Thamilarasan
Advocate for the Accused A3, A4		Thiru. R.Kannan
The Statement of the Accused	A :	Accused denied the offence and stated that the case is a false case.
Decision of the Court	:	In the result, i. this Court holds that the prosecution has failed to establish, beyond all reasonable doubt, that the accused Nos.1 to 4 formed themselves into an unlawful assembly, wrongfully restrained the deceased Muthuraja, assaulted him with wooden logs, caused his death, and thereafter disposed of the dead body as alleged in the final report. Consequently, the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt. ii. Accordingly, Accused Nos.1 to 4 are acquitted of all the charges framed against them by extending the benefit of doubt under Section 235(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. iii. The bail bonds, if any, executed by the accused and their sureties shall stand cancelled. If any of the accused are in judicial custody in connection with this case alone, they shall be released forthwith, unless their custody is required in connection with any other case. iv. The case properties in R.P.R.No.12/2021 marked as M.Os.1, 3 to 8 are ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of the appeal period.

	The vehicle bearing Registration No. TN 74 J 8691, marked as Material Object No. 2 (Item No. 8), shall remain in the custody of the Nilakkottai Police Station. Upon expiry of the statutory period for filing an appeal, the owner of the said vehicle is at liberty to file an appropriate petition before the competent Court for release of the vehicle, and the same shall be released in accordance with law upon obtaining the necessary orders of the Court.
--	---

(P.R.C.No.4/2017 on the file the Judicial Magistrate Court, Nilakottai)

This Sessions case was coming upon 07.07.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Mr. T.Balaji, learned Public Prosecutor, appearing for the State, and Mr. M.Ganesan, learned counsel appearing for the 1st accused and Mr. K.Arun Thamilarasan, learned counsel appearing for the 2nd accused and Mr.R.Kannan, learned counsel appearing for the 3rd and 4th accused and upon hearing both sides arguments, perusing the evidence, documents, the case having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivered the following

J U D G M E N T

The accused Nos.1 to 5 stood charged for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 341 and 302 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, alleging that they had committed the murder of one Muthuraja, son of Murugan, in furtherance of unlawful assembly.

1. Prosecution Case:

- The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that there existed prior enmity between the deceased Muthuraja and the second accused, Murugesan. It is alleged that the deceased had abused the wife of A2 and had attempted to converse with her with an improper intention, which resulted in strained relations between them. Nursing the said grudge, A2, with the assistance of the other accused, is stated to have entered into a criminal conspiracy to eliminate the deceased.
2. Pursuant to the said conspiracy, on 25.09.2016, all the accused allegedly formed themselves into an unlawful assembly with the common object of murdering the deceased. At about 8.00 p.m., A2 is alleged to have deliberately driven the two-wheeler bearing Registration No. TN-74-J-8691 against the deceased, hitting him on the right hip region and thereby causing him to sustain a fracture injury. Thereafter, it is alleged that the accused assaulted the deceased repeatedly with wooden logs on his head and other vital parts of the body, causing multiple grievous injuries, which proved fatal.
3. It is the further case of the prosecution that at about 11.30 p.m. on the same night, after causing the death of Muthuraja, the accused transported his dead body on the very same motorcycle bearing Registration No. TN-74-J-8691 and threw it near the Michaelpalayam–Sangalpatti Junction stream, with the intention of screening the offence, and thereafter fled from the place of occurrence.

Thus, according to the prosecution, the accused had committed offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 341 and 302 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. Investigation and Committal

On the basis of a complaint lodged by Village Administrative Officer Anitha, wife of Raja Prabhakaran, the Inspector of Police, Nilakottai Police Station, registered a case in Crime No.310 of 2016 on 26.09.2016 for the aforesaid offences. The Investigating Officer took up the investigation, visited the place of occurrence, prepared the observation mahazars and rough sketch, conducted inquest over the dead body, arranged for post-mortem examination, examined the witnesses acquainted with the facts of the case, recorded their statements, effected recoveries, completed the investigation and ultimately laid a final report before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Nilakottai.

5. The learned Judicial Magistrate took cognizance of the offences in P.R.C. No.4 of 2017. After furnishing copies of the records to the accused under Section 207 Cr.P.C., the case being exclusively triable by a Court of Session, committed the same to the Court of the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Dindigul, under Section 209 Cr.P.C. The case was thereafter taken on file as S.C. No.89 of 2021 by the Hon'ble Principal District Court and subsequently made over to this Court for trial and disposal in accordance with law.

6. On committal, the case was made over to this Court by the Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Court, Dindigul upon assigning S.C.No.89/2021 and thereafter charges were framed against the 1st and 2nd Accused – U/sec. 148, 302 r/w 149 of IPC. 3rd and 4th Accused – U/sec. 148, 341, 302 r/w 149 of IPC by this court and the accused persons denied the charges and pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. Accordingly, the case was posted for trial.

7. Evidence:

In order to substantiate its case, the prosecution examined P.Ws.1 to 21, marked Exs.P1 to P36, and produced Material Objects Nos.1 to 8.

P.W.1 – Anitha (Village Administrative Officer)

P.W.1, Anitha, the then Village Administrative Officer of Kottur Village, Nilakottai Taluk, deposed that on 26.09.2016, she was serving as the Village Administrative Officer. At about 6.00 a.m., she received telephonic information from the Village Assistants, namely Subramani and Karuppaiya, informing her that the body of an unknown male was lying near the Sangalpatti stream at Ukkadai, Kottur Village. Upon receiving the information, she immediately proceeded to the said place.

8. According to her, on reaching the spot, she found the dead body of a male aged about 30 years, lying near the stream. The deceased was wearing an orange-coloured shirt and blue jeans. She noticed visible injuries on the body,

including bruises on the right eye, above the eyebrow, and other parts of the body. She also found that the big toe of the leg was crushed/compressed.

9. On noticing the suspicious nature of the death, she proceeded to the Nilakottai Police Station and lodged a written complaint, which has been marked as Ex.P1.

10. During her cross-examination, P.W.1 stated that she had received the information at about 6.00 a.m. and that the place where the body was found was situated about one kilometre from her office. She reached the spot within about ten minutes of receiving the information. She was accompanied by Village Assistants Subramani and Karuppaiya, and a nearby farm owner was also present, though she did not know his name. She further stated that the place where the dead body was found was about 6 to 7 kilometres from the Nilakottai Police Station.

11. She further deposed that she prepared the complaint at her office at about 7.15 a.m. and lodged the same before the police at about 7.30 a.m. She stated that the police station was situated at a distance of about half an hour's travel from her office. Thereafter, at about 8.30 a.m., the police examined her at the scene of occurrence. She reiterated that she had personally noticed the injuries on the body, including the crushed toe, and denied the defence suggestion that she had never visited the place of occurrence or that she was falsely deposing in support of the prosecution.

12.P.W.2 – Karuppaiya (Village Assistant)

P.W.2, Karuppaiya, who was working as the Village Assistant attached to the office of P.W.1, deposed that on 26.09.2016, while discharging his official duties along with another Village Assistant, Subramani, he noticed the dead body of a male lying near the Sangalpatti stream. Immediately thereafter, they informed P.W.1, the Village Administrative Officer, over the telephone.

13.He deposed that they found injuries on the head and eyebrow region of the deceased. According to him, the deceased was wearing a black-coloured pants and a coloured shirt. Thereafter, P.W.1 came to the spot, inspected the body and subsequently lodged the complaint before the police.

14.During cross-examination, P.W.2 stated that the office of the Village Administrative Officer was situated about one and a half kilometres from his residence and that P.W.1 was residing at Kottur Village during the relevant period. He further stated that at about 6.00 a.m., while on his routine rounds, he reached the place where the body was found. He also stated that the distance between Michaelpalayam–Sangalpatti Junction and the stream was about one and a half miles and that there were no residential houses or shops near the place where the body was found.

15.He further deposed that the deceased was wearing the same clothes when they first noticed the body and that they immediately informed P.W.1 over the telephone. According to him, the Nilakottai Police Station was situated at a

distance of about three kilometres from the place of occurrence. He further stated that the Inspector of Police examined him at about 9.00 a.m. on the date of occurrence. He denied the suggestions put to him by the defence that he had not seen the dead body or that he was falsely supporting the prosecution case.

16.P.W.3 – Thiru. Subramani (Village Assistant)

P.W.3, Subramani, deposed that at the relevant point of time, he was working as a Village Assistant attached to the Village Administrative Officer's office. On 26.09.2016, at about 6.00 a.m., while he was proceeding along with Village Assistant Karuppaiya near the Sangalpatti stream at Courtur Village, they noticed the dead body of a male lying near the stream.

17. According to him, the deceased was wearing a coloured shirt and blue-coloured jeans. He found injuries on the right eye, the back portion of the head, and bruises over various parts of the body. He also noticed that the big toe of the leg had been crushed. Thereafter, Karuppaiya informed the Village Administrative Officer over the phone, who came to the spot and subsequently lodged the complaint before the police.

18. During cross-examination, P.W.3 stated that the information was conveyed by Karuppaiya to the Village Administrative Officer over the telephone and that the VAO reached the place at about 7.00 a.m. He further stated that the complaint was prepared at the place where the dead body was found. He denied

the suggestion that he had not been present at the place of occurrence or that he was deposing falsely in support of the prosecution.

19.P.W.4 – Sathyabhama (Mother of the deceased)

P.W.4, Sathyabhama, is the mother of the deceased Muthuraja. She deposed that her husband, Murugan, was carrying on the profession of a barber and that they had two sons, of whom the deceased Muthuraja was the eldest one. According to her, Muthuraja was employed in a company at Tiruppur, was unmarried, and was residing in the company's accommodation.

20. She further stated that she had sent new clothes to her son at his Tiruppur address for his birthday. About fifteen days thereafter, she came to know through a newspaper report that her son had died. On learning the said news, she and her husband proceeded to the Nilakottai Police Station, where they enquired about the incident. Thereafter, the police took them to the Government Headquarters Hospital, Dindigul mortuary, where she identified the body of her son.

21. She noticed injuries on the right side of the head, above the right eye, the back portion of the head, and both legs of the deceased.

22. During cross-examination, she stated that she had gone to the police station at about 9.00 a.m. and that the complaint was only written by the police, which she signed after it was read over to her. She admitted that she did not remember the exact date on which she went to the police station but stated that they

received the body of the deceased on the same day at about 5.00 p.m. She denied the suggestion that she had never gone to the police station.

23.P.W.5 – Murugan (Step-father of the deceased)

P.W.5, Murugan, deposed that he was carrying on the business of a barber. He stated that P.W.4 is his second wife and that Muthuraja was her elder son, who was employed at Tiruppur.

24. According to him, he came to know about the death of Muthuraja through a newspaper report. Thereafter, he, along with P.W.4, proceeded to the Nilakottai Police Station and thereafter identified the body of the deceased at the Government Headquarters Hospital, Dindigul. He also noticed injuries on the body of the deceased similar to those spoken to by P.W.4.

25. During cross-examination, he stated that he did not remember the exact date on which he went to the police station. He further deposed that they identified the body at about 12.00 noon. He denied the suggestion that he had no knowledge about the case or that he was deposing falsely.

26.P.W.6 – Murugan, son of Palaniappan

P.W.6, Murugan, son of Palaniappan, did not support the prosecution case. He deposed that he did not know the first accused and professed complete ignorance about the occurrence. As he resiled from his earlier statement recorded during investigation, he was treated as a hostile witness by the

prosecution. Despite being cross-examined by the learned Public Prosecutor, nothing useful to the prosecution could be elicited from his evidence.

27.P.W.7 – Muthuselvan

P.W.7, Muthuselvan, a resident of Palampatti, deposed that P.W.6 Murugan owns a neighbouring agricultural land. He stated that, except for knowing accused Prabhakaran by name, he did not know any of the other accused. He further stated that he did not know the deceased Muthuraja and had no knowledge whatsoever about the occurrence in question. Since he resiled from his earlier statement recorded during investigation, he was treated as a hostile witness. Even after being cross-examined by the learned Public Prosecutor, nothing useful could be elicited from him in support of the prosecution.

28.P.W.8 – Singathevar

P.W.8, Singathevar, son of Rajuthevar, also expressed complete ignorance about the occurrence and stated that he did not know anything regarding the case or the accused. As he failed to support the prosecution version, he was declared hostile. His evidence did not advance the prosecution case in any manner.

29.P.W.9 – Sugumar

P.W.9, Sugumar, son of Kulandan, a resident of Palampatti, Nilakottai, and employed as a driver, deposed that he knew only P.W.8 and had no acquaintance either with the accused or with the deceased. He professed

complete ignorance regarding the occurrence and was accordingly treated as a hostile witness. Nothing favourable to the prosecution was elicited from his testimony.

30.P.W.10 – Michael Raj

P.W.10, Michael Raj, son of Arputham, a resident of Michaelpalayam, deposed that he was running a petty shop near the church in the village. According to him, Rajendran was known to him. About five years prior to his examination, after closing his shop, he and Rajendran were sitting and conversing near the church, when they noticed a motorcycle carrying three persons passing through the area near the Michaelpalayam Church. Subsequently, the police enquired with him regarding the said incident. He was not cross-examined by the defence. He did not identify the accused persons.

31.P.W.11 – Azhagumuthu

P.W.11, Azhagumuthu, a resident of Sempatti and an auto driver by profession, deposed that he had seen the Inspector of Police at the Sangalpatti Junction conducting investigation. According to him, the Investigating Officer prepared the Observation Mahazar and the Rough Sketch, for which he acted as an attesting witness. The Observation Mahazar was marked through him as Ex.P2. He was not cross-examined.

32.P.W.12 – Maheswaran (Village Administrative Officer)

P.W.12, Maheswaran, deposed that on 04.10.2016, he was serving as the Village Administrative Officer of Narivuthu Village and that his Village Assistant was one Bala Murugesan. On that day, while they were at Ponnamanambatti near Nilakottai, the Inspector of Police requested both of them to witness the investigation.

33. According to him, accused Prabhakaran (A1) and Paramasamy were interrogated in their presence. During the course of interrogation, both the accused voluntarily gave separate confession statements. The admissible portion of the confession statement of Prabhakaran was marked as Ex.P3, pursuant to which he produced a blood-stained wooden log concealed near the Paraiyur area, which was recovered by the Investigating Officer under a seizure mahazar in the presence of P.W.12 and his assistant. Thereafter, the admissible portion of the confession statement of Paramasamy was marked as Ex.P5, pursuant to which another wooden log was recovered.

34. P.W.12 further deposed that, based on the disclosure made by the accused, the motorcycle bearing Registration No. TN-74-J-8691, alleged to have been used in the commission of the offence, was also recovered from a nearby stream at Paraiyur under a recovery mahazar marked as Ex.P6. He identified the recovered wooden log (M.O.1) and the motorcycle (M.O.2) before the Court. He was not cross-examined by the defence.

35.P.W.13 – Anita (Village Administrative Officer)

P.W.13, Anita, deposed that on 13.10.2016, she was serving as the Village Administrative Officer of Kottur Village, Nilakottai Taluk. At about 4.00 p.m., while she and her Village Assistant were attending to their official duties, the Inspector of Police called them to witness the investigation in the present murder case.

36. According to her, on reaching the Nilakottai Police Station, accused Murali @ Muralidharan was under interrogation. In her presence, he voluntarily gave a confession statement admitting that he had assaulted the deceased Muthuraja on the back of the head with a wooden log. The admissible portion of the said confession statement was marked as Ex.P7.

37. Pursuant to the said disclosure statement, the accused led the police and witnesses to a bushy area near Paraiyur, where he produced the wooden log allegedly used in the commission of the offence. The Investigating Officer recovered the same under a seizure mahazar in the presence of P.W.13 and her Village Assistant, who attested the recovery.

38.P.W.14 – Shobana (Village Administrative Officer)

P.W.14, Shobana, deposed that she was serving as the Village Administrative Officer of Silukuvarpatti Village on 24.11.2016. She stated that on the said date, the Inspector of Police, Nilakottai, contacted her over the telephone and requested her to be present for the investigation in a murder case. Accordingly,

she, along with her Village Assistant, Subramanian, proceeded to the Silukuvarpatti Bus Stand.

39. According to her, accused Muthupandi was interrogated by the Investigating Officer in her presence. During the course of interrogation, Muthupandi voluntarily gave a confession statement stating that he, along with Murugidharan and two others, had murdered Muthuraja on 25.09.2016 near Kodai Road Mettuveli. The confession statement was witnessed by P.W.14 and her Village Assistant, and both of them signed the same.

40. Pursuant to the disclosure statement, Muthupandi led the police and witnesses to the place where the occurrence had allegedly taken place and identified the scene of offence near Kodai Road Mettuveli. The admissible portion of the confession statement was marked as Ex.P9. P.W.14 also identified accused Muthupandi before the Court. She was not cross-examined by the defence.

41.P.W.15 – Adaikalam

P.W.15, Adaikalam, deposed that he has been running a tea shop near Sangalpatti. According to him, there is a stream situated near his shop, and about seven years prior to his deposition, a male dead body was found near the said stream.

42. He further stated that the police conducted an investigation at the spot and prepared the Observation Mahazar, in which he and one Michael Selvaraj signed as attesting witnesses. The Observation Mahazar was marked through

him as Ex.P10. He also deposed that the police recovered blood-stained soil and sample soil from the place of occurrence under a seizure mahazar, which was also attested by him. The said seizure mahazar was marked as Ex.P11.

43.During cross-examination, P.W.15 deposed that he had been running the tea shop for about 20 years. He used to open the shop at about 5.00 a.m. and close it at about 8.00 p.m. The shop was managed by himself, his wife and his son-in-law, and in his absence, his son would attend to the business.

44.He further stated that his native place is Seekuthampatti, where he owns a house, and that the distance between his native village and the stream is about two kilometres. He used to travel to his native village on a two-wheeler. He also stated that Michael Selvaraj, the other attesting witness, was a regular customer in his tea shop.

45.P.W.15 admitted that he and his wife occasionally stayed in the tea shop itself. He further deposed that police personnel on patrol frequently visited his shop and used to maintain the patrol register there. He, however, denied the suggestion that he was deposing in accordance with the instructions of the police merely because of such acquaintance.

46.He also stated that, owing to the lapse of nearly seven years, he could not recollect the clothes worn by the deceased. He further admitted that the stream was situated about 200 metres east of his tea shop and that the stream was not

visible from his shop with the naked eye. He denied all the remaining suggestions put to him by the defence.

47.P.W.16 – Balakrishnan

P.W.16, Balakrishnan, son of Rasu, an auto driver by profession, deposed that he knew accused No.3, Sankili Murugan. According to him, on 08.01.2017, at about 8.00 p.m., the Nilakottai Police enquired A3 in his presence and in the presence of one Pandi. He stated that A3 gave a confession statement and that he signed the document as an attesting witness at the request of Pandi. However, he categorically stated that he did not know anything about the facts of the case. His signature in the confession mahazar was marked as Ex.P12.

48.Since P.W.16 did not support the prosecution regarding the alleged confession and recovery, he was treated as a hostile witness. During cross-examination by the prosecution, he admitted that the other attesting witness, Pandi, had since died and that the accused belonged to a neighbouring village. He denied the suggestion that he was suppressing the truth in order to help the accused and did not support the prosecution case regarding the recovery allegedly effected pursuant to the confession of A3.

49.P.W.17 – Dr. Panjali (Post-mortem Doctor)

P.W.17, Dr. Panjali, Assistant Professor attached to the Government Head quarters Hospital and Medical College, Dindigul, deposed that on 28.09.2016, while she was working in the said hospital, she received the body of

Muthuraja, aged about 28 years, along with the requisition sent by the Inspector of Police, Nilakottai, through Grade-I Police Constable Muthu Udayar, in connection with a case initially registered under Section 174 Cr.P.C.

50. After the body was identified by the accompanying police constable, she commenced the post-mortem examination at about 2.00 p.m.

51. She found rigor mortis present throughout the body. Both eyes were partially open, the tongue was inside the oral cavity, all 32 teeth were intact, and blood was oozing from both the nose and ears.

52. She noticed the following ante-mortem injuries:

1. Swelling of both eyelids.
2. Bruises over the eyebrow region.
3. Multiple bruises over the left upper limb and the back of the body.
4. A bruise measuring 8×6 cm over the right eyebrow and right cheek.
5. Bruise measuring 2×1 cm over the left great toe.
6. Bruise measuring 2×1 cm over the right great toe.

On internal examination, she found:

1. A 3×3 cm fracture of the skull;
2. Fracture of the left shoulder;
3. Fracture of the left elbow;
4. Fracture of the left thumb; and
5. Fracture of the right hip bone.

53. After receipt of the viscera examination report, she issued her final opinion that the deceased died due to head injuries and the associated multiple ante-mortem injuries sustained by him.

54. During cross-examination, she stated that she was seeing the alleged weapon for the first time in Court. She admitted that similar injuries could also be caused by other blunt objects and that the injuries were not peculiar to the wooden logs shown before the Court. She further stated that death had occurred about three days prior to the post-mortem examination. She admitted that although the post-mortem examination was completed on 28.09.2016, she furnished her final opinion only on 25.01.2017, after receiving the viscera analysis report.

55. P.W.18 – Michael Raj

P.W.18, Michael Raj, an agricultural coolie residing at Michaelpalayam, deposed that about ten years prior to his examination, the police had obtained his signatures in connection with the investigation. His signatures found in the Observation Mahazar and the seizure mahazar were marked as Exs.P15 and P16 respectively.

He stated that he had merely signed the documents at the request of the police and had no knowledge about the occurrence or the investigation. Accordingly, he was treated as a hostile witness, and nothing useful was elicited from him in support of the prosecution.

56.P.W.19 – Muthu Udaiyar

P.W.19, Muthu Udaiyar, the then Grade-I Head Constable, deposed that he accompanied the dead body to the Government Headquarters Hospital, Dindigul, on 28.09.2016, produced the requisition letter issued by the Investigating Officer before the post-mortem doctor, and identified the body of the deceased to the doctor conducting the autopsy. After completion of the post-mortem examination, he handed over the body to the relatives of the deceased.

57. P.W.20 – Anandhi (Sub-Inspector of Police)

P.W.20, Anandhi, the then Sub-Inspector of Police, Nilakottai Police Station, deposed that on 26.09.2016, at about 8.00 a.m., she received a written complaint from the Village Administrative Officer and registered a case in Crime No.310 of 2016 under Section 174 Cr.P.C.

58. The printed First Information Report was marked as Ex.P17, and the same was forwarded to the learned Judicial Magistrate, Nilakottai, through express despatch.

She further stated that subsequently, after receipt of the post-mortem findings and other materials collected during investigation, the case was altered from one under Section 174 Cr.P.C. to offences under Sections 147, 148, 323 and 302 IPC, and the alteration report was forwarded to the jurisdictional Magistrate.

59. She further deposed that since the regular Inspector of Police was on leave, the investigation was initially handled by the Inspector in-charge of Ammaianayakanur Police Station.

60. She also stated that on 08.01.2017, acting upon secret information, accused Sankili Murugan (A3) was intercepted in the presence of witnesses Pandian and Balakrishnan at about 7.00 a.m. After interrogation, the accused allegedly gave a confession statement and identified the place of occurrence. Thereafter, he was remanded to judicial custody at about 11.00 a.m. on the same day.

61. P.W.21 – Karuppusamy (Investigating Officer)

P.W.21, Karuppusamy, the Investigating Officer, who retired from police service in the year 2023, deposed in detail regarding every stage of the investigation conducted by him.

62. He stated that on 26.09.2016, he visited the scene of occurrence, prepared the Observation Mahazar (Ex.P18) and the Rough Sketch (Ex.P19), and recovered blood-stained soil and sample soil under the relevant seizure mahazar.

63. He examined the Village Administrative Officer and other witnesses, conducted the inquest, collected the post-mortem report, and, based on the medical opinion and materials collected during investigation, altered the case from one under Section 174 Cr.P.C. to offences punishable under Sections 147, 148 and 302 IPC. The alteration report was marked as Ex.P22.

64. He further deposed regarding the arrest of the accused persons, the recording of their disclosure statements, and the consequent recoveries of the alleged weapons of offence, namely the wooden logs, as well as the motorcycle allegedly used in the commission of the crime.

65. He also spoke about forwarding the material objects for scientific examination, receiving the Forensic Science Laboratory Report (Ex.P34), Biological Report (Ex.P35) and Serology Report (Ex.P36). The final post-mortem opinion issued by P.W.17 was marked through him as Ex.P33.

66. During cross-examination, P.W.21 denied all suggestions put to him by the defence that the investigation had been conducted in a partisan or improper manner or that the accused had been falsely implicated.

67. After the completion of the prosecution evidence, the accused were examined under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure with reference to the incriminating circumstances appearing against them in the evidence adduced by the prosecution. The accused denied the incriminating circumstances as false and pleaded innocence. No oral or documentary evidence was adduced on the side of the defence.

68. Arguments:

Upon the closure of the evidence on both sides, this Court heard the arguments advanced by Mr. T.Balaji, learned Public Prosecutor, appearing for the State, and Mr. M.Ganesan, learned counsel appearing for the 1st accused and Mr. Aruu Tamilarasan, learned counsel appearing for the 2nd accused and Mr. Mr.R.Kannan, learned counsel appearing for the 3rd and 4th accused.

69. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the prosecution has successfully established the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt through the chain of circumstantial evidence. According to him, the motive for the occurrence has been

clearly established through the prosecution evidence, namely that the deceased Muthuraja had misbehaved with the wife of the second accused, thereby giving rise to strong enmity. It was further contended that the medical evidence fully corroborates the prosecution case regarding the nature of the assault and that the recovery of the wooden logs and the motorcycle pursuant to the voluntary disclosure statements of the accused lends complete assurance to the prosecution case. It was further argued that merely because some witnesses have turned hostile, the prosecution case cannot be rejected, particularly when the official witnesses and medical evidence inspire confidence. Therefore, according to the learned Public Prosecutor, all the accused are liable to be convicted for the offences charged.

70. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the accused vehemently contended that the entire prosecution case is founded purely upon suspicion and not upon legally admissible evidence. It was argued that there is absolutely no eyewitness to the occurrence and that the prosecution has miserably failed to establish every link in the alleged chain of circumstances.

71. The learned counsel further submitted that almost all the material witnesses cited by the prosecution to establish the alleged conspiracy, motive, last seen circumstance and recovery have either turned hostile or have not supported the prosecution case. It was further argued that the alleged motive itself has not been proved by any legally admissible evidence.

72. The learned counsel also attacked the alleged recoveries under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act by contending that the independent witnesses to the recoveries have either not supported the prosecution or were official witnesses, namely the Village Administrative Officers, who were repeatedly utilized by the investigating agency. According to the defence, such recoveries cannot by themselves establish the guilt of the accused.

73. The learned counsel further submitted that even according to the medical evidence, the injuries could have been caused by any blunt object and there is no scientific evidence connecting the recovered wooden logs with the injuries found on the deceased. It was also argued that there is absolutely no forensic evidence connecting any of the accused with the crime.

74. The learned counsel appearing for the accused also filed written arguments, reiterating the above submissions in detail. In the written submissions, emphasis has been laid on the following aspects:

1. that the prosecution has failed to establish the motive alleged against the accused;
2. that there is no evidence whatsoever regarding the alleged conspiracy;
3. that the majority of the independent witnesses have turned hostile;
4. that the alleged extra-judicial confession and recoveries are unreliable and legally unacceptable;

5. that the prosecution has failed to establish the complete chain of circumstances required in a case resting upon circumstantial evidence; and
6. therefore, the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt and consequent acquittal.

This Court has carefully considered the rival oral submissions, the written arguments filed by the accused, the entire oral and documentary evidence available on record, and the precedents relied upon by both sides.

75. Point for Determination:

The point that arises for determination in this case is:

“Whether the prosecution has established beyond reasonable doubt that on 25.09.2016 at about 8.00 p.m., the accused Nos.1 to 5, being members of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object, wrongfully restrained and committed the murder of Muthuraja and thereafter caused the disappearance of the evidence of the offence, thereby rendering themselves liable for the offences charged against them?”

76. Discussion:

The prosecution case, as projected in the final report, is that owing to previous enmity between the deceased Muthuraja and the second accused, all the accused formed themselves into an unlawful assembly and assaulted the deceased with wooden logs after first knocking him down by using a motorcycle, resulting in his death. It is further alleged that thereafter the accused transported the body on the motorcycle and

abandoned it near the Sangalpatti stream in order to screen themselves from legal punishment.

77. At the very outset, it is to be noted that the prosecution does not claim that any person had actually witnessed the occurrence. None of the witnesses examined before this Court claims to have seen the assault or the transportation of the dead body. Thus, the entire prosecution case admittedly rests upon circumstantial evidence. In such a case, the settled position of law is that every incriminating circumstance relied upon by the prosecution must be independently established by reliable evidence, and all such circumstances, when taken together, must form a complete and unbroken chain pointing only towards the guilt of the accused and ruling out every other hypothesis consistent with their innocence.

78. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra*, (1984) 4 SCC 116, has authoritatively laid down the principles governing cases based on circumstantial evidence. The Court has held that the circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is sought to be drawn must be fully established and those circumstances must be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused and they must be conclusive in nature and they should exclude every possible hypothesis except the guilt of the accused and there must be a complete chain of evidence leaving no reasonable ground for a conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused. These principles have consistently been followed by the Hon'ble

Supreme Court and various High Courts and have become the guiding principles for appreciating circumstantial evidence.

Keeping the above principles in view, the evidence adduced by the prosecution requires careful scrutiny.

79. The first circumstance which requires consideration is the nature of the death of the deceased. The evidence of P.Ws.1 to 3, who first noticed the dead body lying near the Sangalpatti stream, establishes that the deceased had sustained multiple external injuries. Their evidence is only with regard to the discovery of the body and the condition in which it was found. Likewise, P.Ws.4 and 5, who are the mother and stepfather of the deceased respectively, have only identified the dead body and spoken about the injuries found on it. Their evidence does not throw any light regarding the occurrence or the identity of the assailants.

80. The medical evidence adduced through P.W.17, Dr. Panjali, assumes considerable significance. The post-mortem doctor has spoken in detail about the numerous ante-mortem injuries found on the body of the deceased, including multiple bruises, fracture of the skull, fracture of the left shoulder, left elbow, left thumb and right hip. The doctor has categorically opined that the deceased died due to the head injury and other associated ante-mortem injuries. Nothing substantial has been elicited during the cross-examination to discredit her opinion regarding the cause of death. Though she has admitted that similar injuries could be caused by any blunt object, such admission only indicates that the injuries are not peculiar to the wooden logs

allegedly recovered. It does not in any manner affect her conclusion that the death was homicidal in nature. Therefore, this Court has no hesitation in holding that the prosecution has satisfactorily established that Muthuraja died a homicidal death.

81. However, the proof of homicidal death by itself does not establish the complicity of the accused. The prosecution is further required to prove that it was these accused and none else who committed the crime.

82. The prosecution has attempted to establish a motive by alleging that the deceased had abused the wife of the second accused and had attempted to speak to her with an improper intention, thereby creating previous enmity. However, on a careful examination of the entire oral evidence, this Court finds that no witness has spoken about the said alleged incident. Crucially, neither the wife of the second accused nor any independent witness has been examined to establish such previous enmity. Even the parents of the deceased have not spoken about any dispute between the deceased and the accused. Thus, the alleged motive remains merely a recital in the prosecution case and has not been substantiated by legally admissible evidence during trial.

83. It is true that motive is not an indispensable requirement in every criminal case. Nevertheless, where the prosecution case is based entirely on circumstantial evidence and there is no direct evidence connecting the accused with the crime, proof of motive assumes considerable importance. In the present case, the complete failure of the prosecution to establish the alleged motive constitutes a significant missing link in the chain of circumstances.

84. The next circumstance relied upon by the prosecution is the recovery of the weapons of offence and the motorcycle pursuant to the disclosure statements allegedly made by the accused. The prosecution has examined P.Ws.12, 13 and 14, all Village Administrative Officers, to prove the alleged disclosure statements and consequent recoveries. According to them, various accused gave voluntary disclosure statements leading to the recovery of wooden logs and the motorcycle allegedly used in the commission of the offence.

85. However, it is equally relevant to note that the prosecution has examined several independent witnesses to the alleged recoveries, namely P.Ws.16 and 18, who have not supported the prosecution. P.W.16 was specifically examined to prove the confession allegedly made by A3. He categorically stated that he did not know anything about the case and admitted only his signature in the document. He was consequently treated as hostile. Similarly, P.W.18 also did not support the prosecution and merely admitted his signatures in the mahazars.

86. The Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that almost every recovery in the present case has been sought to be proved through Village Administrative Officers. Though there is no legal prohibition in relying upon official witnesses, the repeated association of official witnesses alone for every recovery, particularly when independent witnesses have not supported the prosecution, requires the Court to scrutinize such evidence with greater caution.

87. Moreover, the medical evidence does not provide any corroboration to the alleged recoveries. P.W.17 has categorically admitted during cross-examination that she saw the alleged wooden logs only for the first time in Court and that similar injuries could have been caused by any blunt object. Thus, there is no medical opinion specifically connecting the recovered wooden logs with the injuries sustained by the deceased.

88. The prosecution has also relied upon the forensic reports. However, a mere production of the biological and serological reports does not by itself establish the guilt of the accused unless the prosecution demonstrates that the recovered articles were scientifically connected with the accused and the deceased through reliable evidence. The Investigating Officer has filed the reports, but the prosecution has yet to establish how those reports complete the chain of circumstances against each of the accused. Mere recovery of articles, in the absence of convincing corroboration, and substantial evidence, the recovery evidence cannot form the sole basis for conviction in a case resting entirely on circumstantial evidence.

89. The next important feature of the case is the large number of hostile witnesses. P.Ws.6, 7, 8, 9, 16 and 18 have not supported the prosecution at all. Several of them have professed complete ignorance regarding the occurrence. While it is settled that the evidence of hostile witnesses is not to be rejected in toto and the portion supporting the prosecution can be relied upon if otherwise trustworthy, in the present

case these witnesses have not furnished any material capable of advancing the prosecution case.

90. The prosecution has therefore substantially rested its case upon the evidence of official witnesses and the Investigating Officer. It is equally well settled that there is no rule of law that the testimony of official witnesses should be discarded merely because of their official status. Nevertheless, where the prosecution case is founded exclusively on circumstantial evidence and several independent witnesses have not supported the prosecution, the Court is required to examine the official evidence with greater care and caution before recording a conviction.

91. The principal circumstance upon which the prosecution places considerable reliance is the alleged recovery of the weapons of offence and the motorcycle said to have been used in the commission of the crime. According to the prosecution, after their arrest, the accused voluntarily gave disclosure statements, pursuant to which wooden logs alleged to have been used for assaulting the deceased and the motorcycle bearing Registration No. TN-74-J-8691 were recovered. These recoveries have been spoken to by P.Ws.12, 13 and 14, who are Village Administrative Officers, and by P.W.21, the Investigating Officer.

92. Under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, only that portion of the information furnished by an accused in police custody which distinctly relates to the discovery of a fact is admissible in evidence. It is equally settled that the recovery by itself is not

substantive evidence of guilt. Such recovery only constitutes one incriminating circumstance and must necessarily be corroborated by other reliable circumstances forming part of a complete chain of evidence.

93. In the present case, although P.Ws.12, 13 and 14 have spoken about the disclosure statements and the consequent recoveries, the independent witnesses cited by the prosecution have not lent support to the prosecution case. P.W.16, who was cited as an attesting witness to the confession and recovery relating to A3, categorically stated that he knew nothing about the case and admitted only his signature. Likewise, P.W.18 merely admitted his signature in the documents prepared by the police and expressly stated that he had no knowledge regarding the occurrence. Both these witnesses were declared hostile. Therefore, the recoveries substantially rest upon the testimony of official witnesses and the Investigating Officer.

94. Another aspect assumes considerable significance. The prosecution alleges that the deceased was assaulted with wooden logs. The alleged weapons were recovered during investigation. However, P.W.17, the post-mortem doctor, has specifically admitted during cross-examination that she was seeing the alleged weapons for the first time in Court. She has not offered any opinion that the injuries noticed during autopsy could have been caused by those particular wooden logs. On the contrary, she fairly admitted that similar injuries could be caused by any blunt object. Thus, the prosecution has failed to obtain any medical opinion specifically connecting the

recovered wooden logs with the injuries sustained by the deceased. This omission assumes importance because, in a case entirely resting upon circumstantial evidence, scientific corroboration assumes a greater role.

95. The prosecution has also relied upon the Forensic Science Laboratory Report, Biological Report and Serology Report marked as Exs.P34 to P36. Though these reports have been formally marked through the Investigating Officer, the prosecution has not demonstrated, through cogent evidence, that the results contained therein conclusively connect the recovered articles with the accused. The mere production of scientific reports without establishing their evidentiary linkage to the accused cannot complete the chain of circumstances as already observed by me supra. The Court cannot presume such a connection in the absence of satisfactory evidence.

96. Another conspicuous omission in the prosecution case is the absence of any evidence regarding the movements of the deceased immediately prior to his death. No witness has spoken about having last seen the deceased in the company of any of the accused. Likewise, there is no evidence that any of the accused were seen transporting the body or abandoning it near the Sangalpatti stream. The prosecution has not examined any witness to establish the route allegedly taken by the accused or the circumstances under which the body came to be found at the place of recovery. Even PW10 who deposed about seeing three persons travelling in a two wheeler, did not identify the accused persons and the exact time and two wheeler and consequently, the prosecution has failed to establish any "last seen" circumstance or

any conduct of the accused immediately before or after the occurrence which could constitute an incriminating link.

97. Equally, the prosecution has not produced any evidence showing the presence of bloodstains on the clothes of the accused, nor has it established that any blood recovered from the alleged weapons matched the blood group of the deceased. No DNA analysis has been placed before the Court. No fingerprint evidence has been collected from the motorcycle or the alleged weapons. In the absence of such scientific corroboration, the alleged recoveries lose much of their incriminating value. It is also pertinent to note that the prosecution has examined as many as twenty-one witnesses, out of whom P.Ws.6, 7, 8, 9, 16 and 18 have turned hostile. The evidence of hostile witnesses is undoubtedly not liable to be rejected in its entirety, and the Court may rely upon such a portion of their testimony as inspires confidence. However, in the present case, none of these witnesses has furnished any incriminating material against the accused. Their evidence, therefore, does not strengthen the prosecution case in any manner.

98. The evidence of P.Ws.1 to 5 only establishes the discovery and identification of the dead body. P.Ws.10, 11 and 15 are formal witnesses relating to the preparation of the observation mahazar and recovery of soil. P.Ws.12 to 14 speak about the alleged recoveries. P.W.17 proves the homicidal nature of death. P.Ws.19 to 21 are official witnesses connected with the investigation. When the evidence is analysed as a whole, it becomes evident that there is no direct evidence connecting the accused

with the actual commission of the offence, and the prosecution case rests solely upon the alleged recoveries and the official investigation.

99. It is a cardinal principle of criminal law that each incriminating circumstance must not only be proved independently but also must be incapable of explanation on any hypothesis other than the guilt of the accused. If one or more links in the chain are found to be missing, the benefit of such deficiency must necessarily enure to the accused. The Court cannot supply missing links by conjecture or infer guilt merely because a homicidal death has occurred.

100. In the present case, while the prosecution has undoubtedly succeeded in proving that Muthuraja met with a homicidal death, it has failed to establish, by legally acceptable and convincing evidence, that it was the accused who caused such death. The motive remains unproved. There is no eyewitness. There is no last seen evidence. The recoveries are not satisfactorily corroborated by independent evidence or medical evidence. The scientific evidence does not conclusively connect the accused with the crime. Several material witnesses have turned hostile. Consequently, the chain of circumstances remains incomplete and falls far short of the standard required for recording a conviction in a case based solely on circumstantial evidence.

Accordingly, this Court is of the considered view that the prosecution has failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. The accused are therefore entitled to the benefit of doubt.

101. Result,**In the result,**

- i. this Court holds that the prosecution has failed to establish, beyond all reasonable doubt, that the accused Nos.1 to 4 formed themselves into an unlawful assembly, wrongfully restrained the deceased Muthuraja, assaulted him with wooden logs, caused his death, and thereafter disposed of the dead body as alleged in the final report. Consequently, the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt.
- ii. Accordingly, Accused Nos.1 to 4 are acquitted of all the charges framed against them by extending the benefit of doubt under Section 235(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
- iii. The bail bonds, if any, executed by the accused and their sureties shall stand cancelled. If any of the accused are in judicial custody in connection with this case alone, they shall be released forthwith, unless their custody is required in connection with any other case.
- iv. The case properties in R.P.R.No.12/2021 marked as M.Os.1, 3 to 8 are ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of the appeal period.
- v. The vehicle bearing Registration No. TN 74 J 8691, marked as Material Object No. 2 (Item No. 8), shall remain in the custody of the Nilakkottai Police Station. Upon expiry of the statutory period for filing an appeal, the owner of the said vehicle is at liberty to file an appropriate petition before the competent Court for release of

the vehicle, and the same shall be released in accordance with law upon obtaining the necessary orders of the Court.

Directly dictated by me to the google docx, typed by it, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court on this the 5th day of August 2026.

**Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Dindigul.**

Annexures :

Prosecution Witnesses :

P.W.1 -	R. Anitha (VAO, Kottur Village)
P.W.2 -	G.Karuppaiah (Village Assistant)
P.W.3 -	M.Subramani (Village Assistant Rtd)
P.W.4 -	M.Sathiyabama
P.W.5 -	A.Murugan
P.W.6 -	P.Murugan
P.W.7 -	M.Muthuselvan
P.W.8 -	R.Singathevar
P.W.9 -	K.Sugumar
P.W.10-	A.Michelraj
P.W.11-	K.Azhagumuthu
P.W.12-	A.Maheswaran (Village Administrative Officer, Noothalapuram)
P.W.13-	R.Anitha (Village Administrative Officer, Sengattampatti)
P.W.14-	I.Shobana (Village Administrative Officer, Sengattampatti)
P.W.15-	H.Adaikalam
P.W.16-	R.Balakrishnan
P.W.17-	Dr.R.Panjali

PW18-	M.Michelraj
PW19-	V.Muthu Udaiyar(Head Constable)
PW20-	K.Ananthi(Inspector of Police)
PW21-	K.U.Karuppasamy(Investigating officer)

Prosecution Exhibits:-

Ex.P1	26.09.2016	Complaint
Ex.P2	04.10.2016	The first signature appearing in the observation mahazar
Ex.P3	04.10.2016	The admissible portion of the confession statement given by the first accused, Prabhakaran
Ex.P4	04.10.2016	Athachi at 10.30hrs.
Ex.P5	04.10.2016	The admissible portion of the confession statement given by the fifth accused, Paramasamy
Ex.P6	04.10.2016	Athachi at 11.30 hrs.
Ex.P7	13.10.2016	The admissible portion of the confession statement given by the second accused, Murualitharan
Ex. P8	13.10.2016	Athachi at 18.30 hrs.
Ex.P9	24.11.2016	The admissible portion of the confession statement given by the fourth accused, Muthupandi
Ex. P10	26.09.2016	Observation Mahazar
Ex.P11	26.09.2016	Second signature of PW15 in the observation mahazar.
Ex.P12	08.01.2017	The second signature found in the confession statement of the 3rd accused, Sangili Murugan
Ex.P13	28.09.2016	Post Mortem Requisition letter
Ex.P14	28.09.2016	Post Mortem Certificate
Ex.P15	26.09.2016	First signature of PW18 in the observation mahazar.
Ex.P16	26.09.2016	Second signature of PW18 in the Athatchi
Ex.P17	26.09.2016	First Information Report
Ex.P18	26.09.2016	Rough Sketch

Ex.P19	26.09.2016	Observation Mahazar
Ex.P20	26.09.2016	Form 91 at 8.45 hrs.
Ex.P21	26.09.2016	Inquest Report
Ex.P22	28.09.2016	Alteration Report
Ex.P23	28.09.2016	Form 91 at 18.00 hrs.
Ex.P24	04.10.2016	Rough Sketch
Ex.P25	04.10.2016	Form 91 at 10.30 hrs.
Ex.P26	04.10.2016	Form 91 at 11.30 hrs.
Ex.P27	04.10.2016	Section Alteration Report
Ex.P28	13.10.2016	Form 91 at 18.30 hrs
Ex.P29	28.09.2016	RFSL Requisition Letter
Ex.P30	26.10.2016	Court Forwarding Letter for Submission to the Regional Forensic Science Laboratory
Ex.P31	22.11.2016	RFSL Requisition Letter
Ex.P32	23.11.2016	Court Forwarding Letter for Submission to the Regional Forensic Science Laboratory
Ex.P33	25.01.2017	Final opinion
Ex.P34	28.11.2016	Bilogy Report
Ex.P35	23.02.2017	Serology Report
Ex.P36	22.11.2016	Viscera Report

Prosecution Material Objects :-

M.O. 1	Wooden logs - 2, each measuring approximately 2½ feet in length, bearing bloodstains.
M.O. 2	The vehicle bearing Registration No. TN 74 J 8691
M.O. 3	Wooden log- 1, measuring approximately 2–12 feet in length, bearing bloodstains.
M.O. 4	Blood Stained Soil

M.O. 5	Un Blood Stained Soil
M.O. 6	One blue-coloured jeans pant bearing bloodstains.
M.O. 7	One orange-coloured full-sleeved shirt.
M.O. 8	One red-coloured underwear

Defence side witness and exhibits :-

- Nil -

**Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Dindigul.**