



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE,
RAMANATHAPURAM.**

**PRESENT: Thiru. A.K.MEHBUB ALI KHAN, B.L.M, L.L.M.,
PG.D.PM/IR, Dip.in.J.J & J.Psy., PG.D.D.F.,
Principal Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram.**

Tuesday, the 23rd day of June 2026

SESSIONS CASE NO.188/2024

**(P.R.C.06/2024 of Judicial Magistrate Court, Thiruvadanai)
(Thiruppalaikudi Police Station Cr.No.196/2023)**

CNR No.TNRM 01 -003879-2024

The State,
represented through
the Inspector of Police,
Thiruppalaikudi Police Station,
(Crime No.196/2023)

... Complainant

-VS-

Sumathi, aged 39/2023,
W/o. Muniyasamy,
Vagavayal, Thiruppalaikudi.
Ramanathapuram District.

... Accused

Date of Occurrence : 18.11.2023

Date of filing charge sheet : 04.02.2024

Date of taken on file : 18.03.2024



Date of first appearance of the accused	:	22.04.2024
Date of commencement of examination of witnesses	:	23.11.2024
Date of last hearing	:	17.06.2026
Closure of Trial	:	10.06.2026
Date when the defence enquiry was closed	:	12.06.2026
Date of Judgment	:	23.06.2026

**Charge framed against the accused
u/s 302 of IPC.**

Answer of the accused for the charge: The accused pleaded not guilty

Learned Public Prosecutor for the complainant. : Thiru. B.Karthikeyan

Learned Advocate for the accused : Thiru.V.Sunil Malhotra

Case Summary

(As per the Hon'ble High Court's Circular in R.O.C.No.814/2020/RG/F1 & P.Dis.No.36/2021, dated 07.04.2021)

<u>S.No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Date</u>
i)	Date of remand of the accused :	Remanded on 19.11.2023 Released on bail 18.01.2024.
ii)	Date of the filing of the complaint/Final Report in the Court. :	19.11.2023/04.02.2024



- iii) Dare of committal of the case to this Court of Sessions : 05.08.2024
- iv) Date of questioning of the Accused : 23.10.2024
u/s 228/240/246/251 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 as the case may be.
- v) Filing of the miscellaneous petitions including the results on challenge before Superior Courts, except routine petitions u/s 317 of the Code. : ----
- vi) Date of examination in chief and cross examination of witnesses. Witnesses -Chief Examination- Cross Examination
- | | | |
|--------|------------|------------|
| P.W.1 | 19.03.2025 | 19.03.2025 |
| P.W.2 | 19.03.2025 | 19.03.2025 |
| P.W.3 | 19.03.2025 | 19.03.2025 |
| P.W.4 | 19.03.2025 | 19.03.2025 |
| P.W.5 | 19.03.2025 | 19.03.2025 |
| P.W.6 | 19.03.2025 | 19.03.2025 |
| P.W.7 | 19.03.2025 | 19.03.2025 |
| P.W.8 | 17.06.2025 | 17.06.2025 |
| P.W.9 | 16.07.2025 | 16.07.2025 |
| P.W.10 | 16.07.2025 | 16.07.2025 |
| P.W.11 | 22.09.2025 | 22.09.2025 |
| P.W.12 | 24.11.2025 | 24.11.2025 |
| P.W.13 | 15.12.2025 | 15.12.2025 |
| P.W.14 | 11.02.2026 | 11.02.2026 |
| P.W.15 | 10.03.2026 | ---- |
| P.W.16 | 10.03.2026 | ---- |
| P.W.17 | 24.03.2026 | ---- |
| P.W.18 | 24.03.2026 | 24.03.2026 |
| P.W.19 | 10.06.2026 | 10.06.2026 |

- | | | | |
|-------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|
| vii) | Date of enquiry of
the accused u/s 313(1)
(b) of Cr.P.C. | : 12.06.2026 | |
| viii) | Details of absconding
of the accused and his
appearance/production,
as the case may be: | : <u>Abscondance</u> | <u>Production</u>

--- |
| ix) | Grant of stay by superior
courts and the results
thereof: | NIL | |

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

The Sessions case came before this Court on 17.06.2026 for hearing and after hearing the arguments on both side and the documents and after having stood over till this day for consideration, this Court delivers the following:

//JUDGMENT//

This case arose out of the Final Report filed by the Thiruppalaikudi Police in Crime No.196 /2023 for the offence punishable u/s 302 of IPC that, on 18.11.2023 at about 11.30 p.m. the deceased Muniyasamy who was an alcoholic and always used to pick up fights while drunk, with his wife Sumathi had abused and accused fight with his wife and his wife had



attacked her husband with Iron rod on his Head and Chest and thereby caused his death.

A. Cognizance :-

2. The final report was filed before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Thiruvadanai who took cognizance u/s.302 of IPC in PRC.No.06/2024 and issued summons to the accused. On appearance of the accused, copies were furnished to him as required under section 207 Cr.P.C., and the case was committed to the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram. The Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram had assigned S.C.No.188/2024 and has taken on file.

B. FRAMING OF CHARGES:-

3. On opening of the prosecution u/s.226 and after hearing both sides, this court had framed distinct charge u/s. 302 of IPC against the accused. On being questioned about the charge so framed, the accused pleaded not guilty and hence trial proceedings were issued by this Court.



C. WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS

4. In order to prove their case, prosecution have examined P.W.1 to P.W.19 as witnesses and marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.22. Prosecution has also marked P.M.O.1 to P.M.O.7. No witness was examined on the side of the defence and no document was produced.

D. FACTS OF THE CASE:

5. The facts of the case as revealed from the evidence of the prosecution are as follows:

5.1 This is a case of Mariticide. The deceased Muniyasamy is the husband of the accused Sumathi. Master Udheskumar (PW.2) and Master Udheswaran (not examined) are their children. Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) is the sister of the deceased Muniyasamy and Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) is her husband.

5.2 The deceased Muniyasamy was an alcoholic and he used to always pick up fights while drunk, with his wife Sumathi. Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) and Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) would go there and compromise them and advise and warn the deceased Muniyasamy, because they had arranged the



marriage of Muniyasamy with the accused Sumathi. While, this being so, on 18.11.2023 at 11.00 p.m. Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) and Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) received information when they were in their village Kothanvayal, that the deceased Muniyasamy was injured on being attacked by his wife Sumathi during a fight between them. Immediately, Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) and her husband Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) went to Vagaivayal to the house of deceased Muniyasamy and found that Muniyasamy was lying with injuries on the head and chest. According to her, the accused was not present in the house. Their son Udheskumar (PW.2) alone was there and when asked him about what happened, he had told her that his parents quarreled and beat each other and that his mother attacked his father with a Iron rod (M.O.1) on the head and chest. She called 108 ambulance and sent the body of Muniyasamy to Government Hospital, Ramanathapuram with the help of neighbors. Tr.Chithiraivelu (PW.3), Tr.Johnson (PW.4) and other villagers were present there. Thereafter, she gave complaint (Ex.P1) to Thiruppalikudi Police station on 19.11.2023 at 9.00 a.m.

5.3. Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) got information from Tr.Johnson (PW.4) about the said incident and that Muniyasamy was in serious condition after



being beaten by the accused Sumathi during a fight. According to Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) when he sent there along with his wife Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1), he saw the deceased Muniyasamy lying down with injuries and the accused and her two children were present. Since, Muniyasamy was in very serious condition he was sent to Government Hospital in ambulance. But, was declared brought dead by the Dr. Rajamoorthy (PW.13).

5.4 Dr. Rajamoorthy (PW.13) who was on duty in the casualty at Ramanathapuram Government Hospital on 19.11.2023 at 07.05 a.m., admitted Muniyasamy as inpatient at per the request of Tr.Muruganantham (PW.16), SSI and examined him. Since, he was found dead, he recorded Accident Register (Ex.P11) as brought dead and sent body to the morgue.

5.5 Tr.Poomuthu, (PW.18) who was on duty as SI of police of Thiruppalaikudi Police Station, had received the written complaint (Ex.P1) given by Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) at 9.00 a.m. on 19.11.2023 and registered FIR (Ex.P15) in Crime No.196/2023 u/s.302 of IPC, and placed the FIR for perusal of Tmt.Vimala (not examined), Inspector of Police, All Women



Police Station who was incharge as Inspector of Thiruppalaikudi Police Station at that time. The said original FIR was sent to Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai and other officials through Tr.Sivanantham (PW.12), Gr.I at 10.00 a.m. and which was handed over to the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai at 1.45 p.m.

5.6 Tmt.Vimala (not examined) who was incharge of Inspector of Police, Thiruppalaikudi Police Station perused the FIR and took up investigation and went to scene of crime at 10.00 a.m. and prepared Observation Mahazer (Ex.P16) and Rough Sketch (Ex.P17) in the presence of Tr.Soundarrajan (PW.6) and Pitchai Savarimuthu (PW.7) at 10.30 a.m. She also recovered the piece of cement floor with blood (M.O.6) and the piece of cement floor without blood (M.O.7) under Athachi (Ex.P18) in the presence of the said witnesses. However, Tr.Soundarrajan (PW.6) and Pitchai Savarimuthu (PW.7) have deposed that their signatures alone were obtained in blank papers when they went to the police station for some other purpose, and their signatures in Observation Mahazer (Ex.P16) and Athachi(Ex.P11) alone are marked as Ex.P3 to Ex.P6. They were treated as hostile since they did not support the case of the prosecution.



5.7 Thereafter, Tmt.Vimala (not examined) conducted inquest between 13 & 14 hours on 19.11.2023 at Ramanathapuram Government Hospital in the presence of panchayatars and prepared Inquest Report (Ex.P.19). Thereafter, she gave request to conduct autopsy through Tr.Balamurugan (P.W.17) Head Constable who had handed over the said request to Dr. Manobalaji (P.W.14) at 2.15 p.m. and identified the body. He had assisted through autopsy, received the dresses on the body of the deceased, and blood samples (M.O.3 to M.O.5) and handed over the said materials to the Inspector of Police and handed over the body, after autopsy to the family members for cremation.

5.8 Dr. Manobalaji (P.W.14) on receipt of request for conducting autopsy from the Inspector of Police had conducted autopsy at 3.00 p.m on 19.11.2023 on the body of Muniyasamy and prepared the Postmortem Report (Ex.P12) and has noted down the following injuries.

- (i) A Laceration over right Temporal Region 8 x 3 x 5 cm.
- (ii) A Laceration behind right Ear
- (iii) HN EDH found over right Temporal Region.

He collected the internal organs and sent them to Regional FSL for



Forensic Analysis. He had received the Viscera Report (Ex.P.22) stating that the stomach, Intestine, Liver and Kidney of the deceased contained ethyl alcohol, but no poison was deducted. Based on that he gave the final opinion (Ex.P13) that the death had occurred due to the injury sustained on the right side of the head and the haemorrhage in the brain.

5.9 Tmt.Vimala (not examined) had examined the witnesses and recorded their statements and received the dresses of the deceased handed over by Tr.Balamurugan (PW.17), under Athachi (Ex.P14) in the presence of Tr.Sikkanthar (PW.15).

5.10 Tmt.Vimala (not examined) who was in incharge of Inspector of Police of Thiruppalaikudi Police Station arrested the accused at 04.00 p.m on 19.11.2023 at Solanthur bus stop in the presence of Tr.Balu (PW.8) and Tr.Saranraj (PW.11). She recorded the confession given by the accused in their presence and based on the disclosure statement (Ex.P9) made by the accused in her confession, took the accused along with the witnesses to the house of the deceased and recovered the Iron rod (M.O.1) and Nighty (M.O.2) which was produced by the accused from the unused kitchen of



the house under Athachi (Ex.P10). However, Tr.Balu (PW.8) did not support the case of the prosecution and he had stated that his signature were obtained in two blank papers and hence he was treated as hostile. His signatures in confession statement and Seizure Mahazer alone were marked as Ex.P7 and Ex.P8.

5.11 Tr.Saranraj (PW.11) Village Assistant has supported the case of the prosecution and has stated that when he was standing at Solanthur bus stop along with Tr.Balu (PW.8), the Police arrested the Sumathi and recorded her confession statement. He has also deposed and she disclosed that she had hidden the weapon and dress and to hand over them to police, from the place in which they are hidden. Accordingly, he went along with the I.O to the house and the Iron rod and Nighty were recovered under Athachi (Ex.P10) from the unused kitchen.

5.12 After arresting the accused she sent her for remand and handed over the said properties (P.M.O.1 and P.M.O.2) under form 91 (Ex.P20) to the court. She examined the other witnesses and recorded their statements.



5.13 Tr.Paul Yesudhasan (PW.19) who was the regular Inspector of Police of Thiruppalaikudi Police Station joined duty on 19.11.2023 and took up investigation and since the witnesses had stated the same statements as given to Tmt.Vimala and the documents prepared by her were proper, he did not record any separate or further statements of the witnesses. However, he took steps to record the statement of Master Udeshkumar (PW.2) u/s.164 of Cr.P.C on 21.11.2023 by the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai. He later sent the Viscera for Forensic Analysis on 21.11.2023 through Tr.Balamurugan (PW.17) and examined the Forensic Officials who gave Biological Report (Ex.P21) and Viscera Report (Ex.P22). Tr.Muruganantham (PW.16), SSI of police had handed over the request to keep the body in the morgue at 6.00 a.m. on 19.11.2023 to the duty doctor of Government Hospital.

5.14. In this case, Master Udeshkumar(PW.2), S/o. Deceased Muniyasamy and the accused, was cited as eyewitness who had witnessed the fight between the parents and the occurrence. However, he had deposed that his father always fights with his mother while drunk, and on 18.11.2023 he went to his neighbors house to sleep and at 2.00 a.m he was



waken up and was told that his father is dead. He went to his house and found his father was lying dead. He has given as statement u/s.164 of Cr.P.C (Ex.P2) to Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai. He was treated as hostile.

5.15. Similarly, Tr.Chithiraivelu (PW.3), Tr.Johnson (PW.4) and Tr. Ramu (PW.5) were all cited as eyewitnesses, but they did not support the case of the prosecution and have stated only that they had learnt about the death of Muniyasamy and nothing more than that. Hence, they were treated as hostile.

5.16. Tr.Kumar (PW.10) is the ambulance driver who received information about an injured person to be taken to hospital from Vagaivayal Village at 5.30 a.m. on 19.11.2023. Immediately, he went there in ambulance and took the injured person to the hospital. The doctor examined him and declared as brought dead and thereafter he handed over the body to the morgue.

With this, the prosecution closed the evidence, dispensing with the other witnesses.



E. QUESTIONING U/S 313(1)(B) C R .P.C. :

6. After completion of the prosecution side evidence, the incriminating circumstances appearing against the accused was explained to her and she was questioned U/S 313(1)(b) Cr.P.C. The accused denied complicity with the offence and claimed that she has been falsely implicated in this case.

F. POINT FOR DETERMINATION :

7. The point for determination in this case is, “ **Whether the prosecution has proved the guilt of the accused U/S. 302 of IPC beyond reasonable doubt ?** ”

8. Heard the elaborate arguments of the learned Public Prosecutor and the arguments advanced by the defence counsel.

G. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS :

9. The learned counsel for the defence argued that the deceased Muniyasamy is admittedly an alcoholic and used to pick up fights while drunk with his wife as well as other villagers and therefore his wife the



accused herein and his children lived separately. He further argued the deceased had sustained injuries elsewhere and was taken by Tr.Muruganantham (PW.16) from the place where he was found injured to the Government Hospital and the doctor had declared him as brought dead. Thereafter, the police had received a false complaint from Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) and created records and objects and had framed his accused in this case falsely. Therefore, he argued to acquit the accused.

10. Per contra, the Learned Public Prosecutor argued that though the eyewitnesses had turned hostile, Master Udheshkumar (PW.2) had given a statement u/s.164 Cr.P.C to the Judicial Magistrate under (Ex.P2) and therefore the same can be taken into consideration as evidence and convict the accused. The prosecution further argued that motive is established and the accused had attacked her husband with Iron rod (M.O.1) and caused his death. The prosecution has also proved the recovery of the weapon upon the disclosure of the accused and thereby he argued that the prosecution has proved the charges against the accused and prayed for conviction.



11. In this case alleged eyewitnesses namely, Master Udheskumar, Tr.Chithiraivelu, Tr. Johnson, Tr.Ramu (PW.2 to PW.5) did not support the case of the prosecution and they were treated as hostile. Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) and her husband Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) cannot be treated as eyewitness as they had gone to the place of occurrence only after receiving information. It is pertinent to note that while Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) has stated that the accused was not present at the house when they went, as per the evidence Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9), the accused and her two children were present in this house. This contradiction is not explained by the prosecution and creates reasonable doubt whether the accused was present at the scene of occurrence or not. Further, Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) and Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) have admitted that the deceased was an alcoholic and used to regularly pick up quarrels with his wife. He has also admitted that she is separated from his husband and living separately and has prevented her husband from visiting them.

12. The arguments advanced by the prosecution to rely upon the statement u/s.164 Cr.P.C given by Master Udheskumar (PW.2) to the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai cannot be accepted, because the



statement u/s.164 Cr.P.C. is not a substantive piece of evidence, but it can be used either to contradict or corroborate the evidence. However, in this case even when, Master Udheshkumar (PW.2) was treated as hostile and was cross examined by the prosecution, the previous statement made by him u/s.164 Cr.P.C. were not put to him and the contradictions are not elicited, so as to prove the contradiction. Therefore, in the absence of any such proof of the contradiction or corroboration, the contents of Ex.P2 cannot be relied upon by this court as evidence. It is further important to note that Udheshkumar (PW.2) has admitted that he gave Ex.P2 statement as directed by the police, in his cross examination. Therefore, Ex.P2 statement of Udheshkumar (PW.2) recorded u/s.164 Cr.P.C is not helpful to advance the case of the prosecution as it cannot be relied upon.

13. It is further important to note that since there are no eyewitnesses in this case, it has to be looked into whether the prosecution has proved the guilt of the accused through circumstantial evidence. No doubt it is true that Muniyasamy has died due to injuries and as per the evidence of the Dr.Manobalaji (PW.14), the death is caused by homicide. However, it has to be found, whether the said homicide is linked to the accused in this case



and proved by the prosecution. In this case, the prosecution has relied upon the confession statement of the accused and the discovery of the fact and the recovery of the weapon used by her. In this regard, the prosecution has examined two witnesses namely Tr.Balu (PW.8) and Tr.Saranraj (PW.11). However, Tr.Balu (PW.8) did not support the case of the prosecution. Even, in the evidence of Tr.Saranraj (PW.11) it is found that he has categorically stated in his cross examination that he did not go into the house of the deceased Muniyasamy from where the Iron rod (M.O.1) and Nighty (M.O.2) were recovered by the police. He has also categorically stated that he was standing outside the house and the police went inside and brought the objects. Therefore, his evidence cannot be considered as proof of recovery, because he was not actively involved in the process of the identifying the place where M.O.1 & M.O.2 were hidden and were seized by the police. It is well settled that, when the witnesses who is examined in support of the recovery of weapons has not gone inside the house and had not seen the process of taking the weapon from the place where it was hidden, his evidence cannot be considered as proof of such recovery. Therefore, in this case also, the evidence of Tr.Saranraj (PW.11) cannot be considered as proof of recovery as he had not seen the process of taking



P.M.O.1 and P.M.O.2 from the kitchen. Therefore, even though Tr.Saranraj (PW.11) has supported the case of the prosecution about the arrest and confession statement (Ex.P9), his evidence is not sufficient to prove the recovery of the weapon from the alleged places where it was hidden. Therefore, in the considered opinion of this court, the prosecution has not proved the recovery of the weapon as required by law.

14. It is further important to note that the prosecution witnesses have admitted that the deceased was an alcoholic and was in the habit of picking fights and quarrels with others and therefore, there is every probability that he was attacked by someone elsewhere and not by this accused. This contention of the defence gains support from the evidence of Dr.Rajamoorthi (PW.13), who had recorded under Accident Register (Ex.P11), clearly stating that the body was brought by Tr.Muruganantham (PW.16), SSI of Police and at his request he examined him and declared as brought dead. However, the Inspector of Police Tr.Paul Yesudhasan (PW.19) has clarified that Tr.Muruganantham (PW.16), SSI of Police had given the request only upon insistance by the doctor for receiving the body and he did not take the body to the hospital. This clarification cannot be



accepted because there is no reason for Dr.Rajamoorthy (PW.13), to wrongly make enteries in the Accident Register (Ex.P11) that the deceased Muniyasamy was brought by Tr.Muruganantham (PW.16). Had the deceased was taken by his sister Tmt.kaleeswari (PW.1) and her husband Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9), it would have been definitely noted in the Accident Register (Ex.P11). It is needless to state that law presumes that the official acts done in furtherance of the duty by the Government Officials are done properly unless proved otherwise. In this case prosecution has not established that Accident Register (Ex.P11) was wrongly entered by Dr.Rajamoorthy (PW.13) and this court finds no reason to disbelieve of the evidence Dr.Rajamoorthy (PW.13).

15. Therefore, in this case the theory propounded by the defence that the accused was attacked elsewhere by some one and it was found by Tr.Muruganantham (PW.16), SSI and was taken by the hospital by him and got him admitted and thereafter, came to know about the relatives of the deceased and had informed Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) and others about the death is probable. Since, there is no eyewitnesses in this case and also the prosecution has failed to establish the complete chain of circumstantial



evidence which can point only towards the accused, it cannot be held that Muniyasamy was murdered by this accused. Further, it is pertinent to note that in cases of this nature of circumstantial evidence, the prosecution has to prove that the offence should have been committed only by the accused and not by any other person. That is to say that the guilt of the accused should be so certain so as to avoid any possibility of being committed by any other person. But, in this case, the prosecution has not established the guilt of the accused with such certainty and there is every probability that the accused was attacked by some other person at a different place. The prosecution has not proved that the accused was found at with the deceased in his house, soon before the death and was missing after the death. Regarding this, the evidence of Tr.Ayyamperumal (PW.9) I.O is very clear that the accused along with her sons were present in the house. Whereas Tmt.Kaleeswari (PW.1) has stated that she was missing.

16. Similarly, the police has claimed to have arrested the accused in Solanthur bus stop on the next day and there is no explanation why she was not arrested when she was present in the house. Therefore, in view of the contradictions in the evidence of the prosecution, the incomplete chain of



evidence presented by the prosecution against the accused and also since the prosecution has not proved the guilt of the accused with certainty that she alone would have committed the murder and there is no possibility of some one else having committed it, this court is of the considered opinion based on the evidence available in this case, that the prosecution has failed to establish and prove the guilt of the accused for the charges u/s.302 IPC in this case. This point is decided accordingly.

H. CONCLUSION:

17. It is fine, it is held that the prosecution has not proved the guilt of the accused for the offences u/s 302 of IPC beyond reasonable doubts and it is held that the evidence available in this case is not sufficient to hold the accused guilty for the offence u/s 302 of IPC.

I. RESULT:

In the result, the accused is found not guilty for the offence u/s 302 of IPC and is acquitted u/s 235(1) of Cr.P.C.

The properties remanded in P.R. No.4/2025 and marked as P.M.O.1 to P.M.O.7 are ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of appeal period.



The bail bond executed by the accused if any shall automatically be cancelled after the appeal time is over or after disposal of the appeal if any filed. The bond executed by the accused u/s.481 BNSS shall be in force for 6 months.

This Judgment was dictated to the Steno-Typist, transcribed and typed by her on computer and delivered by me in open Court on 23rd day of June 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

ANNEXURE :

Prosecution Witnesses:

P.W.1	-	Tmt. Kaleeswari
P.W.2	-	Tr. Udheshkumar
P.W.3	-	Tr. Chithiraivelu
P.W.4	-	Tr. Johnson
P.W.5	-	Tr.Ramu
P.W.6	-	Tr.Soundarrajan
P.W.7	-	Tr. Pitchai Savarimuthu



P.W.8	-	Tr. Balu
P.W.9	-	Tr. Ayyamperumal
P.W.10	-	Tr. Kumar
P.W.11	-	Tr. Saranraj
P.W.12	-	Tr.Sivanantham
P.W.13	-	Dr. Rajamoorthi
P.W.14	-	Dr. Manobalaji
P.W.15	-	Tr.Sikkanthar
P.W.16	-	Tr.Muruganantham, SSI
P.W.17	-	Tr.Balamurugan
P.W.18	-	Tr.Poomuthu, SI (Rtd.)
P.W.19	-	Tr.Paul Yesudhasan, Inspector of Police

Prosecution Exhibits:

Ex.P.1	19.03.2025	Complaint
Ex.P.2	19.03.2025	U/s.164 Cr.P.C Statement
Ex.P.3	19.03.2025	1 st Signature in Observation Mahazar
Ex.P.4	19.03.2025	1 st Signature in Seizure Mahazar for cement stones
Ex.P.5	19.03.2025	2 nd Signature in Observation Mahazar
Ex.P.6	19.03.2025	2 nd Signature in Seizure Mahazar for cement stones
Ex.P.7	17.06.2025	2 nd signature in Confession Statement
Ex.P.8	17.06.2025	2 nd signature in Seizure Mahazar for Iron rod and Nighty



Ex.P.9	22.09.2025	Admitted portion of confession statement
Ex.P.10	22.09.2025	Seizure Mahazar for Iron rod and Nighty
Ex.P.11	15.12.2025	Accident Register
Ex.P.12	11.02.2026	Postmortem Report
Ex.P.13	11.02.2026	Final opinion of Autopsy
Ex.P.14	10.03.2026	Seizure Mahazer for Lungi and Jatti of deceased
Ex.P.15	24.03.2026	First Information Report
Ex.P.16	10.06.2026	Observation Mahazer
Ex.P.17	10.06.2026	Rough Sketch
Ex.P.18	10.06.2026	Seizure Mahazer for cement stones
Ex.P.19	10.06.2026	Inquest Report
Ex.P.20	10.06.2026	Form 91
Ex.P.21	10.06.2026	Biological Report
Ex.P.22	10.06.2026	Viscera Report

Material Objects on the side of prosecution:-

P.M.O.1	17.06.2025	Nail-pulling iron bar
P.M.O.2	17.06.2025	Red colour Nighty
P.M.O.3	10.03.2026	Blue and Brown checkered Lungi
P.M.O.4	10.03.2026	NSK marked blue colour Jatti
P.M.O.5	10.03.2026	Blood soaked sample cloth container
P.M.O.6	10.06.2026	Blood stained cement stone
P.M.O.7	10.06.2026	Blood stainless cement stone

Principal Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram.

TNRM010038792024



Principal Sessions Court,

Ramanathapuram

Sessions Case No.188 /2024

Fair Judgment

Dated: 23.06.2026