



IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KARAIKUDI

PRESENT: THIRU.J.KARMEGAKANNAN, B.A., B.L.,

JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KARAIKUDI

On Thursday the 06th day of August 2026

Summary Trial Case No.44 of 2022

Old S.T.C.No.2537 of 2018

Crime Number.531 of 2017

(On the file of Karaikudi North Police Station)

CNR No.TNSV19 – 000 – 463 – 2022

Statement as per Rule 106 of the Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019

1.	Serial Number	Summary Trial Case (S.T.C). No.44 of 2022
2.	Name of the Police Station and Crime Number	State Reperesented through Sub Inspector of Police, Karaikudi North Police Station, Sivagangai District. Crime No. 531 of 2017. Complainant
3.	Name	1. Iqbal Rahman,
	Father's name	S/o. Mohamed Abdulla,
	Occupation	No. 14/ 1, Masjid Street, Vadapalani, Chennai,
	Residence	Chennai District.
	Age	2. Abdul Ajis, S/o. Mohamed Abdulla, No. 14/ 1, Masjid Street,



		Vadaalani, Chennai, Chennai District. 3. Nazir Ahamed, S/o. Mohamed Abdulla, No.0/2A, Manimegalai Street, Kattu Thalaivasal, Karaikudi, Sivagangai District. Accuseds																											
4.	Date of Occurrence	07.09.2017																											
5.	Date of Final Report	29.11.2017																											
6.	Date of Apprehension	09.09.2017																											
7.	Date of Release on bail	13.09.2017																											
8.	Date of examination of witnesses in chief, Cross	<table><tr><th>Witnesses</th><th>Chief Examination</th><th>Cross Examination</th></tr><tr><td>PW-1</td><td>16.10.2023</td><td>16.10.2025</td></tr><tr><td>PW-2</td><td>16.10.2023</td><td>28.10.2025</td></tr><tr><td>PW-3</td><td>16.10.2023</td><td>16.10.2025</td></tr><tr><td>PW-4</td><td>16.10.2023</td><td>25.03.2026</td></tr><tr><td>PW-5</td><td>28.11.2023</td><td>20.11.2025</td></tr><tr><td>PW-6</td><td>05.12.2023</td><td>28.10.2025</td></tr><tr><td>PW-7</td><td>16.10.2025</td><td>16.10.2025</td></tr><tr><td>PW-8</td><td>23.06.2026</td><td>23.06.2026</td></tr></table>	Witnesses	Chief Examination	Cross Examination	PW-1	16.10.2023	16.10.2025	PW-2	16.10.2023	28.10.2025	PW-3	16.10.2023	16.10.2025	PW-4	16.10.2023	25.03.2026	PW-5	28.11.2023	20.11.2025	PW-6	05.12.2023	28.10.2025	PW-7	16.10.2025	16.10.2025	PW-8	23.06.2026	23.06.2026
Witnesses	Chief Examination	Cross Examination																											
PW-1	16.10.2023	16.10.2025																											
PW-2	16.10.2023	28.10.2025																											
PW-3	16.10.2023	16.10.2025																											
PW-4	16.10.2023	25.03.2026																											
PW-5	28.11.2023	20.11.2025																											
PW-6	05.12.2023	28.10.2025																											
PW-7	16.10.2025	16.10.2025																											
PW-8	23.06.2026	23.06.2026																											



		PW-9	09.07.2026	09.07.2026
9.	Closure of Trial	09.07.2026		
10.	Accused are questioned u/s.313(1)(b) of Crpc date	20.07.2026		
11	Sentence or Order.	In the result, the offence alleged against Accused Nos. 1 to 3 under Sections 294 (b), 323, 427 and 448 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, has not been proved and the accused are found not guilty. Hence, Accused are acquitted under Section 255 (1) of Cr.P.C. The bail bonds, if any, executed by the accused shall stand cancelled and the sureties, if any, shall stand discharged after the expiry of the appeal period.		
12.	Service of copy of judgment or finding on accused person	The Judgment was uploaded in e-court portal		
13.	Explanation of delay	The delay was occasioned due to the delay in serving of summons on the accused is and Covid - 19 pandemic situation.		
14.	Date of Judgment Reserved	30.07.2026		
15.	Date of Judgment Pronounce	06.08.2026		
16.	Date of Judgment upload	06.08.2026		



This case being taken on file in the year 2018 and previously numbered as S.T.C.No.2537/2018 and this court converted on 2022 as Judicial Magistrate Court Karaikudi, new number has been assigned as S.T.C.No.44/2022 and the state being represented by Mr.V. Selvaraj, Assistant Public Prosecutor- Grade I and Mr.V.Nelson Jeeva, counsel for Accused persons and after perusing the documents filed, evidence adduced and upon hearing submission of both sides, this court passes the following:-

JUDGMENT

1. This case is charge sheeted by the Sub Inspector of Police, Karaikudi North Police Station in Crime No. 531 of 2017 alleging the commission of offence against the accused persons under Sections 294 (b), 323, 427 and 448 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. The prosecution case in brief is as follows:-

On 07.09.2017 at about 11.30 AM when the defacto complainant was at his house along with his parents and elder brother, situated at Kattuthalaivasal, Karaikudi, the three accused came to his house, used filthy language, and asked them to go away from the house, stating that the house stood in their name. They also damaged the TV, washing machine, bureau, and fridge. When his mother tried to prevent them from doing so, they also beat her with their hands and caused her simple injuries.



3. On the basis of the same, the defacto complainant has lodged a complaint on 09.09.2017 and on the basis of the same, the FIR was registered on 09.09.2017. On charge sheet being file, the case was taken on file against the accused persons and summons were issued. Hence, on appearance of the accused persons, copies were furnished under section 207 Cr.P.C. The particulars of the offence of which they being accused persons under Sections 294 (b), 323, 427 and 448 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, was put to them and asked whether they plead guilty or has any defence to make. However, the accused are denied the accusation and claimed to be tried, hence this court on prima facie case existed, proceeded to hear the prosecution evidence.

4. The evidence on the side of prosecution consists of testimonies of PW1 to PW9 and Exhibits P1 to P11 and M.O.No. 1 and 2 also marked. After closure of prosecution side evidence, this court questioned the accused persons U/s 313 of the criminal procedure code, regarding incriminating material available against them in the prosecution evidence. The accused are denied the complicity of the offence. The defence side did not examine any witness nor did mark any document.

5. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for the State argued that the case of the Prosecution has been proved beyond all reasonable doubts on account of the consistent testimony of the witnesses regarding the offence



against the accused persons under Sections 294 (b), 323, 427 and 448 of Indian Penal Code, 1860. Thus, it was strongly pressed on behalf of State that the Accused be convicted and given maximum punishment.

6. Per contra, the learned counsel for the accused has Arguing that Prosecution has completely failed to discharge its burden of proving the case of the Accused beyond reasonable doubts, learned Counsel for the Accused pressed upon his acquittal from the present case.

7. This court have heard learned APP for the State and learned Counsel for the accused. I have gone through the oral and documentary evidence for appreciating the rival contentions.

8. Points for Consideration:-

Whether the prosecution has proved its case beyond all reasonable doubt against the accused persons for the offence under Sections 294 (b), 323, 427 and 448 of Indian Penal Code, 1860?

The Testimonies of the Prosecution witnesses in brief is as follows;-

9. The PW1- Umar Farook- The defacto complainant has deposed that he knew the accused and they are his brothers. He is residing at Manimegalai Street, Door No. 2A. On 07.09.2017 at about 11.30 AM, he, his sons and wife



were at their house. The accused came to his house. They said that he had obtained the house from his father and that he has to go away from the house. When he said that the same will be resolved, the 2nd accused used filthy language against him and stated that if he did not vacate the house, the 2nd accused would kill him. Accused Nos.1 to 3 beat his wife, son and him with their hands. Out of the same, he sustained injuries on his right side chin, head and right side knee. They also pulled his wife down and caused bleeding from her mouth. Thereafter, they took away the washing machine, fridge and grinder. They also came with ten unknown persons, drove them out of the house, locked the house and took away the keys. Thereafter, he and his wife were admitted to the hospital. Thereafter, his elder son Tharik lodged a written complaint. In this occurrence, his wife's 5 sovereigns of gold, which she was wearing, was found missing and the same was informed to the police. Thereafter, they also took away the ATM card, PAN card and his wife's Aadhaar card from the bureau. They also took the grinder, fridge and all other household articles in a lorry and kept the same near Five Lamps and thereafter the same was kept at his rented house. After four to five days, on the basis of the information given by the accused, they went to that house and took the same. They also damaged several things in the house. Some of the items were stolen. In this regard, he was examined by the police.



10. The PW2- Mydeen- who was examined as an eye witness to the case, has deposed that he knew the accused and PW1. On 07.09.2017 at about 11.30 AM, he went to PW1's house to see him. At that time, the accused came there. The accused asked PW1 to go away from the house and blamed him. They also used filthy language against PW1 and his wife and attacked them. He witnessed the same. In the said occurrence, PW1 sustained injuries on his right side chin and right side shoulder. At that time, the accused also issued a threat to PW1's son with his life. Thereafter, they also threw the household articles like cooking vessels, fridge and mixie. After attacking them, they drove them out of the house, locked the house and took away the key. In this regard, the police examined him.

11. The PW3- Kani- who was examined as an eye witness to the case, has deposed that he knew the one accused who has bron with the PW1 and he knew the PW1. On 07.09.2017 at about 11.30 AM, he went to PW1's house to see him. At that time, the accused came there. The accused asked PW1 to go away from the house and blamed him. They also used filthy language against PW1 and his wife and attacked them. He witnessed the same. In the said occurrence, PW1 sustained injuries on his right side chin and right side shoulder. At that time, the accused also issued a threat to PW1's son with his life. Thereafter, they also threw the household articles like cooking vessels, fridge and mixie. After attacking them, they drove them out of the house,



locked the house and took away the key. In this regard, the police examined him.

12. The PW4- Pakkeer Mohamed- who was examined as the mahazar witness, has deposed that on 09.09.2017 at about 11.15 AM, when he was walking towards Umar Farooq's house, the Karaikudi North Police were there and enquired about the quarrel. At that time, they drew the sketch and prepared the documents, wherein he signed. He has also admitted his signature and the same was marked as Ex.P1. In this regard, he was examined by the police.

13. The PW5- Palanisamy- who was examined as the seizure mahazar witness, has deposed that he knew the accused persons. He was driving a car for them. On 09.09.2017 at about 02.00 PM, he went to Shahul Hameed's house and he was in his car. At that time, there was a fight near the Muthumariamman Temple Lane, but he does not know between whom the fight took place. The police obtained his signature, and he signed in the seizure mahazar. He has admitted his signature and the same was marked as Ex.P2.

14. The PW6- Sahul Hameed- who was examined as the seizure mahazar witness, deposed that on 09.09.2017 at about 01.00 PM, when he went to Manimagalai Street on his two-wheeler, the Karaikudi North Police were examining Umar Saruk regarding the articles kept outside his house and the



damages caused. In this regard, the police prepared a seizure mahazar, in which he signed as the first witness. His signature has been marked as Ex.P3.

15. The PW7- Thariq Anwar- The defacto complainant has deposed that PW1 is his father. He knew the accused. On 07.09.2017 when he was studying first year at Mount Zion Engineering College, on that day, he, his brother, his father and his mother, Sithi Aayesha, were at their house situated at Door No. 0/2A. At about 11.30 AM the accused came and asked them to vacate the house since the same was standing in their name and used abusive language. When he and his father questioned the same, they took the TV, fridge, washing machine and bureau and damaged the same. When they questioned the same, all the three accused attacked his father on his knee, hand, forehead and right eye. His mother was attacked by the accused on her head, chin and stomach. He also tried to intervene in the same. The accused locked the house and took away the key. At that time, Abdul Ajis had also issued a life threat against them. Thereafter, he admitted his father at Government Hospital, Karaikudi, and he was there for two days. Thereafter, he lodged a complaint on 09.09.2017 and the same has been marked as Ex.P1. Abdul Ajis also used abusive language and at that time Iqbal Rahman and Nasik Ahamed also attacked them. His mother also lost a gold chain weighing 5 sovereigns. In this regard, the police had examined him.



16. The PW8- Muthukrishnan- The Investigation Officer had deposed that on 09.09.2017 at about 10.15 AM when he was at station duty, PW7 came and lodged a complaint and based on the same, he registered an FIR in Crime No. 531 of 2017 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 427, 448, 379 and 506(1) of IPC, and the same has been marked as Ex.P5. Thereafter, he went to the occurrence spot and prepared the observation mahazar and rough sketch, and the rough sketch has been marked as Ex.P6. He arrested the accused persons on 09.09.2017 at about 11.15 AM and sent them to judicial custody. Thereafter, he also examined Dr. Narmatha, who had treated the injured persons. Thereafter, he recovered the case properties under a seizure mahazar and marked the seizure mahazar as Ex.P7. The same was sent to the court through Form 95. The damaged plastic pieces, two in number, have been marked as M.O.1 and the damaged glass pieces, one in number, have been marked as M.O.2. Thereafter, he altered the provisions and marked the alteration report as Ex.P9. Thereafter, he filed the final report on 21.09.2017.

17. The PW9- Dr. Narmatha- The doctor had deposed that on 07.09.2017 when she was on duty at the Government Hospital, Karaikudi, at about 05.10 PM, one Sithi Aayesha came for treatment stating that she was attacked by three known persons and four unknown persons at about 11.30 AM, at her house with a wooden stick. She had no external injuries. She complained of head giddiness and she was referred for a CT scan. Thereafter,



she did not come for further treatment and hence she had not issued any opinion. The Accident Report alone has been marked as Ex.P10. In connection with the same case, one Umar Farooq came for treatment individually at about 05.05 p.m. stating that he was attacked by three known persons and four unknown persons with a wooden stick at his house. He had a 2×1 cm laceration on his lower lip and a 2×3 cm abrasion on his left knee, and she had opined that the same were simple injuries. The Accident Report-cum-Wound Certificate has been marked as Ex.P11.

The point for consideration is answered as follows;-

18. The prosecution case is that on 07.09.2017 at about 11.30 AM, the three accused came to the house of the defacto complainant at Kattuthalaivasal, Karaikudi, abused him in filthy language, asked him to vacate the house saying that it belonged to them, damaged the household articles and assaulted his mother when she tried to stop them.

19. To prove the case, the prosecution examined PW1 to PW9, marked Ex.P1 to Ex.P11 and produced M.O.1 and M.O.2.

20. The PW1 is the injured witness. He has stated that when he was in the house with his wife and two sons, the accused came there, asked him to vacate the house, used filthy language and assaulted him. According to him, he



suffered injuries on his right chin, head and right knee. However, PW9, the Doctor, has stated that PW1 had only a lacerated injury on his lower lip and an abrasion on his left knee. The Doctor has not spoken about any head injury or injury on the right knee. The chief examination of the PW9 is extarcted hereunder for better appreciation;-

“நான் காரைக்குடி அரசு மருத்துவமனையில் உதவி மருத்துவ அலுவலராக 07.09.2017 அன்று பணியில் இருந்தபோது 05.10 மணிக்கு காரைக்குடியை சேர்ந்த சித்தி ஆயுசா என்பவர் சிகிச்சைக்காக தனாக வந்தார். அவரை விசாரணை செய்தபோது அன்றைய தினம் இரவு 11.30 மணியளவில் அவருடைய வீட்டில் வைத்து 3 அடையாளம் தெரிந்த மற்றும் 4 அடையாளம் தெரியாத நபர்கள் மரக்குச்சியால் தன்னை தாக்கியதாக சொன்னார். அவருக்கு வெளிப்புற காயங்கள் எதுவும் இல்லை. தலைச்சுற்றல் இருந்தது. CT Brain எடுப்பதற்காக நான் பரிந்துரை செய்தேன். அதன்பின்னர் அவர் சிகிச்சைக்கு என்னிடம் வரவில்லை. ஆகையால் அவருடைய காயம் குறித்து என்னால் கருத்துரை வழங்க இயலவில்லை. விபத்து பதிவேடு அ.சா.ஆ.10. இதே வழக்கில் தொடர்புடைய மற்றொரு நபர் உமர் பரூக் என்பவர் தன்னிச்சையாக சிகிச்சைக்கு என்னிடம் அன்றைய தினம் 05.05 மணியளவில் வந்தார். அவரை விசாரணை செய்தபோது 3 அடையாளம் தெரிந்த மற்றும் 4 அடையாளம் தெரியாத நபர்கள் மரக்குச்சியால் தன்னுடைய வீட்டில் வைத்து தாக்கியதாக சொன்னார். அவருக்கு 2x1 cm சிதைந்த காயம் கீழ் உதட்டில் இருந்தது 2x3 cm



அளவிலான சிராய்ப்பு காயம் அவருடைய இடது முழுங்கால் பகுதியில் இருந்தது அவருக்கு ஏற்பட்ட காயமானது சாதாரண வகையை சேர்ந்தது என்று நான் சான்று அளித்தேன். விபத்து பதிவேட்டுடன் கூடிய காயச்சான்று அ.சா.ஆ.11.”

Therefore, the evidence of PW1 is not fully supported by the medical evidence.

21. The PW1 has also stated that the accused damaged the household articles. But in the same evidence, he has stated that the accused loaded the articles in a lorry, took them to a rented house near Five Lamps and that he recovered them after five days. This creates doubt as to whether the articles were really damaged. Though PW1 has stated that many household articles were damaged, the prosecution has produced only two broken plastic pieces and one broken glass piece as M.O.1 and M.O.2. The television, washing machine, bureau and fridge were not produced before the court as damaged articles. Therefore, the prosecution has not satisfactorily proved the damage to the properties.

22. Another important fact is that PW9, the Doctor, has stated that PW1 informed her that he was attacked by three known persons and four unknown persons with a wooden stick. But none of the prosecution witnesses have stated



before this court that they were attacked with a wooden stick. They have only stated that they were beaten with hands. This is a clear contradiction between the medical records and the oral evidence.

23. The prosecution has also stated that PW1's wife, Sithi Ayesha, suffered injuries in the occurrence. However, she has not been examined before this court and she was not even arraigned as witness in the list. She was an injured person and an important witness. Her evidence would have helped the court to know what really happened. The prosecution has not given any reason for not examining her. This creates doubt about the prosecution case.

24. The PW2, who was examined as an eye witness, has stated that the accused came to the house, asked PW1 to vacate the house and assaulted him. He has stated that PW1 suffered injuries on the right chin and right shoulder. This is different from the evidence of PW1, who spoke about injuries on the head and right knee, and it is also different from the medical evidence given by PW9. Thus, there are contradictions regarding the injuries sustained by PW1.

25. Further, there are three accused in this case. But none of the witnesses have clearly stated which accused assaulted which person or what specific act was done by each accused. Such specific evidence is necessary



when more than one accused is involved. The evidence of PW2 is general in nature and does not fix the role of each accused.

26. The PW3 has also given evidence similar to PW2. His evidence does not contain any specific act against any particular accused. Therefore, his evidence also does not improve the prosecution case.

27. PW4, who was examined as the observation mahazar witness, has admitted that he signed the mahazar at the police station and that he did not know between whom the quarrel took place. Therefore, his evidence does not support the prosecution.

28. The PW6, the seizure mahazar witness, has admitted that he does not know from whom the articles were recovered or who damaged them. Hence, his evidence also does not help the prosecution.

29. The PW7, who gave the complaint, has stated that his mother suffered injuries and that his father suffered injuries on the knee, hand, forehead and right eye. He has also stated that they were attacked only with hands. This is again different from the medical records, which mention an attack with a wooden stick. Therefore, his evidence also contains contradictions.



30. The PW8, the Investigation Officer, has admitted that there was a delay of two days in giving the complaint. No proper explanation has been given for this delay. He has also admitted that Sithi Ayesha was not examined during the investigation though she was said to be an injured person. He has further admitted that the damaged household articles were not recovered. For better appreciation the relevant portion of his cross examination is extracted hereunder;-

“சம்பவம் நடந்து இரண்டு நாட்கள் கழித்து புகார் அளிக்கப்பட்டது என்றால் சரிதான். புகார் கொடுக்க ஏன் காலதாமதம் என்று குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளேனா என்றால் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளேன் மருத்துவமனையில் சிகிச்சையில் இருந்ததால் கால தாமதம் ஏற்பட்டது. புகாரில் புகார்தாரர் சம்பவம் நடந்ததாக சொல்லும் இடத்தில் புகார்தாரர் அவருடைய தாயார் சித்தி ஆயிஷா தகப்பனார் உமர்பாளுக் அவர் சகோதரர் உஸ்மான் அலி ஆகியோர் மட்டும்தான் இருந்தார்கள் என்று சொல்லியுள்ளார் என்றால் சரிதான். வழக்கில் சித்தி ஆயிஷா மற்றும் உஸ்மான் அலி ஆகியோர்களை சாட்சிகளாக விசாரணை செய்யவில்லை என்றால் சரிதான். எதிரிகள் அடித்து நொறுக்கியதாக சொல்லப்படும் பொருட்களை கைப்பற்றவில்லை என்றால் சரிதான். நான் கைப்பற்றியதாக சொல்லும் பிளாஸ்டிக் மற்றும் கண்ணாடி துண்டுகள் ஆகியவை சேதப்படுத்தப்பட்ட பொருள்களில் இருந்து தான் எடுக்கப்பட்டது என்பதற்கான சான்றுகள் எதுவும் இல்லை என்றால் சரிதான்.”



These admissions weaken the prosecution case.

31. Regarding the offence under section 294(b) IPC, the prosecution has not proved all the necessary ingredients. Though PW1 has spoken about the abusive words, there is no evidence to show that the alleged words caused annoyance to the public. Therefore, the offence under Section 294(b) IPC is not proved.

32. As already discussed, that the offence under section 323 IPC is also not proved beyond reasonable doubt. The evidence regarding the injuries is not consistent with the medical evidence. The prosecution has also failed to examine Sithi Ayesha, who was another injured person.

33. The offences under sections 427 and 448 IPC are also not proved. The evidence shows that the accused and the complainant are brothers and there was already a dispute regarding the house. The prosecution has not produced clear and reliable evidence to prove that the accused committed house trespass or intentionally damaged the household articles.

34. Moreover, it is the paramount duty of the prosecution to establish the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. Unless the guilt is established beyond all reasonable doubt, the accused can not be held guilty of the alleged



offences. On this point held in, (2016) 10 SCC 519 - AIR 2016 SC 4581 in para 56, Hon'ble Apex held thus hereunder:

"56. It is a trite proposition of law, that suspicion however grave, it cannot take the place of proof and that the prosecution in order to succeed on a criminal charge cannot afford to lodge its case in the realm of "may be true" but has to essentially elevate it to the grade of "must be true". In a criminal prosecution, the court has a duty to ensure that mere conjectures or suspicion do not take the place of legal proof and in a situation where a reasonable doubt is entertained in the backdrop of the evidence available, to prevent miscarriage of justice, benefit of doubt is to be extended to the accused. Such a doubt essentially has to be reasonable and not imaginary, fanciful, intangible or non-existent but as entertainable by an impartial, prudent and analytical mind, judged on the touchstone of reason and common sense. It is also a primary postulation in criminal jurisprudence that if two views are possible on the evidence available one pointing to the guilt of the accused and the other to his innocence, the one favourable to the accused ought to be adopted."

35. Therefore, this court finds that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges under Sections 294(b), 323, 427 and 448 of the Indian Penal Code beyond reasonable doubt. Hence, all the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt and are liable to be acquitted.



36. In the result, the offence alleged against Accused Nos. 1 to 3 under Sections 294 (b), 323, 427 and 448 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, has not been proved and the accused are found not guilty. Hence, Accused are acquitted under Section 255 (1) of Cr.P.C. The bail bonds, if any, executed by the accused shall stand cancelled and the sureties, if any, shall stand discharged after the expiry of the appeal period.

37. In this case property remanded in P.R.No.191/2017, 1) Damaged Plastic Pieces -2, 2) Damaged Glass Pieces shall be destroyed after the expiry of the appeal period. In case an appeal is filed, the disposal of the said property shall be subject to the orders of the Appellate Court.

Typed by me in my computer, verified by me to be correct and pronounced in open court on 06th day of August, 2026.

Judicial Magistrate,
Karaikudi.

Chart for Complaint side witnesses:		
PW.No	Name of Witness	Description
1	Mr. Umar Farook	Injured witness
2	Mr. Mydeen	Eye witness
3	Mr. Kani	Eye witness
4	Mr. Pakkeer Mohammed	Mahazar witness



5	Mr. Palanisamy	Seizure Mahazar witness
6	Mr. Sahul Hameed	Seizure Mahazar witness
7	Mr. Thariq Anwar	Defacto Complainant
8	Mr. Muthukrishnan	Investigation Officer
9	Mrs. Narmatha	Doctor witness
Defence Side Witness - NIL		
Chart for Exhibited Documents		
Exhibit No.	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by/Attested by
1	Observation Mahazar	PW4
2	Signature of the PW5 in Seizure Mahazar	PW5
3	Signature of the PW6 in Seizure Mahazar	PW6
4	Complaint	PW7
5	First Information Report	PW8
6	Rough Sketch	PW8
7	Seizure Mahazar	PW8
8	Form 95	PW8
9	Section Alteration Report	PW8
10	Accident Register	PW9



11	Accident Register with Wound Certificate	PW9
Exhibits of the Defence - NIL		
Material Objects Submitted by Prosecution		
1	Damaged Plastic Pieces - 2	PW8
2	Damaged Glass pieces - 1	PW8
Material Objects Submitted by Defence - NIL		

Judicial Magistrate,
Karaikudi.

Note:

1. During the period of trial the accused were enlarged on bail.
2. No witnesses were held more than three days without examination.
3. Judgment Date : 06.08.2026.