



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

1

S.C.No.217/2022

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, SALEM

Present: Thiru. Swarnam J. Natarajan, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge, Salem.

Wednesday, this the 19th day of August - 2026

Sessions Case No. 217/2022 -in-
CNR No. TNSA01-005862-2022

(Crime No.21/2022, Thevoor Police Station)
(P.R.C.No.8/2022 of the Judicial Magistrate No.I Court, Sankari.)

Name of the accused person	: Kathavarayan @ Poremannan (M/46/2022), S/o. Arumugam, Thailan Kadu, Chettipatty, Arasiramani Village, Sankari Taluk, Salem District.
Charges levelled against the accused person	: Against the Accused:- under section 302 IPC.
Plea of the accused	: Not guilty

Judgment : In the result,

(i) The prosecution had failed to prove the charge against accused person under Section 302 IPC., and the accused person is acquitted from the charge and ordered to be set at liberty.

(ii) The material objects, M.O.1 to M.O.10, namely, the sickle, the clothes, the cement stones, the ropes, and newspaper, are no more required, and

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

2

S.C.No.217/2022

the same are ordered to be destroyed after the appeal time is over, or after the disposal of the appeal, whichever is later, subject to the outcome of the appeal proceedings.

(iii) The bail bond executed by the accused stands revoked.

This sessions case came up for final hearing before me on 14.08.2026 in the presence of Thiru. G. Prakasam, Public Prosecutor for the District on behalf of the State and Thiru. R. Raja, Advocate accused person and upon hearing both sides arguments, perusing the evidence, documents, the case having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivers the following:

J U D G M E N T

The Inspector of Police, Thevoor Police Station, in Crime No.21/2022, had laid final report against the accused person, Kathavarayan @ Poremannan, son of Arumugam, alleging that the complainant Chithanathan is the son of the deceased Anandan. Anandan was the village temple poosari of Sri Durgai Sudalai Kaliyamman Temple, performing poojas in the temple, and used to stay there during night time.

(ii) The accused person Kathavarayan @ Poremannan, Ramalingam, Kaliappan, and the deceased, all together, had, prior to the occurrence, contributed

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

each Rs.90,000/- and purchased a tractor for the purpose of breaking rocks by getting a machine for the same.

(iii) After some time, the accused person informed his other partners that it was not feasible for him to continue in the said partnership business and had taken back his share of Rs.95,000/-. During the said transaction, the accused person was in enimical terms with the deceased person.

(iv) In furtherance to the same, the accused person was running a chit, wherein the deceased and others had subscribed for the said chit. However, the accused person was not regular in repayment of the chit amount to the subscribers. In this regard also, there was a previous quarrel between the deceased person and the accused person. In this regard also, the accused person was in enimical terms with the deceased for having caused loss to his business.

(v) Further, the accused person's wife had fell down into the well while she was washing her clothes and died few years ago. The accused person developed misunderstanding against the deceased person that he had only performed black magic, and due to the same, his wife fell down into the well and committed suicide.

(vi) Due to the above enmity developed by the accused person, on 05.03.2022 at 10.00 p.m., while the deceased person had laid down in the cot in



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

4

S.C.No.217/2022

front of Sri Durgai Sudalai Kaliamman Temple, the accused person went there with an aruval and shouted at the deceased person that he had spoiled his entire life, and indiscriminately assaulted the deceased by abusing him with filthy languages on his neck, shoulder, chest, head, back, etc., and due to the injuries sustained, the deceased person died on the spot. Thereby, there appears prima facie case that the accused person had committed the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC.

2. On the case being taken cognizance by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sankari, as P.R.C.No.8/2022 on 22.08.2022, had taken cognizance and was pleased to issue summons to the accused person for his appearance on 05.09.2022. On appearance of the accused person, the free copies of the police records as contemplated under Section 207 Cr.P.C. were furnished to him free of cost.

3. Thereafter, the accused person had reported that he had sufficient means to engage counsel of his choice. The learned Judicial Magistrate felt that the case is exclusively triable by the Court of Sessions, and was pleased to commit the case to this Court, which was assigned with S.C.No.217/2022. On hearing the learned Public Prosecutor and the counsel for the defence, the charge was framed against the accused person under Section 302 IPC. When the contents of

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

5

S.C.No.217/2022

the same were read over and explained to the accused person, upon questioning, the accused denied the same and claimed to be tried.

4. In order to bring home the offence charged against the accused person, on the side of the prosecution, P.W.1 to P.W.18 were examined, Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.18 and M.O.1 to M.O.10 were marked.

5. **The case of the prosecution in brief is as follows:-**

(i) The defacto complainant, Chithanathan, the son of the deceased Anandan, was a resident of Chettipatty, Vanniyar Street. For 30 years, his father was performing pooja in Sudalai Kaliyamman Temple, and daily he used to stay in the temple during nighttime.

(ii) Ten years prior to the occurrence, his father, along with three other persons including the accused person, had joined for a business in breaking the wooden logs with a tractor, and in this regard, Kaaliappan, Ramalingam, Kathavarayan had also joined together in the said business and contributed each Rs.90,000/-. The accused person felt inconvenient to continue in the partnership business and had taken back his contribution along with Rs.5,000/- additionally; totally Rs.95,000/- was taken back by the accused person.

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



(iii) Thereafter, the accused person had run a chit transaction with the deceased person as well as several villagers, and was irregular in the repayment of the chit amount, due to which his father had quarreled with the accused person. Few years ago, the accused person's wife, while she went to the local well for washing clothes, she fell down in the well and died, which also provoked the accused person that the deceased person would be responsible for the death of his wife since the deceased person used to do black magic in the temple.

(iv) In continuation of the same, whenever the deceased person happened to see the accused person in the local village, the accused person used to threaten him with dire consequences. In continuation of the said enmity, on 05.03.2022 at 9.00 p.m., his father, after taking food, had returned to the temple and stayed there.

(v) At about 10.30 p.m., he, along with his uncle Anandan (L.W.2, who was not examined before the Court and dispensed with), had been to the public toilet near to the temple. At that time, they had seen the accused person coming in the opposite direction with a yellow-colour dhoti with bloodstains on his hand, holding an aruval from the temple, and on seeing the same, they developed suspicion, and they proceeded to the temple, and found his father in a



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

7

S.C.No.217/2022

pool of blood with injuries on his hand, back, leg, chest, neck, and also on the head.

(vi) When they went to see the father, they noticed that their father died, informed the local persons, went to the police station, and lodged the complaint, Ex.P.1.

(vii) P.W.2 Murugan, P.W.3 Anandakumar, and P.W.4 Kaliappan are the relatives of the deceased person. On hearing the incident over phone from their relatives, they had been to the hospital, seen the body of the deceased person, and also spoken about the enmity the accused had developed against the deceased person prior to the occurrence. P.W.5 Kaliappan is a hearsay witness who had not seen the occurrence. P.W.6 Kulanthaiyan is an observation mahazar witness who had been to Mariamman Temple, in whose presence the Inspector of Police had recovered the bloodstained soil, sample soil, and also recovered the incriminating materials in their presence under cover of mahazar Ex.P.3, and prepared observation mahazar Ex.P.2 and rough sketch.

(viii) P.W.7 Ramalingam and P.W.8 Ramachandran were the erstwhile partners of the deceased and the accused person, who had stated that 10 years prior to the occurrence, they had commonly purchased a tractor for the purpose of breaking the wooden logs with a machine, and thereafter they



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

developed misunderstanding between themselves, and the accused person received his due share and left. P.W.9 Thangam is a hearsay witness.

(ix) P.W.10 Krishnan and P.W.11 Kathiresan are the electricity board officials who had issued the certificate with regard to uninterrupted power supply. P.W.12 Sridhar is the Village Administrative Officer of Arasiramani Bit-I, in whose presence, on 06.03.2022 at 11.15 a.m., the Inspector of police arrested the accused person, who had voluntarily confessed about his involvement in the case and produced the aruval as well as his bloodstained dhoti.

(x) P.W.13 Dr. Karthik is the doctor who conducted the post-mortem on the body of the deceased person, noted down the external injuries.

“EXTERNAL EXAMINATION:-

INJURIES:

- 1) VERTICALLY OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-12XCMSXBONE DEEP NOTED OVER LEFT OCCIPITAL REGION TO BACK OF LEFT UPPER NECK O/D UNDERLYING SKULL FOUND COMPLETELY CUT.
- 2) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-5X1CMXMUSCLE DEEP NOTED 2 CMS BELOW THE PREVIOUS INJURY.
- 3) HORIZONTAL CUT INJURY M-9X1CMSXMUSCLE DEEP NOTED OVER FRONT OF LEFT UPPER NECK.
- 4) HORIZONTAL CUT INJURY M-11X1CMSXBONE DEEP NOTED OVER FRONT OF NECK 2 CMS BELOW THE PREVIOUS INJURY



O/D UNDERLYING MUSCLES VESSELS NERVES AND TRACHEA FOUND COMPLETELY CUT UNDERLYING C3 VERTEBRA FOUND PARTIALLY CUT.

- 5) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-25X1CMXBONE DEEP EXTENDING FROM BACK OF LEFT LOWER NECK TO SUPRA STERNAL NOTCH TO RIGHT UPPER CHEST.
- 6) VERTICAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-11X1CMSXMUSCLE DEEP NOTED 1CM OUTER TO PREVIOUS INJURY.
- 7) VERTICAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-10X1CMXMUSCLE DEEP 1CM OUTER TO PREVIOUS INJURY.
- 8) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-5X1CMXBONE DEEP OVER FRONT OF LEFT SHOULDER OD / UNDERLYING BONE FOUND PARTIALLY CUT.
- 9) HORIZONTAL CUT INJURY M-7X1CMXBONE DEEP OVER LEFT UPPER CHEST O/D UNDERLYING BONE FOUND PARTIALLY CUT.
- 10) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-12X1CMXBONE DEEP OVER RIGHT SIDE OF CHEEK TO BACK OF RIGHT UPPER NECK, OD / UNDERLYING CHEEK BONE FOUND PARTIALLY CUT.
- 11) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-4X1CMXMUSCLE DEEP OVER BACK OF RIGHT MID FOREARM.
- 12) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-4X0.5X0.5CMS OVER BACK OF RIGHT UPPER CHEEK.



- 13) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-6X0.5X0.5CMS, 2CMS
BELOW THE PREVIOUS INJURY.
- 14) HORIZONTAL OBLIQUE CUT INJURY M-10X0.5X0.5CMS, 1CM
BELOW THE PREVIOUS INJURY.”

The doctor had collected the internal organs of the deceased person and forwarded the same for viscera opinion. On receipt of the viscera opinion, the Doctor offered final opinion with regard to the cause of death of the deceased person as:

FINAL OPINION:

“THE DECEASED WOULD APPEAR TO HAVE DIED OF SHOCK AND
HAEMORRHAGE DUE TO MULTIPLE CUT INJURIES TO THE HEAD
AND BACK, PRIOR 12-24 HOURS TO AUTOPSY.”

P.W.14 Mathaiyan is the Head Constable who had assisted the post-mortem doctor, received the internal organs of the deceased person, handed over the same to the Forensic Department for report, and assisted the Investigating Officer. (xi)
P.W.15 Eswaran had handed over the express FIR to the learned Judicial Magistrate. P.W.16 Bhagiyaraj had assisted the Investigating Officer in typing the statements. P.W.17 Senthilkumaran is the Sub-Inspector of Police who had registered the case in Crime No.21/2022 under Section 302 IPC and registered the FIR. P.W.18 Devi is the Inspector of Police who prepared the observation



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

mahazar and rough sketch in the place of occurrence at 3.00 a.m., seized the bloodstained cement stone and sample cement stone, conducted inquest on the body of the deceased person, arrested the accused person, and recorded his confession statement. After completion of the investigation, the Inspector of Police laid final report against the accused person. Through the Inspector of Police, the rough sketch, inquest report, serology, biology, viscera, and Form 91 were marked.

6. When the accused person was questioned with regard to the incriminating circumstances made out against him in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, the same were denied by the accused person in specific and claimed that a false case has been foisted against him. In short, the accused person proclaimed his total innocence and denied his complicity. However, no witnesses were examined on the side of the defence.

7. The accused had submitted in writing his statement stating that on 06.03.2022 at 1.00 a.m., while he was sleeping at his house, the police came, took him from his house, and taken him for illegal custody. He had no role to play in the crime, and he has no enmity with the deceased person, and the police have foisted false case against him.



8. The point for determination is:-

Whether the prosecution had proved the charge against the accused person beyond reasonable doubt and whether the accused person is liable to be convicted for the offence charged ?

9. The learned Public Prosecutor had contended that the incident had been seen by the complainant while the accused returned from the temple in a bloodstained dhoti holding the aruval with his hand, and contended that the accused person was seen immediately after the crime returning home by the complainant, who immediately rushed to the place of occurrence and seen his father in pool of blood. Hence, the learned Public Prosecutor had contended that he had also spoken about the enmity of the accused person with the deceased, which is the root cause for the crime. Hence, the learned Public Prosecutor prays for conviction of the accused person.

10. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the defence filed his written arguments and contended that the witness statements are full of embellishments and developments, and the chain of circumstances were not proved beyond reasonable doubt by the prosecution. Hence, the learned counsel for the accused prays for acquittal of the accused person.



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

13

S.C.No.217/2022

(ii) He relied upon the judgments of the Honourable Supreme Court and High Court of Madras in ***Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. [2013 (6) CTC 533]***, the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal [1997 SCC (Cri) 92]***, the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***State of Gujarat v. Kishanbhai [(2014) 5 SCC 108]***, the judgment of the Honourable High Court of Madras in ***Shanmugam S/o Murugan v. State, rep. by Inspector of Police, Kanchi Taluk Police Station [2011 (1) MWN (Cr.) 151 (DB)]***, the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar [(2014) 3 MLJ (Crl) 353 (SC)]***, the judgment of the Honourable High Court of Madras in ***Babuji @ Mahesh v. State [2008 (1) CTC 798]***, the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Vikramjit Singh alias Vicky v. State of Punjab [2007 Cri. L.J.1000]***, the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Bhanwar Singh v. State M.P. [1998 Cri. L.J. 1054]***, the judgment of High Court of Madras in ***Lakshmanan vs. The Inspector of Police, Thogamalai Police Station [2015 (1) LW (Crl.) 70]***, the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court of India in ***Ajit Balse v. Capt. Ranga Karkere, [(2015) 15 SSC 748]***, the judgment of the Honourable High Court of Madras in ***Palanisamy v. State [2016 (3) MWN (Cr.) 108 (DB)]***, and the judgment of the Honourable High Court of Madras in ***Murugan vs. State By Inspector of Police, Ottapidaram [(1994) 1 Crimes 137]***,

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

on the above points, hence, the learned counsel for the accused prays for acquittal of the accused person.

11. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by both parties.

12. The entire case revolves upon circumstantial evidence as there is no direct eyewitness for the occurrence.

13. The prosecution had relied upon the following circumstances to put forth their case:

- 1) The accused person and the deceased were indulged in partnership business 10 years ago in cutting wood and stones with the help of a tractor and a machine. Thereafter, the accused obtained his due share and left the partnership business abruptly. He indulged in chit transactions and was not regular in repaying the chit amount to his subscribers. In this regard, the accused person and the deceased developed enmity with each other.
- 2) The deceased person was performing poojas in the temple, and the accused person's wife had fallen down by accident into the well while she was washing her clothes, and the accused person developed enmity and unreasonable suspected the deceased person that only due to his



performance of black magic, his wife was made to fall into the well.

- 3) The complainant had last seen the deceased person lying down in the temple in front of the same with the cot, and the accused person was seen returning from the said place holding an aruval with bloodstains on his dhoti. The accused was arrested on the next day, who confessed about his involvement in the crime before the Inspector of Police, and the dhoti and aruval were recovered under cover of mahazar, the same tallied with the blood group of the deceased person.

These are the circumstances the prosecution had put forth to prove the charge, and in order to appreciate the same, the first aspect to be appreciated is the motive for the crime.

14. To speak about the motive, the partners of the deceased person, as well as the son of the deceased, P.W.1, had deposed evidence before the Court. However, they had only given feeble evidence with regard to the motive, suggesting that the deceased person and the accused person were in enimical terms. However, no specific incidents were cited by the witnesses to suggest that the deceased person and the accused person shouted with each other, quarreled, or that the accused person had uttered words expressing his desire to get rid of the deceased person. In this regard, no witnesses were examined on the side of the



prosecution to suggest that the accused person was in enimical terms with the deceased person.

15. To prove the motive except the interested testimony of the complainant, who is the son of the deceased, no other witnesses were examined on the side of the prosecution, and even the evidence of P.W.1 is very feeble to believe the theory put forth by the prosecution that there is motive on the side of the accused person to get rid of the deceased person due to the partnership business failure 10 years ago, and the deceased person had demanded the chit amount from the accused person, who was the cause of the death of the accused person's wife.

16. These three aspects when it had happened, what was the reaction of the accused person and the deceased person subsequent to the incident, whether there was any quarrel in connection with the said motive attributed in this regard there were no positive evidence. So, the theory put forth by the prosecution is a very weak piece of evidence without any substantial materials to corroborate the same. Hence, this Court finds that the motive theory has not been successfully established by the prosecution before this Court.

17. According to the complainant, he had been to the public toilet at 10.30 p.m., and while he was there, he had seen from a distance the accused



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

person returning from the temple holding an aruval with a bloodstained dhoti in his hand. On seeing the same, the complainant developed suspicion, rushed to the place of occurrence, and seen his father in a pool of blood. However, this evidence adduced by the complainant is very doubtful. The distance between the public toilet and the temple, and the distance between the temple and the accused person's house, were not proved by the prosecution beyond reasonable doubt. According to the complainant, the distance between the temple and the accused person's house is around half a kilometer. In the charge sheet, it is stated that initially there was a wordy quarrel between the accused and the deceased person, and in continuation of the said word provoked by the deceased person, the accused person ran to his house, taken aruval, returned back, and indiscriminately assaulted the deceased person.

18. Under such circumstances, the distance between the public toilet, temple, and the house of the accused person is material. In this regard, no particulars were provided by the Investigating Officer to prove the distance between the public toilet and the temple and the possibility of the complainant who have seen the accused person returning from temple.

19. Moreover, it is established during the cross-examination of P.W.1, that P.W.1 is residing in a full-fledged concrete house provided with toilet, and



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

there is no necessity for the complainant to go to public toilet far away from his house during odd hours at 10.30 p.m. along with another person by name Anandan, L.W.2, who was not examined before the Court and his evidence was dispensed.

20. The presence of the complainant at odd hours near to the place of occurrence is doubtful, and the possibility of witnessing the accused person returning from temple with pool of blood is also not believable. Moreover, it is established during cross-examination that the said place is a busy locality, and no independent witnesses were examined on the side of the prosecution to prove the fact deposed by P.W.1 to corroborate his evidence. Under such circumstances, this Court finds that the conduct of the accused person subsequent to the occurrence, as well as the last seen theory also not proved by the prosecution beyond reasonable doubt.

21. Apart from the above evidence, the evidence available on hand is the confession statement of the accused person allegedly given before the Inspector of Police, and in pursuant to the same, the recovery made by the Investigating Officer on the facts discovered by him from the statement recorded. In this regard, the specific place where the materials were concealed by the accused person was not disclosed in the confession statement, and in the admitted portion



of the confession statement, there is no specific indication as to the place where the material objects were concealed. Under such circumstances, the admitted portion of the confession statement does not corroborate the prosecution's case to the satisfactory extent.

22. Leaving the above three aspects, there were no chain of circumstances pointing unerringly the accused person's guilt in the present case, and the evidence adduced on the side of the prosecution were very feeble. The time of death of the deceased person, the serology report which are the scientific evidence available on the side of the prosecution which did not throw much light about the possibility of the accused person's involvement in the crime. The aruval, the dhoti recovered from the accused person whose blood group did not match with the blood group of the deceased person, and the serology report was negative on the above aspect suggesting that the blood group in the said material objects during examination was found to be inconclusive. So, the time of the death of the deceased person was also not specifically proved by the prosecution through the doctor who conducted post-mortem to suggest that the accused person alone has access to the temple during odd time and he would be the person who would have committed the crime.



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

20

S.C.No.217/2022

23. In view of the above circumstances, this Court finds that the chain of circumstances put forth against the accused person were not proved beyond reasonable doubt and the benefit of doubt shall be extended to the accused person, and he is liable to be acquitted of the charge.

In the result,

(i) The prosecution had failed to prove the charge against accused person under Section 302 IPC., and the accused person is acquitted from the charge and ordered to be set at liberty.

(ii) The material objects, M.O.1 to M.O.10, namely, the sickle, the clothes, the cement stones, the ropes, and newspaper, are no more required, and the same are ordered to be destroyed after the appeal time is over, or after the disposal of the appeal, whichever is later, subject to the outcome of the appeal proceedings.

(iii) The bail bond executed by the accused stands revoked.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, taken by her in shorthand, transcribed and typed by her with the help of voice recorder, and Microsoft 365, corrected and pronounced by me, in the open court, this the 19th day of August - 2026.

**Principal Sessions Judge,
Salem.**

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

Annexures:-

List of witnesses examined on the side of prosecution:-

PW1	02.07.2025	Thiru. Chithanathan / Complainant
PW2	02.07.2025	Thiru. Murugan / Inquest witness
PW3	05.08.2025	Thiru. Anantha Kumar / Inquest witness
PW4	05.08.2025	Thiru. Kaliappan / Inquest witness
PW5	21.08.2025	Thiru. Kaliyappan / Hearsay witness
PW6	19.09.2025	Thiru. Kulanthan / Observation and Seizure Mahazar witness
PW7	19.09.2025	Thiru. Ramalingam / Hearsay witness
PW8	19.09.2025	Thiru. Ramachandran / Hearsay witness
PW9	19.09.2025	Thiru. Thangam @ Elango / Hearsay witness
PW10	05.11.2025	Thiru. Krishnan / Other witness
PW11	25.11.2025	Thiru. Kathiresan / Other witness
PW12	08.01.2026	Thiru. Sridhar / Confession and Seizure Mahazar witness
PW13	30.01.2026	Dr. Karthick / Expert witness
PW14	19.02.2026	Thiru. Madhaiyan / Other witness
PW15	19.02.2026	Thiru. Eswaran / Other witness
PW16	19.02.2026	Thiru. Bakkiyaraj / Other witness
PW17	08.06.2026	Thiru. Senthilkumaran / Sub-Inspector of Police / Duty Officer
PW18	28.07.2026	Tmt. Devi / Inspector of Police / Investigating Officer



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

22

S.C.No.217/2022

List of documents marked on the side of prosecution:-

Ex.P1/PW1	06.03.2022	Complaint
Ex.P2/PW6	06.03.2022	Observation Mahazar
Ex.P3/PW6	06.03.2022	Seizure Mahazar (M.O.3 to M.O.7)
Ex.P4/PW11	16.04.2022	Letter sent by the Assistant Engineer to the Inspector of Police, Sankari.
Ex.P5/PW12	06.03.2022	Admitted portion of confession statement given by the accused person
Ex.P6/PW12	06.03.2022	Seizure Mahazar (M.O.1 and M.O.2)
Ex.P7/PW13	06.03.2022	Post Mortem Certificate of deceased person
Ex.P8/PW13	30.03.2022	Final Opinion
Ex.P9/PW14	---	Special Report
Ex.P10/PW17	06.03.2022	First Information Report
Ex.P11/PW18	06.03.2022	Rough Sketch
Ex.P12/PW18	06.03.2022	Inquest Report
Ex.P13/PW18	06.03.2022	Serology Report
Ex.P14/PW18	19.05.2022	Biology Report
Ex.P15/PW18	24.03.2022	Visera Report
Ex.P16/PW18	06.03.2022	Form 95 (M.O.3 to M.O.7)
Ex.P17/PW18	06.03.2022	Form 95 (M.O.1 and M.O.2)
Ex.P18/PW18	06.03.2022	Form 95 (M.O.8 and M.O.10)

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.

23

S.C.No.217/2022

List of material object marked on the side of prosecution:-

M.O.1/PW1	Sickle
M.O.2/PW1	Yellow Colour Towel
M.O.3/PW3	Blood stained cement stone
M.O.4/PW3	Cement stone
M.O.5/PW3	Blood stained cot rope
M.O.6/PW3	Cot rope
M.O.7/PW3	Blood stained Newspaper
M.O.8/PW14	Blood stained bed sheet
M.O.9/PW14	Blood stained lungi
M.O.10/PW14	Blood stained panties

List of witnesses and documents on the side of defence:-

-Nil-

List of material objects on the side of the side defence:-

-Nil-

**Principal Sessions Judge,
Salem.**

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem



*Scan the code using 'e Courts Services'
mobile application download from Play Store.*

24

S.C.No.217/2022

Principal Sessions Court,
Salem.

Fair/Draft Judgment in

S.C. No. 217/2022

Dated : 19.08.2026

19.08.2026

Principal Sessions Judge, Salem