

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, KARUR
PRESENT:-THIRU.K.H. Elavazhagan, B.Sc., M.L.,
District & Sessions Judge.

Monday, the 09th day of March, 2026

SESSIONS CASE No.74/2024
[CNR.NO.TNKR01-003442-2024]

(Pasupathipalayam Police Station Crime No.48/2022)

(P.R.C. 06/2024 on the file of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur)

Name of the Complainant	State, Represented by the Inspector of Police, Pasupathipalayam Town P.S., Karur District.
Represented by	Thiru. N. Senthilkumar, Public Prosecutor.
Accused	S. Hariharan, age 22/2022, S/o. Saravanan, 95, Puravipalayam, Aathi Diravidar Street, Puliyur, Karur.
Represented by	Thiru. M. Thirugnanam, advocate for the accused.
Period of judicial custody already undergone by the accused, if any.	Date of Remand : 21.01.2022 Released on Bail : 25.01.2022
Charge-sheeted for the offences punishable under Sections	U/s.294(b) of IPC and 3 (1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992.
Charges framed by the Court against the accused	Charges framed against the Accused : 1 st charge against the accused for the offence u/s. 294(b) of IPC. 2 nd charge against the accused for the offence u/s. 3(1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992.
Plea of the accused while framing charges	Pleaded not guilty to the charges
Findings of the Court Result of the case and sentence awarded, if any	In fine, (i) The accused is acquitted from all the charges u/s 294(b) of IPC and 3 (1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 as per U/s. 235(1) of CRPC.

	<p>(ii) The bail bond executed by the accused shall stand cancelled.</p> <p>(iii) The properties MO.1 and MO.2 shall be destroyed after appeal period is over.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FORM B

Date of Offence	20.01.2022
Date of FIR	21.01.2022
Date of Charge Sheet	31.01.2022
Date of framing of Charges	09.04.2025
Date of Commencement of Evidence	09.02.2026
Date of the Judgment	09.03.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	09.03.2026

ACCUSED DETAILS

Rank of the Accused	A1
Name of the Accused	S. Hariharan
Date of Arrest	21.01.2022
Date of Release on bail	25.01.2022
Offence charged with	Charge against the accused U/s. 294(b) of IPC and 3(1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992.
Whether Acquitted or Convicted	Acquitted
Sentence imposed	<p>In fine,</p> <p>(i) The accused is acquitted from all the charges u/s 294(b) of IPC and 3 (1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 as per U/s. 235(1) of CRPC.</p> <p>(ii) The bail bond executed by the accused shall stand cancelled.</p> <p>(iii) The properties MO.1 and MO.2 shall</p>

	be destroyed after appeal period is over.
Period of Detention under gone during trial for purpose of Sec.428 of CRPC	Date of Remand : 21.01.2022 Released on Bail : 25.01.2022

This Sessions Case coming on 07.03.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.N. Senthilkumar, Public Prosecutor for the State and of Thiru. M. Thirugnanam, Advocate for accused and after hearing the arguments of both sides and upon perusing the relevant records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court pronounced the following

JUDGMENT

The Inspector of Police, Pasupathipalayam Police Station has filed a final report alleging that on 20.01.2022 at about 10.30 p.m., PW1 and PW2 were doing their duty as patrol at the Puliur street along with the check post police PW3 to check if all the shops were closed due to the ban imposed by the Tamil Nadu Government due to Corona Virus. Further, at that time, PW3 noticed and informed to the PW1 and PW2, that accused is making noise at check post and they came there and the accused also scolded the PW1 with filthy languages and caused damaged to the door and window glass at check post worth of Rs.5072/-. Hence, the accused has committed offence under Section 294(b) of IPC and section 3(1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992.

2. COGNIZANCE & COMMITTAL:

1. The learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur took cognizance against the above said accused in P.R.C.No. 06/2024 and the copies were furnished to him u/s 207 Cr.P.C.

2. On receipt of the final report alongwith the relevant records produced by the prosecution, the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur has taken the case on file in P.R.C.No.06/2024 and posted the case for appearance of the accused. The copies of

records under Section 207 Cr.P.C. with free of cost. Since the offence U/s 3(1) TNPPDL Act 1992 is exclusively triable by the Sessions Judge, the case was committed to this court under section 209(a) Cr.PC and the accused was directed to appear before this court for trial. On receipt of the records from the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Karur the case was taken on file by this court in Sessions case No.74/2024. After the appearance of the accused and on hearing both sides and after careful scrutiny of the documents, for trial and disposal and the charges were framed.

3. The charges were read over and explained to the accused. The Accused had denied the offence and pleaded not guilty to the charges framed against him.

3. OPENING OF PROSECUTION:

1. The prosecutor has opened the case of the prosecution as per Section 226 of Cr.P.C. Upon hearing the counsel and by perusing the case records, the prima facie case was made out and hence, the charges were framed.

4. CHARGES FRAMED AND COMMENCEMENT THE TRIAL:

1. Charges framed against the Accused :

1st charge against the accused for the offence u/s. 294(b) of IPC.

2nd charge against the accused for the offence u/s. 3(1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992.

2. The charges were read over and explained to the accused. The Accused has denied the offences and pleaded not guilty to the charges framed against him.

5. Gist of Charge is as follows:

1. On 20.01.2022 at about 10.30 p.m., PW1 and PW2 were doing their duty as patrol at the Puliur street along with the check post police PW3 to check if all the shops were closed due to the ban imposed by the Tamil Nadu Government due to Corona Virus. Further, at that time, PW3 noticed and informed to the PW1 and PW2, that accused is making noise at check post and they came there and the accused also scolded the PW1 with filthy languages and caused damaged to the door and window glass at check post worth of Rs.5072/-. Hence, the accused has committed offence

under Section 294(b) of IPC and section 3(1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992.

6.COMMENCEMENT OF TRIAL:

In order to prove the case of Prosecution, P.W.1 to P.W.8 were examined. Ex.P1 to Ex.P9 were marked. M.O.1 and M.O.2 were also marked. On the side of the accused no one was examined and no documents were marked.

7. THE PROSECUTION CASE, AS UNFOLDED BY THE PROSECUTION WITNESSES AS FOLLOWS :-

1. The PW1 Kandasamy, GR-I Police constable at Pasupathipalayam has deposed that, on 20.01.2022 he had been assigned beat duty for the areas of Puliur, Puravipalayam and Goundampalayam. On the same day at about 10.00 p.m., he along with Saravanan (PC No.210) went to the Puliur Out-Post Police Station and at that time Home Guard Senthilkumar (HG No.1596) was on duty at the said out-post. Since it was the COVID-19 period and restrictions imposed by the Government of Tamil Nadu were in force, they proceeded in different directions to verify whether the shops were closed after 10.00 p.m. as per the Government orders. After some time, the Senthilkumar contacted him over phone and informed that a person was shouting and creating nuisance at the Puliur Out-Post Police Station. At that time the accused Hariharan, on seeing them, abused them in filthy language by saying “கேனப்புண்ட மவனே” and the accused picked up a stone lying there and threw the same at the glass door and window panes of the out-post police station and broke them. The value of the damaged glasses would be around Rs.5,000/-. After damaging the glasses the accused ran away from the place. Subsequently he went to Pasupathipalayam Police Station and gave a complaint to the Sub-Inspector of Police. The complaint was marked as Ex.P1. The stone was marked as MO.1 and the broken glass pieces were marked as MO.2.

2. The PW 2 Saravanakumar GR-I Police constable at Pasupathipalayam has

deposed that, on 20.01.2022 he had been assigned beat duty for the areas of Puliur, Puravipalayam and Goundampalayam. At that time Home Guard Senthilkumar (HG No.1596) was on duty at the said out-post. Since it was the COVID-19 period and restrictions imposed by the Government of Tamil Nadu were in force, they proceeded in different directions to verify whether the shops were closed after 10.00 p.m. as per the Government orders. After some time, the Senthilkumar contacted him over phone and informed that a person was shouting and creating nuisance at the Puliur Out-Post Police Station. At that time the accused Hariharan, on seeing them, abused them in filthy language by saying “நீயெல்லாம் ஒரு ஆளு புண்டையாடா” and the accused picked up a stone lying there and threw the same at the glass door and window panes of the out-post police station and broke them. After damaging the glasses the accused ran away from the place. Subsequently he and PW.1 went to Pasupathipalayam Police Station and gave a complaint to the Sub-Inspector of Police.

3. PW.3 Chakravarthy, he has been running a shop in the name and style of “Raja Glass and Plywoods” for about 20 years. On 24.01.2022, in connection with Crime No.48/2022 of Pasupathipalayam Police Station, the Sub-Inspector of Police gave him a letter requesting him to assess the damage value of the broken door and window glasses. He went to the Puliur Out-Post Police Station and found that one door glass and one window glass were broken. He inspected the same, assessed the damage caused to the broken glasses and prepared a valuation report and submitted the same to the IO. The value of the damaged glasses were assessed by him at Rs.5,072/- and that he submitted a report to that effect. The damage report was marked as Ex. P3.

4. PW 4 Senthilkumar, On 20.01.2022, he had gone on duty to the Puliur Outpost. On that day, Kandasamy and Saravanakumar were also on duty at the said outpost. At about 10.30 p.m., the accused Hariharan took a stone and broke the door and window glass of the check post. Further, while throwing the stone, the accused abused him and the other police in filthy language. As a result of which the window glass was broken. Further, the main glass door was also damaged. Thereafter, he

informed Kandasamy over phone. Subsequently, Kandasamy and Saravanakumar came to the place. On seeing the police, the accused again abused them in filthy language and thereafter ran away from the place. Thereafter, Police Constable Kandasamy informed the Inspector of Police of Pasupathipalayam Police Station over phone.

5. PW.5 Chitambaram and PW.6 Thangaraj stated that, no stone or glass pieces were seized in their presence. On 21.01.2022 night, information was received that a load of chickens would be arriving. Two days after the occurrence the police enquired them and obtained their signature in seizure mahazar. The 1st and 2nd signature in sizer mahazar are marked as Ex.P4 and P5.

6. On 20.01.2022 PW 7 Tr.Chandrasekaran, Sub-inspector of Police at Pasupathypalayam, Karur. While he was in duty the PW 1 Kandasamy appeared before him and given written complaint, On receipt of the complaint he has registered a FIR Pasupathypalayam Police Station Crime No 48 of 2022 exhibit P 6 and case registered under sections 294(b) of IPC and 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992. Thereafter he had sent the complaint and FIR to the Judicial Magistrate No.1 Karur.

7. PW 8 Senthilkumar, Inspector of Police, he has stated that on 31.01.2022 while he was working as Inspector of Police in Pasupathypalayam Police Station, Karur, he has took Crime No 48 of 2022 and case registered under sections 294(b) of IPC and 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992. Before him, the then Sub-Inspector Mr. Chandrasekar, had already prepared the Observation Mahazar and the Rough Sketch. Since the same were found to be correct, he did not prepare any further documents. The Observation Mahazar was marked as Ex.P.7 and the Rough Sketch was marked as Ex.P.8. The Seizure Mahazar was marked as Ex.P.9. Sub-Inspector Mr. Chandrasekar had examined Kandasamy, Saravanakumar, Senthilkumar and Chakravarthi and recorded their statements. Further he did not record any further statements. Thereafter, he examined Mr. Chakravarthi, who had issued the damage assessment certificate, and recorded

his statement. He also examined Sub-Inspector Mr. Chandrasekar and recorded his statement. Thereafter, on the same day, he filed the final report against the accused under Sections 294(b) IPC and Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act.

8. PW 5 and 6 are treated as hostile witnesses.

9. After completing prosecution evidence incriminating evidence against the accused were post to him u/s.313(1)(b) of Cr.P.C.,

On closing the prosecution side evidence on 07.03.2026 under section 313(2) (b) CrPC question was posed to the accused, he has answered the same and stated he has no defense witnesses to examine on his side.

10.The Points for consideration in this case are as follows:-

1) Whether the accused has scolded the PW1 in filthy language so as to attract section 294(b) of IPC ?

2) Whether the prosecution has proved the offences u/s.294(b) of IPC and section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 leveled against the Accused beyond reasonable doubt?

3) If case is proved beyond all reasonable doubt, quantum of punishment ?

4) Whether the victim is entitled for compensation u/s section 357 (a) of Cr.P.C?

5) Whether the accused is entitled for compensation u/s section 358 of Cr.P.C?

6) Whether the properties to be returned, confiscated or destroyed?

11. The prosecutor has orally argued and filed written arguments in line with the prosecution case.

Arguments of Public Prosecutor in brief :

The arguments of he Public Prosecutor is that even though the PW 5 and PW.6 turned hostile On considering the evidence of PW 1 to PW.4 alone the charges are proved. Further PW 4 has stated that there was a dispute on 20.01.2022, and his evidence is corroborated with the evidence of PW1 and PW.2. And prayed that the accused should be punished of his crimes.

Arguments of Defence Counsel in brief :

The defense counsel argued that the seizure witnesses are turned as hostile. Hence, the property was not recovered from the scene of occurrence. Further, a medical shop and an ATM are located near the outpost. At the time of occurrence, CCTV were installed and their footage recorded in those cameras was not produced before the Court. Further there is no corroborative evidence available and the recovery witness PW 5 and PW 6 have totally not supported the case of prosecution. Hence prayed for acquittal.

12. Answering Point No.1 to 3:

1. On 20.01.2022 PW 7 Tr.Chandrasekaran, Sub-inspector of Police at Pasupathpalayam, Karur. While he was in duty the PW 1 Kandasamy appeared before him and given written complaint, On receipt of the complaint he has registered a FIR Pasupathpalayam Police Station Crime No 48 of 2022 exhibit P 6 and case registered under sections 294(b) of IPC and 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992. Thereafter he had sent the complaint and FIR to the Judicial Magistrate No.1 Karur.

2. The PW1 Kandasamy, GR-I Police constable at Pasupathpalayam has deposed that, on 20.01.2022 he had been assigned beat duty for the areas of Puliur, Puravipalayam and Goundampalayam. On the same day at about 10.00 p.m., he along with Saravanan (PC No.210) went to the Puliur Out-Post Police Station and at that time Home Guard Senthilkumar (HG No.1596) was on duty at the said out-post. Since it was the COVID-19 period and restrictions imposed by the Government of Tamil Nadu were in force, they proceeded in different directions to verify whether the shops were closed after 10.00 p.m. as per the Government orders. After some time, the Senthilkumar contacted him over phone and informed that a person was shouting and creating nuisance at the Puliur Out-Post Police Station. At that time the accused Hariharan, on seeing them, abused them in filthy language by saying “கேனப்புண்ட மவனே” and the accused picked up a stone lying there and threw the same at the

glass door and window panes of the out-post police station and broke them. The value of the damaged glasses would be around Rs.5,000/-. After damaging the glasses the accused ran away from the place. Subsequently he went to Pasupathipalayam Police Station and gave a complaint to the Sub-Inspector of Police. The complaint was marked as Ex.P1. The stone was marked as MO.1 and the broken glass pieces were marked as MO.2.

3. The PW 2 Saravanakumar GR-I Police constable at Pasupathipalayam has deposed that on 20.01.2022 he had been assigned beat duty for the areas of Puliur, Puravipalayam and Goundampalayam. At that time Home Guard Senthilkumar (HG No.1596) was on duty at the said out-post. Since it was the COVID-19 period and restrictions imposed by the Government of Tamil Nadu were in force, they proceeded in different directions to verify whether the shops were closed after 10.00 p.m. as per the Government orders. After some time, the Senthilkumar contacted him over phone and informed that a person was shouting and creating nuisance at the Puliur Out-Post Police Station. At that time the accused Hariharan, on seeing them, abused them in filthy language by saying “நீயெல்லாம் ஒரு ஆளு புண்டையாடா” and the accused picked up a stone lying there and threw the same at the glass door and window panes of the out-post police station and broke them. After damaging the glasses the accused ran away from the place. Subsequently he and PW.1 went to Pasupathipalayam Police Station and gave a complaint to the Sub-Inspector of Police.

4. PW 4 Senthilkumar, On 20.01.2022, he had gone on duty to the Puliur Outpost. On that day, Kandasamy and Saravanakumar were also on duty at the said outpost. At about 10.30 p.m., the accused Hariharan took a stone and broke the door and window glass of the check post. Further, while throwing the stone, the accused abused him and the other police in filthy language. As a result of which the window glass was broken. Further, the main glass door was also damaged. Thereafter, he informed Kandasamy over phone. Subsequently, Kandasamy and Saravanakumar came to the place. On seeing the police, the accused again abused them in filthy language and thereafter ran away from the place. Thereafter, Police Constable

Kandasamy informed the Inspector of Police of Pasupathipalayam Police Station over phone.

5. From the evidence of PW.1, PW.2 and PW.4, it is seen that PW.4 was present at the scene of occurrence. PW.4 has deposed that he telephoned PW.1 and informed him that one person was making noise and had thrown a stone and broken the door and window glass of the check post. Thereafter, PW.1 and PW.2 went to the scene of occurrence.

5.1. It is further stated that when the accused Hariharan saw them, he abused them in filthy language by stating “நீயெல்லாம் ஒரு ஆளு புண்டையாடா”. Thereafter, the accused picked up a stone lying there and threw it at the glass door and window panes of the outpost police station, causing them to break. After the occurrence, the accused fled away from the scene.

5.2. Subsequently, PW.1 lodged a complaint, which was marked as Ex.P2. PW.1 also identified the broken glass pieces, which were marked as MO.2. PW.2 has also deposed in similar lines and corroborated the evidence of PW.1 to the extent that the accused picked up a stone lying there and threw it at the glass door and window panes of the outpost police station. PW.4 Senthilkumar has also stated that the accused Hariharan took a stone and broke the door and window glass of the check post and thereafter informed PW.1 and PW.2 over phone, upon which they came to the scene of occurrence.

5.3. However, certain contradictions are noticed in the evidence of these witnesses. PW.1 has stated that the accused threw a stone and broke both the window glass and the glass door. On the other hand, PW.2 has stated that only the glass door was broken. Per contra, PW.4 has stated that the accused threw a stone into the outpost and broke both the window glass and the glass door. Therefore, the versions of PW.1, PW.2 and PW.4 with regard to the manner in which the damage was caused are not consistent and contain contradictions.

5.4. Furthermore, Ex.P2 complaint shows that PW.1 had given a written complaint to the police station on 21.01.2022. It reveals that on 20.01.2022 at about

10.30 p.m., PW.2 went to the outpost based on the call made by PW.4 and a complaint was given on 21.01.2022 at 00.30 hours. Ex.P6 FIR further shows that the case was registered on 21.01.2022 at 00.30 hours and the said complaint was also received at the same time. However, the evidence of PW.4 Senthilkumar shows that he had informed PW.1 about the incident and had also given an oral complaint to the Inspector of Police, Pasupathipalayam Police Station, through phone. Thus, there appears to be a contradiction regarding the receipt of the complaint. The oral information allegedly given by PW.4 to the Inspector of Police, Pasupathipalayam, through phone appears to be the first information, which was prior to the written complaint marked as Ex.P2. However, no steps appear to have been taken on the basis of the said earlier information.

5.5. Therefore, this creates a doubt regarding the origin of the complaint and shakes the foundation of the prosecution case. Further, PW.1 has also stated that he had telephoned and informed the Inspector of Police, Pasupathipalayam, about the incident and thereafter submitted the written complaint at about 11.30 p.m. This circumstance also creates doubt regarding the genuineness of the complaint and affects the credibility of the prosecution case.

5.6. In this aspect, the prosecution has remained silent. Hence, a doubt arises as to whether there were two complaints received from PW.1 and whether the earlier complaint was suppressed by the prosecution. In this regard, reliance can be placed on the decision in *Sheik Meheboob @ Hetak and others Vs. State of Maharashtra*, reported in *2005 (2) TNL R 162 (SC)*.

6. PW.3 Chakravarthy, he has been running a shop in the name and style of "Raja Glass and Plywoods" for about 20 years. On 24.01.2022, in connection with Crime No.48/2022 of Pasupathipalayam Police Station, the Sub-Inspector of Police gave him a letter requesting him to assess the damage value of the broken door and window glasses. He went to the Puliyur Out-Post Police Station and found that one door glass and one window glass were broken. He inspected the same, assessed the damage caused to the broken glasses and prepared a valuation report and submitted

the same to the IO. The value of the damaged glasses was assessed by him at Rs.5,072/- and that he submitted a report to that effect. The damage report was marked as Ex. P3.

7. PW.5 Chitambaram and PW.6 Thangaraj stated that, no stone or glass pieces were seized in their presence. On 21.01.2022 night, information was received that a l load of chickens would be arriving. Two days after the occurrence the police enquired them and obtained their signature in seizure mahazar. The 1st and 2nd signature in sizer mahazar are marked as Ex.P4 and P5. They were treated as hostile witnesses. From the evidence of PW.5 and PW.6 were turned as hostile with respect to the complaint given by the PW.1. It is also creates doubt of the prosecution case.

8. Further, during the cross-examination of PW.1 and PW.2, they have stated that MO.1 stone was found outside the outpost. If really the stone had been thrown through the window and had broken the glass window, it ought to have fallen inside the outpost station. However, in the present case, MO.1 stone was found outside the outpost station.

8.1. Therefore, the evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 in this regard creates doubt about the manner of occurrence as alleged by the prosecution. This contradiction creates a serious doubt as to whether the stone was actually thrown in the manner stated by the prosecution witnesses. Hence, this circumstance also creates doubt in the prosecution case and affects the credibility of the evidence of PW.1 and PW.2.

8.2. From the evidence of PW.3, it is seen that the damage assessment report was prepared and submitted by him. According to PW.3, MO.2 consists of 5 mm glass. However, in the damage assessment report he has assessed the damage on the basis of 6 mm glass. It is pertinent to note that the cost of 5 mm glass is lesser than that of 6 mm glass. Nevertheless, PW.3 has assessed the damage to a sum of Rs.5,072/-.

8.3. Further, there is no corroborative evidence available to support the evidence of PW.3 regarding the assessment of damage. Moreover, the recovery witnesses, namely PW.5 and PW.6, have not supported the case of the prosecution

and have turned hostile. Hence, the evidence of PW.3 regarding the damage assessment cannot be safely relied upon.

8.4. Further, PW.1 has stated that the accused abused them in filthy language by uttering the words “கேனப்புண்ட மவனே”. On the other hand, PW.2 has stated that the accused abused them in filthy language by saying “நீயெல்லாம் ஒரு ஆளு புண்டையாடா”. However, PW.4, who was also stated to be present at the place of occurrence, has not stated anything about the accused using any filthy or abusive language.

8.5. Therefore, there is a clear contradiction in the evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 with regard to the exact words allegedly uttered by the accused. Further, the silence of PW.4 regarding the alleged abusive words creates doubt about the prosecution version. Hence, this inconsistency also affects the credibility of the prosecution case.

8.6. From the above discussions, the prosecution has not proved the charges beyond all reasonable doubts. Therefore the Prosecution has not proved the charges 294(b) of IPC, section 3(1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 beyond all reasonable doubt and hence the accused is acquitted from all the charges. Accordingly points No 1 to 3 are answered.

13. Answering to the Point No.4:

Case on hand the prosecution has incurred Rs. 5,072/- loss and has not proved the charges beyond all reasonable doubts and the question of the victim does not arise u/s 357(a) of Cr.P.C. Accordingly point No 4 is answered.

14. Answering to the Point No.5:

The accused herein has not claimed any compensation, nor while cross examination of the Investigation officer, he has not also put any questions to this effect. Since, he has not claimed any compensation for his arrest and detention, I am not inclined to grant any compensation in this section 358 of Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the point No. 5 is answered.

15. Answering Point No. 6:

The MO.1 stone and MO 2 broken glass window and door pieces, which do not have any value and hence these material objects may be destroyed after appeal period is over. Accordingly, the point No. 6 is answered.

In fine,

(i) The accused is acquitted from all the charges u/s 294(b) of IPC and 3 (1) of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 as per U/s. 235(1) of CRPC.

(ii) The bail bond executed by the accused shall stand cancelled.

(iii) The properties MO.1 and MO.2 shall be destroyed after appeal period is over.

Dictated to the Steno-typist, she typed directly on the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 09th day of March, 2026.

**DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
KARUR.**

LIST OF WITNESSES AND EXHIBITS**Witnesses on behalf of Prosecution:-**

PW1	Kandasamy
PW2	Saravanakumar
PW3	Sakkaravarthi
PW4	Senthilkumar
PW5	Chithamparam
PW6	Thangaraj
PW7	Chandrasekaran
PW8	Thiru. Senthilkumar

Exhibits on behalf of Prosecution:-

Ex.P1	20.01.2022	Complaint
-------	------------	-----------

Ex.P2	20.01.2022	Complainant's signature in the Complaint
Ex.P3	24.01.2022	Raja Glass and plywoods bill for the damaged glasses worth of Rs.5072/-
Ex.P4	24.01.2022	1 st Signature in the Sizer Mahazar
Ex.P5	24.01.2022	2 nd Signature in the Sizer Mahazar
Ex.P6	21.01.2022	FIR
Ex.P7	21.01.2022	Observation Mahazar
Ex.P8	21.01.2022	Rough Sketch
Ex.P9	21.01.2022	Seizer Mahazar

Material Objects on behalf of Prosecution:-

M.O.1	Small Stone piece of one
M.O.2	Damaged glass window and door pieces

List of Witnesses, exhibits on behalf of Defence:- NIL

List of Documents marked through Court:- NIL

**DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
KARUR.**

ANNEXURE-II
CASE SUMMARY

(in S.C.No.74/2024)

i	The period of remand of the accused ;	21.01.2022		
ii	The date of filing of the final report in the case ;	31.01.2022		
iii	The date of committal of the case to the Court of Sessions;			
iv	The date of questioning of the accused u/s 228 of the Cr.P.C. as the case may be ;	-----		
v	Filing of all miscellaneous petitions and their results including the results on challenge before superior Courts;except routine petitions like petitions u/s 317 of the Code;	CrI. M.P.No.	Result	Result in Superior Courts
		----	====	----
vi	Date of examination in chief and cross examination of a witness;	P.Ws. No.	Date of Chief examination	Date of Cross examination
		1	09.02.2026	09.02.2026
		2	09.02.2026	09.02.2026
		3	09.02.2026	09.02.2026
		4	13.02.2026	13.02.2026
		5	13.02.2026	13.02.2026
		6	13.02.2026	13.02.2026
		7	13.02.2026	13.02.2026
		8	07.03.2026	07.03.2026
vii	Date of examination of the accused u/s 313 of the Code;	07.03.2026		
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	---
----	----------------------------------------------------------	-----