

**IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE, KILVELUR.**

Present : R. MEENAKSHI, M.L.,
District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kilvelur.

On Wednesday, the 22nd day of July 2026

S.T.C. No. 67 of 2026
In
Crime No. 82 of 2025
(Velankanni PS, Nagapattinam Dt.)

CNR.No. TNNG16-000331-2026

State rep by its

Inspector of Police,

Velankanni Police Station,

Nagapattinam Dt.,

(Crime No. 82 of 2025)

.. **Complainant**

/Vs/

Greaton @ Rosary Greaton (M/30 years)

S/o. Ganesan,

Aariyanattu Vadakku Theru,

Velankanni.

.. **Accused**

<i>Statement as per Rule 106 of Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019</i>
--

1.	Case Number	S.T.C. No. 67 of 2026
2.	Name of the Police Station and Crime Number	Crime No. 82 of 2025 (Velankanni PS., Nagapattinam Dt.)
3.	Name of the Accused	Greaton @ Rosary Greaton (M/30 years.
4.	Father's Name	Ganesan

5.	Occupation	Coolie
6.	Residence	Aariyanattu Vadakku Theru, Velankanni.
7.	Age	30/2026
8.	Date of Occurrence	19.02.2025
9.	Date of Complaint	20.02.2025
10.	Date of Apprehension	02.03.2026
11.	Date of Release on Bail	Accused is in Judicial Custody.
12.	Date of Commitment	Not applicable
13.	Date of Commencement of Trial (The date of furnishing of documents u/s.230 of BNSS)	20.04.2026
14.	Closure of Trial	02.07.2026
15.	Sentence or Order	In result, accused, Greateon @ Rosary Greateon (M/30 years) S/o. Ganesan is found guilty for the offence u/s. 269 of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and CONVICTED of the offence under section 269 of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita,2023 in accordance with section 278(2) of Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and sentenced to Simple Imprisonment for a term of 3 [Three] months. The period of incarceration already undergone by the accused as undertrial from 02.03.2026 to 30.05.2026 shall be set off against the sentence of imprisonment imposed in the present case as per section 468 of

		BNSS.
16.	Service of copy of judgment or Finding on accused	Yes
17.	Explanation of delay	NA

This case came up for final hearing before me in the presence of Mr. K. Sukumaran, B.Sc., B.L., Advocate, learned counsel for the accused and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for the State, having heard both sides, perused the records and having stood over it for consideration, this Court on 22.07.2026 delivers the following,

JUDGMENT

1. CASE OF THE PROSECUTION

1.1. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that the accused herein was arrayed as the second accused in Crime No.288 of 2022 of Velankanni Police Station, which was taken on file as S.C.No.6 of 2023 on the file of the Hon'ble District and Sessions Court, Nagapattinam. During the pendency of the Sessions Case, the accused was enlarged on bail subject to the conditions imposed by the Sessions Court.

1.2. According to the prosecution, when the Sessions Case was posted for trial on 18.02.2025, the accused failed to appear before the Sessions Court in accordance with the terms of the bail granted to him. Consequently, the Hon'ble Sessions Judge issued a Non - Bailable Warrant against him. Even thereafter, the accused neither

surrendered before the Sessions Court nor took steps to have the warrant recalled. He continuously remained absent from the Court proceedings, thereby preventing the Sessions Court from proceeding with the trial, examining the witnesses and bringing the Sessions Case to its logical conclusion.

1.3. PW1, who was attached to the Sessions Court for Court duty, therefore submitted a written complaint requesting initiation of criminal proceedings against the accused for failure to appear before the Court. On the basis of the said complaint, a case in Crime No.82 of 2025 under Section 269 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita came to be registered. Upon completion of investigation, the final report was laid before this Court.

1.4. At the completion of investigation in the case, Final Report dated 28.02.2026 was laid out against the accused, Greateon @ Rosary Greateon, (M/30 years) S/o. Ganesan for the offences u/s.269 of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

1. FURNISHING OF COPIES U/S.230 OF BNSS TO THE ACCUSED

Upon perusal of the complaint appended therewith, this Court was convinced that there were sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused. Hence summons was issued to the accused herein. On his appearance, copies served on the accused on 09.04.2026 in accordance with section 230 of BNSS.

2. SUBSTANCE OF ACCUSATION AND PLEA OF ACCUSED

3.1. Upon service of the summons U/s. 227 of BNSS and appearance of the accused; copies of the final report and documents were given to the accused in compliance with section 230 of BNSS, Thereafter, the substance of accusation U/s. 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 was read out and explained to accused as per section 274 of BNSS on 15.04.2026.

3.2. When the accused was questioned on the accusation, he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The plea of the accused was recorded and case was posted for trial in accordance with section 277(1) of BNSS.

3. EVIDENCE ADDUCED BY THE PROSECUTION

During the trial, the side of the prosecution, out of 6 witnesses mentioned in the list of witnesses, were examined as P.W.1 to P.W.6. Ex.P1 to Ex.P3 were marked. P.W.1 is the de-facto complainant in this case. P.W.2, P.W.4, are cited as the eye witness. P.W.3 is a witness to Formal Arrest of Accused. P.W.5 and P.W.6 are the investigating officer, who deposed about lodging of Special report from the complainant, registration of First Information Report and Non-Bailable Warrant issued by Hon'ble District and Sessions Judge, Nagapattinam. and filing of final report.

4. QUESTIONING U/S.351(1)(b) OF BHARATIYA NAGARIK SURAKSHA SANHITA, 2023

After the prosecution evidence, the accused was questioned as to incriminating materials appearing against him in terms of section 351 (1) (b) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and he denied the same as false. However, he did not adduce any evidence on his side.

5. ARGUMENTS OF BOTH SIDE

6.1. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor contended that the oral evidence of PW1 to PW6, read along with Ex.P1 to Ex.P3, clearly establishes that the accused, after having been released on bail in the Sessions Case, deliberately failed to appear before the Sessions Court in accordance with the terms of the bail. It was further submitted that despite issuance of the Non-Bailable Warrant, the accused continued to remain absent and thereby obstructed the progress of the Sessions Case. The prosecution therefore prayed that the accused be convicted under Section 269 of the Bharatiya NyayaSanhita.

6.2. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the accused filed written arguments and contended that the prosecution has failed to establish the essential ingredients of the offence under Section 269 BNS beyond reasonable doubt. The learned defence counsel primarily contended that mere non-appearance of the accused before the Sessions Court would not, by itself, constitute an offence under

Section 269 BNS unless the prosecution establishes that such failure to appear was without sufficient cause. It was argued that the evidence elicited during the cross-examination of the prosecution witnesses, particularly with regard to the illness of the accused and his alleged treatment at Chennai, creates a reasonable possibility of sufficient cause for his non-appearance.

6.3. It was further contended that the accused had allegedly informed his counsel about his medical condition and his absence, but that the counsel had subsequently withdrawn the vakalat without informing the accused. According to the defence, the accused therefore cannot be held responsible for his non-appearance before the Sessions Court. It was further argued that the accused had been subjected to several criminal cases and that the present case was also foisted against him due to previous enmity with the police. It was therefore contended that the prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt and that the accused is entitled to acquittal.

6. POINT FOR DETERMINATION

- Whether the prosecution has proved beyond all reasonable doubts that the accused has committed the offences charged against him?
- If proved what shall be the sentence?

7. APPRECIATION OF EVIDENCE AND FACTS

8.1. The case of the prosecution is that the accused, who was the 2nd accused in S.C.No.6 of 2023 on the file of the Hon'ble District and Sessions Court, Nagapattinam, having been released on bail, failed to appear before the said Court on 18.02.2025, when the case was taken up for trial, and thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 269 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

8.2. The learned defence counsel, by filing written arguments, has seriously disputed the prosecution case. The main contentions of the defence are that the prosecution has failed to establish the essential ingredients of Section 269 BNS; i) that there is no satisfactory evidence regarding the terms of the alleged bail; ii) that the accused had sufficient cause for his absence; iii) that the accused was suffering from jaundice and had gone to Chennai for treatment; iv) that his counsel had withdrawn the vakalat without informing him; that the FIR was belatedly forwarded to the Court; v) that there are material discrepancies regarding the date of issuance and receipt of the Non-Bailable Warrant; vi) that the investigation was defective and mechanical; and that the present case was foisted against the accused due to previous enmity. Therefore, the evidence has to be carefully appreciated with reference to each ingredient of the offence.

8.3. The essential ingredients which the prosecution is required to establish are:

- (i) that the accused had been charged with an offence;

- (ii) that he had been released on bail on bond;
- (iii) that, in accordance with the terms of such bail or bond, he was required to appear before the court;
- (iv) that he failed to appear before the Court; and
- (v) that such failure was without sufficient cause.

The prosecution must establish the foundational facts constituting the offence beyond reasonable doubt. The statutory provision relating to sufficient cause also has to be applied to the facts and circumstances established by the evidence.

9. Whether the accused was facing a criminal case before the Sessions Court

9.1. PW1 has spoken about the pendency of S.C.No.6 of 2023 and the fact that the accused was arrayed as the 2nd accused therein. PW3 has also spoken about the proceedings before the Sessions Court. The evidence of PW1 and PW3, read along with Ex.P3 – the Non-Bailable Warrant, establishes that the accused was facing criminal proceedings before the Hon'ble District and Sessions Court, Nagapattinam.

9.2. The accused has also not seriously disputed the fact that he was an accused in the said Sessions Case. In fact, the entire defence proceeds on the footing that he was represented by an advocate before the Sessions Court and that his absence on the relevant date was due to the circumstances projected by the defence.

Therefore, this Court finds that the fact that the accused was facing criminal prosecution before the learned Sessions Court stands established.

10. *Whether the accused failed to appear before the Sessions Court*

10.1. PW1 has deposed that the accused failed to appear before the Sessions Court on 18.02.2025. PW5 has also deposed that, on the said date, the accused did not appear and that a Non-Bailable Warrant was issued. The Investigating Officer has admitted during cross-examination:

“அமர்வு நீதிமன்ற வழக்கில் பிடியாணை பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்ட அன்று சாட்சிகள் விசாரணை நடைபெற்றது என்றால் சரிதான்.” He has further admitted: “பிடியாணை பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்ட தேதி 18.02.2025.”

Thus, the evidence establishes that the Sessions Case was taken up for trial on 18.02.2025 and that the accused was absent, resulting in the issuance of a Non-Bailable Warrant. The said fact is further corroborated by Ex.P3.

10.2. The defence has pointed out that PW1 obtained the warrant only on 19.02.2025. PW4 has stated:

“அ.சா.1 எந்த தேதியில் தனி அறிக்கை அளித்தார் என்றால் 19.02.2025-ம் தேதியில் கொடுத்தார்.” PW4 has further stated that PW1 obtained the warrant on 19.02.2025.

10.3. PW5 has also stated that PW1 obtained the warrant on 19.02.2025 and submitted it along with the special report. The defence has therefore contended that there is inconsistency regarding the date of the warrant. However, the evidence as a whole shows that the warrant was issued on 18.02.2025, whereas PW1 obtained the warrant from the Sessions Court on 19.02.2025. These are two separate events. Therefore, the said discrepancy does not create a material contradiction affecting the factum of non-appearance. Accordingly, this Court finds that the prosecution has established that the accused was absent before the Sessions Court on 18.02.2025 and that, consequent upon such absence, a Non-Bailable Warrant was issued.

11. Whether the failure to appear was without sufficient cause ?

11.1. The most important question is whether the accused had sufficient cause for his non-appearance. The defence has suggested to PW5 that:

“2025-ம் ஆண்டு பிப்ரவரி மாதம் வாக்கில் எதிரி மஞ்சள் காமாலை நோயால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டு சிகிச்சைக்காக சென்னைக்கு செல்ல இருந்ததால் தனது வழக்கறிஞரிடம் தெரிவித்து சென்றார் என்றும், அவரின் வழக்கறிஞருக்கு அவர் மீது இருந்த கோபத்தால் எதிரிக்கு தெரிவிக்காமல் அவருடைய வக்காலத்தை திரும்ப பெற்றுக் கொண்டார்...” PW5 has denied the said suggestion.

11.2. Similarly, the Investigation Officer has been confronted with the same defence version. The Investigation Officer has stated that he does not know about

such circumstances and has denied the suggestion that the accused was falsely implicated. At this juncture, it is necessary to bear in mind the distinction between a suggestion put to a witness and an admission made by the witness.

11.3. The above statement regarding jaundice, treatment at Chennai and withdrawal of vakalat is only a defence suggestion put to PW5 and the Investigation Officer. Neither witness has admitted the truth of those facts. Therefore, the said suggestion, by itself, cannot be treated as substantive evidence establishing the existence of sufficient cause. However, the fact that the suggestion was put consistently to the prosecution witnesses is a circumstance showing that the defence had taken a specific stand regarding the reason for the accused's absence. The Court must therefore examine whether that defence version is otherwise supported by the evidence available on record.

12. Whether the accused established the alleged illness and treatment & Defence contention regarding withdrawal of vakalat ?

12.1. The accused has not produced any medical record, prescription, discharge summary or other documentary material to show that he was suffering from jaundice on 18.02.2025 or that he was undergoing treatment at Chennai. No doctor has been examined on behalf of the accused. No independent witness has been examined to establish that the accused was actually in Chennai for medical treatment on the relevant date. Thus, the defence version regarding jaundice and

treatment at Chennai remains a contention which has not been substantiated by acceptable evidence.

12.2. The defence has also contended that the accused had informed his counsel about his circumstances but that the counsel, due to personal hostility, withdrew the vakalat without informing the accused. The Investigation Officer has stated:

“18.02.2025-ம் தேதியில் அமர்வு நீதிமன்றத்தில் எதிரியின் வழக்கறிஞர் தனது வக்காலத்தை திரும்ப பெற்றதால் தான் பிடியாணை பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்டது என்றால் அது குறித்து எனக்கு தெரியாது.” This is not an admission that the advocate did withdraw the vakalat. It is only an admission of lack of knowledge on the part of the Investigation Officer. Therefore, this evidence does not establish the defence version.

12.3. More importantly, there is no material before this Court to show that the accused took any immediate steps before the Sessions Court to explain his absence or to establish that he was unaware of the proceedings. The next date in the Sessions Case, according to the evidence of the Investigation Officer, was 11.03.2025. The Investigation Officer has stated:

“அமர்வு நீதிமன்றத்தில் பிடியாணை பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்டு அடுத்த வாய்தா எப்போது போடப்பட்டது என்றால் 11.03.2025 ஆகும்.”

Therefore, the accused had an opportunity to approach the Sessions Court and explain the circumstances of his absence. However, no material has been produced before this Court to establish that he had taken such steps. Thus, the defence contention regarding withdrawal of vakalat cannot, in the absence of supporting evidence, be accepted as sufficient cause.

12.4. The defence has strongly relied upon the delay in forwarding the FIR. PW5 has admitted: “முதல் தகவல் அறிக்கையில் ... காவல் நிலையத்திற்கு தகவல் கிடைத்த நாள்: 20.02.2025, 19.00 மணி என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான்.” He has further admitted: “முதல் தகவல் அறிக்கை 24.02.2025-ம் தேதி காலை 10.30 நீதிமன்றத்தில் பெறப்பட்டது என்றால் சரிதான்.” Most importantly, he has admitted: “காலதாமதத்திற்கு குறிப்பிட்டு எந்த காரணமும் இல்லை என்றால் சரிதான்.”

Thus, there is an admitted delay between the registration of the FIR and its receipt by the Court, and the prosecution has not offered any specific explanation for the delay. This circumstance certainly requires consideration. However, the delay in forwarding the FIR, by itself, does not necessarily establish that the prosecution case is false. The Court has to examine whether such delay affects the core prosecution case or creates a reasonable possibility of fabrication.

12.5. In the present case, Ex.P3 is the Non-Bailable Warrant issued by the Sessions Court. The defence has not established that Ex.P3 is a fabricated document or that the warrant was not issued by the Hon'ble District and Sessions Court, Nagapattinam.

Therefore, though the delay is an irregularity and the absence of an explanation is a weakness in the prosecution case, it cannot, by itself, disprove the fact that the accused was absent before the Sessions Court and that the warrant was issued.

12.6. The Investigating Officer has admitted: “வேளாங்கண்ணி காவல் நிலையத்தில் வழக்கு கால கட்டத்தில் பல வழக்குகளில் பிடியாணை பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்டு நிலுவையில் இருந்தது என்றால் சரிதான்.” He has further admitted: “நீண்ட நாட்களாக நிலுவையில் உள்ள பிடியாணை வழக்குகளில் சட்டப்பிரிவு 269 BNS பிரிவின் படி வழக்கு பதியப்பட்டுள்ளது.”

12.7. This evidence shows that several warrants were pending during the relevant period and that cases under Section 269 BNS had been registered in respect of long-pending warrants. The defence has relied upon this admission to contend that the present case was registered mechanically as part of a general police action. This Court finds that the said admission by itself does not establish that the present accused did not commit the offence. However, it is certainly a relevant circumstance while appreciating the investigation.

12.8. The prosecution cannot obtain a conviction merely because the accused had a pending warrant. The prosecution must independently establish the statutory ingredients of Section 269 BNS in the present case.

Therefore, the fact that similar cases were registered against other persons does not dispense with the requirement of proving the present charge.

13. Investigation regarding the accused.

13.1. The Investigating Officer has admitted: “எதிரியை எங்கெல்லாம் தேடினார்கள் என்று குறிப்பிட்டு சொல்ல முடியுமா என்றாலும், வழக்கு நாட்குறிப்பில் அது குறித்த குறிப்பு எதுவும் உள்ளதா என்றாலும், ஆய்வாளர் அது குறித்து குறிப்பு எதுவும் எழுதவில்லை.”

Thus, the Investigating Officer has admitted that the case diary does not contain specific details regarding the places where the accused was allegedly searched for. This is a clear lapse in investigation. However, the offence under Section 269 BNS is concerned primarily with the failure of the accused to appear before the Court in accordance with the terms of bail or bond. The subsequent failure of the police to trace the accused properly does not, by itself, disprove his earlier non-appearance.

13.2. Nevertheless, the Court cannot ignore the said lapse altogether. It has to be considered while assessing the overall reliability of the prosecution case. The allegation of mechanical investigation. The defence has suggested to the Investigating Officer:

“இந்த வழக்கை நான் முறையாக புலன் விசாரணை செய்யாமல் எதிரிக்கு எதிராக இயந்திர கதியில் செயல்பட்டு இந்த இறுதி அறிக்கை தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளது...”

13.3. The Investigating Officer has denied the said suggestion. The expression “இயந்திர கதியில்” means that the investigation was allegedly carried out mechanically, without proper application of mind. The mere suggestion having been denied cannot by itself establish mechanical investigation. However, when the said suggestion is considered along with the admitted facts that the case diary did not contain details of the efforts made to trace the accused and that the FIR reached the Court after a delay for which no specific reason has been given, the investigation cannot be said to be free from procedural lapses. Nevertheless, the question before this Court is whether such lapses are sufficient to create a reasonable doubt regarding the core allegation that the accused failed to appear before the Sessions Court.

13.4. The defence has also suggested that the police had previous enmity against the accused and that several false cases had been registered against him. The Investigating Officer has denied the same. It is true that the Investigating Officer has admitted that three Arms Act cases had been registered against the accused at

Velankanni Police Station. However, the mere existence of other criminal cases does not establish false implication in the present case. The defence has not produced independent evidence to establish that the police fabricated Ex.P3 or that the Sessions Court did not in fact issue the Non-Bailable Warrant. Hence, the allegation of previous enmity, by itself, does not discredit the documentary evidence regarding the issuance of the warrant.

14. Whether the prosecution has proved “without sufficient cause”

14.1. The prosecution has established the factum of the accused’s absence before the Sessions Court on 18.02.2025 and the consequent issuance of the Non-Bailable Warrant. However, the defence has raised a specific explanation, namely that the accused was suffering from jaundice and had gone to Chennai for treatment and that his counsel had withdrawn the vakalat without informing him. The said defence version has not been supported by medical records or other independent evidence.

14.2. The words “மஞ்சள் காமாலை நோயால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டு சிகிச்சைக்காக சென்னைக்கு செல்ல இருந்ததால்” were put only as a suggestion to PW5 and the Investigating Officer, and neither witness admitted the same. Similarly, the allegation that the advocate had withdrawn the vakalat without informing the accused has not been established by any evidence. Therefore, on the materials available before this Court, the accused has not established the alleged sufficient cause.

14.3. At the same time, this Court has carefully considered the admitted delay in forwarding the FIR, the absence of a specific explanation for such delay, the fact that several warrants were pending, the absence of specific case-diary entries regarding the efforts to trace the accused, and the fact that the accused was not given an opportunity to explain his absence before the present case was registered. These circumstances are relevant but do not, in the considered view of this Court, negate the established fact of his non-appearance before the Sessions Court.

14.4. Thus, this Court finds that the prosecution has established the essential ingredients of the offence and that the accused has failed to establish sufficient cause for his non-appearance.

15. FINDING

In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court holds that **THE PROSECUTION HAS PROVED BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT** that the accused, having been charged with an offence and having been released on bail, failed to appear before the Hon'ble District and Sessions Court in accordance with the terms of his bail and that he has failed to establish sufficient cause for such non-appearance.

16. THE DECISION

In light of the discussion and conclusions drawn under the previous head, this Court holds that the prosecution HAS PROVED the charges against the accused beyond all reasonable doubts. In result, the accused is found guilty and **CONVICTED of the offence under section 269 of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita in accordance with section 278(2) of Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.**

17. SENTENCE

The accused was questioned as to the sentence under section 278(2) of Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The accused stated that

"குறைந்தபட்ச தண்டனை தர வேண்டும் என்று
வேண்டினார்"

Considering facts and circumstance of the case and the plea of accused, this court awards the following sentence.

Therefore, after giving due consideration of the plea of the accused, the previous criminal antecedents, the nature and seriousness of the offence, this Court sentences the **accused, Greateon @ Rosary Greateon S/o. Ganesan, for Simple Imprisonment for a term of 3 [Three] months for the offence u/s.269 of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.**

The period of incarceration already undergone by the accused as undertrial from 02.03.2026 to 30.05.2026 shall be set off against the sentence of imprisonment imposed in the present case as per section 468 of BNSS.

18. PROPERTY ORDER U/S 498 OF BNSS.

No property has been handed over to the custody of this court in this case.

Hence the need to pass an order U/s.498 of BNSS does not arise.

This judgment is dictated by me to the Steno typist, directly typed by him in computer. corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this 22nd day of July, 2026.

District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Kilvelur.

ANNEXURE

I. PROSECUTION SIDE WITNESS:

PW1	18.05.2026	Tmt. Sangeetha, WPC 258, Hon'ble District Sessions Court Police, Velankanni PS. – Complainant.
PW2	18.05.2026	Ramesh, R Head Constable, Velankanni PS. – Eye Witness.
PW3	18.05.2026	Radhakrshnan, Sub Inspector, Velankanni PS – Formal Witness.
PW4	18.06.2026	Loganathan, SSI of Police, Velankanni PS - Eye Witness.
PW5	18.06.2026	Supriya, Inspector of Police, Velankanni PS – Investigating Officer.
PW6	02.07.2026	Tmt. Selvi R, Inspector of Police, Velankanni PS - Investigating Officer.

II. PROSECUTION SIDE EVIDENCE:

Exhibit No.	Particulars
Ex.P.1/PW.1	Complaint.(Special Report)
Ex.P.2/PW.5	First Information Report.
Ex.P.3/PW.5	Non-Bailable Warrant issued by Hon'ble District and Sessions Court, Nagapattinam.

III. MATERIAL OBJECT : Nil

IV. DEFENCE SIDE EVIDANCE, WITNESS AND MATERIAL OBJECT: Nil

District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Kilvelur.

Note:

- 1.The accused is in Judicial custody throughout the trial.
- 2.No witness was retained more than 3 times.
3. The out come of the case shall be forthwith communicated to the complainant and learned APP of this court.