

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, THANJAVUR.**

PRESENT: **Thiru. P. Velmurugan, B.A., B.L.,**  
Principal Sessions Judge, Thanjavur.

Tuesday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026  
(Thiruvalluvarandu 2057 Sri Viswavasud Varudam Panguni Thingal 3<sup>rd</sup> day)

**Sessions Case No. 389/2025**  
**CNR No. TNTJ01 – 011032 – 2025**

(PRC No. 102/2025 of Judicial Magistrate No. I Court, Thanjavur)  
(Cr. No. 146/2025 on the file of Thanjavur South Police Station)

Complainant	: State represented by Inspector of Police, Thanjavur South Police Station. Crime No. 146/2025
Name and Address of the Accused	: Arivalagan, aged 46/2026, S/o. Loganathan, No. 41/1, Keela Theru, Ganapathi Nagar, Thanjavur.
<b><u>Charge</u></b>	: Committing murder – punishable under Section 103(1) of the BNS, 2023.
Plea of the Accused	: Not Guilty
Finding of the Court	: Not Guilty
Sentence or order of this Court	: In the result, the accused is not found guilty of the offence punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and is acquitted under Section 258(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The bail bond, if any, shall stand cancelled.

After the completion of the appeal period or upon the disposal of the appeal, if there be any, the case properties namely MO1 – MO8 are ordered to be destroyed, as those material objects are of no use

**Brief Facts of the Case:–**

- 1) Name of the Police Station and the Crime Number : Thanjavur South Police Station; Crime No. 146/2025
- 2) Name of the Accused : Arivalagan
- 3) Name of the Accused's Father : Loganathan
- 4) Occupation of the Accused : Driver – Auto–rickshaw
- 5) Residence of the Accused : No. 41/1, Keela Theru, Ganapathi Nagar, Thanjavur.
- 6) Age of the Accused : 46/2026
- 7) Date of Occurrence : 06.07.2025
- 8) Date of Complaint : 06.07.2025
- 9) Period of Remand of the Accused : 07.07.2025 – 06.12.2025
- 10) Date of Committal of the Case : 05.11.2025
- 11) Date of Questioning the Accused under Section 228 of CrI.P.C. : 08.12.2025
- 12) Date of Examination of the Accused under Section 313(1)(b) of CrI.P.C. : 07.03.2026
- 13) Commencement of Trial : 15.12.2025
- 14) Close of Trial : 23.02.2026
- 15) Sentence or Order : 17.03.2026

**16) Criminal Miscellaneous Petitions filed by the accused:–**

<b>Petitions</b>	<b>Crl. M. P. No.</b>	<b>Date of Filing</b>	<b>Date &amp; Nature of Disposal</b>
Bail Petition	5453/2025	–	20.09.2025 – Allowed

**Dates of Examination in Chief and Cross–Examination of witnesses:–**

<b>Name of the Witnesses</b>		<b>Date of Chief Examination</b>	<b>Date of Cross Examination</b>
PW1	Duraimurugan	15.12.2025	15.12.2025
PW2	Karthik	15.12.2025	15.12.2025
PW3	Dhanarajan	15.12.2025	–
PW4	Vijay	15.12.2025	–
PW5	Mahalakshmi	15.12.2025	15.12.2025
PW6	Vinothkumar	15.12.2025	15.12.2025
PW7	Manikandan	15.12.2025	15.12.2025
PW8	Sriram	17.12.2025	17.12.2025
PW9	Monishkanna	17.12.2025	17.12.2025
PW10	Sivakumar	17.12.2025	17.12.2025
PW11	Nandabalan	17.12.2025	17.12.2025
PW12	Dr. Mithun Chakravarthi	18.12.2025	–
PW13	Dr. Balamurali	18.12.2025	18.12.2025
PW14	Naveen	19.01.2026	–
PW15	Ravichandran, SI of Police	04.02.2026	04.02.2026
PW16	Sudha, Inspector of Police	11.02.2026	11.02.2026
PW17	Jagadesan, Inspector of Police	23.02.2026	23.02.2026

This Sessions Case was taken up before this Court for final hearing on 11.03.2026 in the presence of Mr. S. Sathiamoorthy, Learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the Complainant and Mr. K. Balakrishnan, Learned Legal Aid Defence Counsel appearing for the Accused, and, upon hearing of both sides and perusing available material records and having stood over for consideration till date, this Court passed the following ....

### **J U D G M E N T**

1. The Inspector of Thanjavur South Police Station laid a final report against the accused alleging that:

The accused Arivalagan and the deceased Thiruvankadam are brothers. The accused was married to one Revathi, but owing to marital discord they were living separately. The deceased Thiruvankadam remained unmarried. Both the accused and the deceased were residing together in their ancestral house situated at Ganapathi Nagar. Both of them were habituated to consuming alcohol and, on account of such habit, quarrels frequently arose between them. In particular, disputes often occurred regarding the division of the rental income derived from two shops situated in front of their ancestral house. While so, on 06.07.2025, at about 3.00 p.m., when both the accused and the deceased were present in their ancestral house, a quarrel arose between them over the sharing of the rental income of shops. During the course of the altercation, the accused, with the intention of causing the death of his younger brother, took a wooden reaper, which had been concealed in the house, and repeatedly assaulted the deceased on his head and face. As a result of the grievous head injuries sustained in the attack, Thiruvankadam succumbed to death, thereby the accused

committed an offence punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Upon receipt of the Final Report, the Learned Judicial Magistrate No. I, Thanjavur, took cognizance of the case and numbered it as PRC No. 102/2025 for the offence punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhitha, 2023, (hereinafter referred to as “BNS”) and after furnishing copies of the relevant documents to the accused as mandated under Section 207 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, (hereinafter referred to as “CrPC”) committed the case to the Court of Sessions, as the offence punishable under Section 103(1) of the BNS is exclusively triable by the Sessions Court.

3. Upon receipt of case records from the Committal Court, this Principal Sessions Court, Thanjavur, has taken up the case on file and numbered it as SC No. 389/2025. After making the appearance of the accused, charges were framed for the offences punishable under Section 103(1) of the BNS against the accused. The charges were read over and explained to the accused, to which, he pleaded not guilty and sought to be tried.

4. In order to prove the charges framed against the accused, the prosecution examined PW1 to PW17 and marked Ex.P1 to Ex.P24, along with MO1 – MO8.

5. **The brief case of the prosecution from its oral and documentary evidence, is as follows:-**

(5.1) While so, on 06.07.2025, at about 3.00 P.M. the accused, with the intention of causing the death of his younger brother namely

Thiruvengadam, took a wooden reaper, which had been concealed in the house, and repeatedly assaulted the deceased on his head and face on account dispute regarding sharing the rental income of the shops situated before their house and therefore, said Thiruvengadam succumbed to the injuries. However, the body of the deceased was taken to Thanjavur Medical College Hospital, wherein, PW12 Dr.Mithun Chakravarthi examined him and declared his death. He sent the body of the deceased to the mortuary vide Ex.P10 Mortuary memo.

(5.2) PW2 Karthik and one Jayakumar are eye witnesses to the occurrence.

The brothers of the accused as well as the deceased namely PW1 Duraimurugan and PW3 Dhanarajan heard about the occurrence. PW5 Mahalakshmi, mother of the accused as well as the deceased, also heard about the occurrence and went to the occurrence place. PW4 Vijay, PW6 Vinothkumar and PW7 Manikandan are the relatives of the deceased person and they heard about the occurrence. After knowing the occurrence, PW1 went to the occurrence place and then, he lodged Ex.P1 complaint.

(5.3) PW15 Ravichandran, then Sub-Inspector of Thanjavur South Police Station received the complaint and registered the case in Cr.No.146/2025 u/s 103(1) of BNS under Ex.P16 First Information Report. He sent the express FIR through PW14 Naveen, Grade I PC, to the Jurisdictional Magistrate and other higher officials. Then, he placed the case records for the investigation of the Inspector of Police.

(5.4) PW16 Sudha, Inspector of Police, who was Inspector of Thanjavur All Women Police Station and in additional charge of Thanjavur South Police Station, took the case for investigation, visited the occurrence place at 23.00 Hours on the same day in the presence of the witnesses PW8 Sriram and PW9 Monishkanna and prepared the Ex.P4 Observation Mahazar and Ex.P17 Rough sketch. Further, in the presence of the same witnesses, PW16 seized the MO1 bloodstained Cement Plaster and MO2 – Non–Blood–Stained Cement Plaster through Ex.P18 Seizure Mahazar, which were sent to the Court through Ex.P19 – Form 91. The signatures of PW8 in the observation mahazar and above said Seizure mahazar were marked as Ex.P2 & Ex.P3 respectively. The signature of PW9 in the above said Seizure mahazar was marked as Ex.P5. Thereafter, PW16 enquired the witnesses Duraimurugan, Karthik and Jayakumar and recorded their respective statements. On the next day, PW16 handed over the case records to PW17 Jagadeesan, Inspector of Police, Thanjavur South Police Station, since he joined duty after completion of his leave.

(5.5) PW17 Jagadeesan, took up the case for investigation and on 07.07.2025 conducted the inquest on the body of the deceased at the mortuary at Thanjavur Medical College Hospital in the presence of the witnesses and panchayathars and prepared Ex.P20 Inquest Report. He sent the body to postmortem vide Ex.P11 Requisition letter through Head Constable Sivapathasekaran and PW13 Dr.Balamurali conducted autopsy on the body

of the deceased. The dresses of the deceased i.e. MO3 pante, MO4 full handed shirt and MO5 underwear were received under special report and PW17 sent the same to the Court vide Ex.P21 Form 91. After the postmortem, the Head Constable Sivapathasekaran received the body and handed over the same to the relatives of the deceased.

(5.6) While PW17 was searching the accused, on receipt of secret information, he arrested the accused at 16.00 Hours near the wine shop at Balaji Nagar and he enquired him in the presence of the witnesses PW10 Sivakumar and PW11 Nandabalan and recorded the confession statement, voluntarily given by the accused in the presence of the above said witnesses. Based on the confession statement, he recovered the dresses of the accused viz. MO6 pante, MO7 shirt and MO8 wooden reaper under Ex.P23 Seizure Mahazar. The admitted portion of the confession statement was marked as Ex.P22. The signatures of PW10 in the confession statement and the above said seizure mahazar were marked as Ex.P6 and Ex.P7. Similarly, the signatures of PW11 in the confession statement and the above said seizure mahazar were marked as Ex.P8 and Ex.P9.

(5.7) Thereafter, PW17 brought the accused to the police and sent him to the court for remanding to judicial custody and sent the MO6 to MO8 to court vide Ex.P24 Form 91. On 08.07.2025, PW17 enquired the witnesses Duraimurugan and Dhanarajan, and their further statements. Then, he

enquired the witnesses Mahalakshmi and Manikandan and recorded their statements.

(5.8) Thereafter, he enquired Tmt.Jaya, Deputy Director of Regional Forensic Lab, Thanjavur and recorded her statement and enquired Dr. Balamurali and recorded his statement and received Ex.P12 Postmortem Certificate, Ex.P13 Biological Report, Ex.P14 Serology Report and Ex.P15 Viscera Report. PW17 enquired the witnesses Naveen – Grade 1 Police, Jothimani – Police Constable, Sivapathasekaran – Head Constable, Rajkumar, Karthikeyan, Senthamilselvan and Ravichandran – Sub Inspector of Police and recorded their respective statements. On completion of his investigation, he filed the final report against the accused on 01.08.2025 u/s 103(1) of BNS.

6. Upon the closure of the prosecution evidence, the accused was questioned under Section 351(1)(b) of BNSS with respect to the incriminating circumstances appearing against him in the evidence on record. The accused denied all such circumstances as false. Neither oral nor documentary evidence was adduced on the side of the accused.

7. Upon a comprehensive consideration of the materials placed on records and the testimony of the prosecution witnesses, the following point arise for determination:

*1. Whether the prosecution has established that the death of Thiruvengadam was homicide and amount to murder?*

2. *Whether the prosecution has succeeded in proving the guilty of the accused for the charged offences beyond reasonable doubt ?*

**Point No.1:-**

8. The Learned Public Prosecutor has argued that even though some of the witnesses had turned hostile and did not support the case of the prosecution, the charges have been proved by examining remaining witnesses, whose evidence would inspire the confidence of this Court. The prosecution, therefore, prayed this Court to come to a conclusion that charges were proved against the accused beyond reasonable doubt and also prayed to convict him by awarding maximum punishment.

9. The Learned Defence Counsel argued that most of the witnesses inquired by the investigating officer had turned hostile and were not supporting the case of the prosecution. It is further argued that the witnesses, who supported the case of the prosecution during their examinations, were official witnesses, and therefore, this Court cannot believe the evidence of those witnesses, and also argued that the prosecution has miserably failed to establish the guilty against the accused and prayed the Court to acquit the accused from the aforesaid charge.

10. This Court has carefully considered the arguments advanced on both sides and perused the records.

11. The de-facto complainant Duraimurugan is the brother of accused as well as the deceased Thiruvengadam. He lodged Ex.P1 complaint alleging that on 06.07.2025 at about 08.00 PM, he came along with his mother Mahalakshmi, to visit his brothers and when his mother entered into the house and immediately, she

shouted and ran out of the house, and in turn, the de-facto complainant went into the house and saw his brother Thiruvengadam, who laid in pool of blood and immediately, the de-facto complainant called 108 ambulance, and subsequently, the ambulance came, and the staff on duty in the ambulance examined his brother and declared his death. During the course of his chief-examination, the de-facto complainant PW1 deposed that when he reached his house, his brother Thiruvengadam lay dead. PW2 Karthik, neighbour of the deceased also deposed that he saw Thiruvengadam as dead. PW12 Dr.Mithun Chakravarthy, deposed in his evidence that on 06.07.2025, when he was in duty in Thanjavur Medical College Hospital, the dead body of Thiruvengadam was brought through 108 ambulance and he examined the same and declared the death of Thiruvengadam. PW13 Dr.Balamurali deposed about the autopsy conducted on the body of deceased Thiruvengadam, noted down the injuries found on his body and issued the postmortem certificate Ex.P12, in which, gave final opinion that the deceased would appear to have died of hemorrhagic shock following, head injuries sustained. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that the prosecution has established beyond all reasonable doubt that the death of Thiruvengadam was homicidal in nature and amounts to murder. Thus, the Point No.1 is answered accordingly.

**Point No.2:**

12. The prosecution, in order to prove the guilt of the accused, has examined seventeen witnesses, including eyewitness, hearsay witnesses, observation mahazar witnesses, recovery mahazar witnesses, confession statement witnesses, expert

witnesses and investigation officers.

13. Significantly, among the seventeen witnesses, six witnesses viz. PW2, PW5, PW7, PW8, PW10 & PW11, who are cited as material witnesses to the occurrence and surrounding circumstances, have not supported the case of the prosecution and have been declared hostile. It is well settled that though the evidence of a hostile witness is not to be rejected in toto, the portion of evidence supporting the prosecution alone can be relied upon if it is otherwise credible. However, in the case at hand, nothing useful has been elicited from the hostile witnesses during cross-examination by the prosecution so as to connect the accused with the alleged offence.

14. The remaining witnesses examined by the prosecution are either official witnesses, including the police officials, doctors and other formal witnesses, or witnesses, who did not open their mouth about the murder stating that they know nothing about how the murder had been taken place. The official witnesses have deposed only about the procedural aspects such as registration of the case, preparation of observation mahazar & rough sketch and other reports, recovery, confession, conduct of inquest, post-mortem, and investigation. Their evidence is purely formal and procedural in nature and does not directly establish the occurrence or the involvement of the accused in the alleged crime.

15. In the course of the present analysis, the Court has followed the dictum in *Kali Ram v State of Himachal Pradesh*, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that:

*Observations in a recent decision of this Court, Shivaji Sahabrao Bobade & Anr. v. State of Maharashtra(') to which reference has been made during arguments were not intended to make a departure from the rule of the presumption of innocence of the accused and his entitlement to the benefit of reasonable doubt in criminal cases. One of the cardinal principles which has always to be kept in view in our system (1) Cr. App.Ho.26 of 1970 decided on August 27, 1973 of administration of justice for criminal cases is that a person arraigned as an accused is presumed to be innocent unless that presumption is rebutted by the prosecution by production of evidence as may show him to be guilty of the offence with which he is charged. The burden of proving the guilt of the accused is upon the prosecution and unless it relieves itself of that burden, the courts cannot record a finding of the guilt of the accused. There are certain cases in which statutory presumptions arise regarding the guilt of the accused, but the burden even in those cases is upon the prosecution to prove the existence of facts which have to be present before the presumption can be drawn. Once those facts are shown by the prosecution to exist, the court can raise the statutory presumption and it would, in such an event, be for the accused to rebut the presumption. The onus even in such cases upon the accused is not as heavy as is normally upon the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused. If some material is brought on the record consistent with the innocence of the accused which may reasonably be true, even though it is not positively proved to be true, the accused would be entitled to acquittal. Leaving aside the cases of statutory presumptions, the onus is upon the prosecution to prove the different ingredients of the offence and unless it discharges that onus, the prosecution cannot succeed.*

... ..

... ..

... ..

*Another golden thread which runs through the web of the administration of justice in criminal cases is that if two views are possible on the evidence adduced in the case, one pointing to the guilt of the accused and the other to his innocence, the view which is favourable to the accused should be adopted. This principle has a special relevance in cases wherein the guilt of the accused is sought to be established by circumstantial evidence. Rule has accordingly been laid down that unless the evidence adduced in the case is consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused and is inconsistent with that of his innocence, the court should refrain from recording a finding of guilt of the accused. It is also an accepted rule that in case the court entertains reasonable doubt regarding the, guilt of the accused, the accused must have the benefit of that doubt. Of course, the doubt regarding the guilt of the accused should be reasonable: it is not the doubt of a mind which is either so vacillating that it is incapable of reaching a firm conclusion or so timid that it is hesitant and afraid to take things to their natural consequences. The rule regarding the benefit of doubt also does not warrant acquittal of the accused by resort to surmises, conjectures or fanciful considerations. As mentioned by us recently in the case of State of Punjab v. Jagir Singh,(<sup>1</sup>) a criminal trial is not like a fairy tale wherein one is free to give flight to one's imagination and phantasy. It concerns itself with the question as to whether the accused arraigned at the trial is guilty of the offence with which he is charged. Crime is an event in real life and is the product of interplay of different human emotions. In arriving at the conclusion about the*

*guilt of the accused charged with the commission of a crime, the court has to judge, the evidence by the yardstick of probabilities, its intrinsic worth and the animus of witnesses. Every case in the final analysis would have to depend upon its own facts. Although the benefit of every reasonable doubt should be given to the accused, the courts should not at the same time reject evidence which is ex facie trustworthy, on grounds which are fanciful or in the nature of conjectures.*

*It needs all the same to be re-emphasised that if a reasonable doubt arises regarding the guilt of the accused, the benefit of that cannot be withheld from the accused. The courts would not be justified in withholding that benefit because the acquittal might have an impact upon the law and order situation or create adverse reaction in society or amongst those members of the society who believe the accused to be guilty. The guilt of the accused has to be adjudged not by the fact that a vast number of people believe him to be guilty but whether his guilt has been established by the evidence brought on record. Indeed, the courts have hardly any other yardstick or material to adjudge the guilt of the person arraigned as accused. Reference is sometimes made to the clash of public interest and that of the individual accused. The conflict in this respect, in our opinion, is more apparent than real. As observed on page 3 of the book entitled "The Accused" by J.A. Courts 1966 Edition, "When once it is realised, however, that the public interest is limited to the conviction, not of the guilty, but of those proved guilty, so that the function of the prosecutor is limited to securing the conviction only of those who can legitimately be proved guilty, the clash of interest is seen to operate only within a very narrow limit, namely, where the evidence is such that the guilt of the accused should be established.*

*In the case of an accused who is innocent, or whose guilt cannot be proved. the public interest and the interest of the accused alike require an acquittal.”*

*It is no doubt true that wrongful acquittals are undesirable and shake the confidence of the people in the judicial system, much worse, however, is the wrongful conviction of an innocent person. The consequences of the conviction of an innocent person are far more (1) Cr. App. 7 of 1972 decided on August 6, 1973 7 3 6 serious and its reverberations cannot but be felt in a civilized society. Suppose an innocent person is convicted of the offence of murder and is hanged, nothing further can undo the mischief for the wrong resulting from the unmerited conviction is irretrievable. To take another instance, if an innocent person is sent to jail and undergoes the sentence, the scars left by the miscarriage of justice cannot be erased by any subsequent act of expiation. Not many persons undergoing the pangs of wrongful conviction are fortunate like Dreyfus to have an Emile Zola to champion their cause and succeed in getting the verdict of guilt annulled. All this highlights the importance of ensuring. as far as possible, that there should be no wrongful conviction of an innocent person. Some risk of the conviction of the innocent, of course, is always there in any system of the administration of criminal justice. Such a risk can be minimised but not ruled out altogether. It may in this connection be apposite to refer to the following observations of Sir Carleton Allen quoted on page 157 of "The Proof of Guilt" by Glanville Williams, Second Edition:*

*“I dare say some sentimentalists would assent to the proposition that it is better that a thousand, or even a million, guilty persons should escape than that one*

*innocent person should suffer; but no responsible and practical person would accept such a view. For it is obvious that if our ratio is extended indefinitely, there comes a point when the whole system of justice has broken down and society is in a state of chaos.”*

*The fact that there has to be clear evidence of the guilt of the accused and that in the absence of that it is not possible to record a finding of his guilt was stressed by this Court in the case of Shivaji Sahabrao Bobade & Anr. (supra) as is clear from the following observations:*

*“Certainly it is a primary principle that the accused must be and not merely may be guilty before a court can convict and the mental distinction between ‘may be’ and ‘must be’ is long and divides vague conjectures from sure considerations”.*

16. It is a cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that mere suspicion, however strong it may be, cannot take the place of legal proof. In the absence of any reliable ocular testimony or independent corroborative evidence connecting the accused with the commission of the offence, the Court cannot sustain a conviction merely on conjectures or surmises.

17. In the case at hand, the material witnesses have turned hostile and there is no independent or reliable evidence connecting the accused with the commission of offence.

18. In view of the foregoing discussion and upon an overall appreciation of the evidence on record, this Court finds that the prosecution has miserably failed to

establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. The material witnesses having turned hostile, and there being no substantive or independent evidence to connect the accused with the commission of the offence, the very foundation of the prosecution case stands seriously shaken. Applying the aforementioned well-settled principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is bound to extend the benefit of doubt to the accused. The prosecution having failed to establish a consistent and complete chain of circumstances pointing unerringly to the guilt of the accused, this Court has no hesitation in holding that the accused is not guilty of the charges framed against him. Thus, the point is answered accordingly.

19. In the result, the accused is not found guilty of the offence punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and he is acquitted under Section 258(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The bail bond, if any, shall stand cancelled.

20. After the completion of the appeal period or upon the disposal of the appeal, if there be any, the case properties namely MO1 – MO8 are ordered to be destroyed, as those material objects are of no use.

This Judgment is dictated to the Stenographer Grade – III of this Court, typed by him in computer directly, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, on this 17<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

**Principal Sessions Judge,  
Thanjavur.**

**Witnesses examined on the side of the Prosecution:**

(1)	PW1	Duraimurugan
(2)	PW2	Karthik
(3)	PW3	Dhanarajan
(4)	PW4	Vijay
(5)	PW5	Mahalakshmi
(6)	PW6	Vinothkumar
(7)	PW7	Manikandan
(8)	PW8	Sriram
(9)	PW9	Monishkanna
(10)	PW10	Sivakumar
(11)	PW11	Nandabalan
(12)	PW12	Dr. Mithun Chakravarthi
(13)	PW13	Dr. Balamurali
(14)	PW14	Naveen
(15)	PW15	Ravichandran
(16)	PW16	Sudha
(17)	PW17	Jagadesan

**Documents marked on the side of the Prosecution:**

Ex.P1	06.07.2025	Complaint given by PW1
Ex.P2	–	1 <sup>st</sup> Signature of PW8 on Ex.P4 Observation mahazar
Ex.P3	–	1 <sup>st</sup> Signature of PW8 on Ex.P18 Seizure Mahazar
Ex.P4	06.07.2025	Observation Mahazar
Ex.P5	–	2 <sup>nd</sup> Signature of PW9 on Ex.P18 Seizure Mahazar

Ex.P6	–	1 <sup>st</sup> Signature of PW10 on the Confession Statement
Ex.P7	–	1 <sup>st</sup> Signature of PW10 on Ex.P23 Seizure Mahazar
Ex.P8	–	2 <sup>nd</sup> Signature of PW11 on the Confession Statement
Ex.P9	–	2 <sup>nd</sup> Signature of PW11 on Ex.P23 Seizure Mahaar
Ex.P10	06.07.2025	Mortuary Memorandum
Ex.P11	07.07.2025	Requisition Letter
Ex.P12	07.07.2025	Post–Mortem Report
Ex.P13	08.08.2025	Biological Report
Ex.P14	02.09.2025	Serology Report
Ex.P15	18.07.2025	Viscera Report
Ex.P16	06.07.2025	First Information Report
Ex.P17	06.07.2025	Rough Sketch
Ex.P18	06.07.2025	Recovery Mahazar
Ex.P19	06.07.2025	Form 91
Ex.P20	07.07.2025	Inquest Report
Ex.P21	07.07.2025	Form 91
Ex.P22	07.07.2025	Admitted Portion of the Confession Statement
Ex.P23	07.07.2025	Recovery Mahazar
Ex.P24	07.07.2025	Form 91

**Material Object marked on the side of the Prosecution:–**

- (1) PMO1 Blood–Stained Cement Plaster
- (2) PMO2 Non–Blood–Stained Cement Plaster
- (3) PMO3 Trousers
- (4) PMO4 Long–Sleeve Shirt
- (5) PMO5 Underwear

- (6) PMO6 Trousers
- (7) PMO7 Shirt
- (8) PMO8 Wooden Reaper

**Witness examined and Documents marked on the side of the Accused:** Nil

**PSJ**

Draft / Fair Copy of Judgment in  
SC No. 389/2025  
PSJ Court, Thanjavur.  
Date: 17.03.2026