

IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, No. I,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT.

Present:- Selvi. S.T. Kanimozhi, L.L.M.,
Judicial Magistrate, No. I,
Thanjavur.

Monday, the 23rd day of March 2026
CALENDAR CASE No.77 of 2025
CNR:No:TNTJ05-006019-2024

The State Represented by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
South PS, Thanjavur, in
Crime No: 572/2024

.....Complainant.

Vs

Sathiyamoorthy
S/o. Durairaj

.... Accused.

In this case cognizance was taken on 03.03.2025 and came up for final hearing on 16.03.2026 before this court, in the presence of Assistant Public Prosecutor Grade II for the state and Mr. P. Shanmuganathan Advocate for the accused, having stood over for consideration till this day, upon perusing the records and hearing both side arguments, this court doth delivers the following...

JUDGMENT

I. **The gist of the final report is that**, on 13.08.2024 at 18.45 hrs, when the accused Sathiyamoorthy going to his KDR Consultancy (Share Market business) office, the LW1 stood blocking/restraining the path and drinking tea. The accused said to step aside, then he accused verbally abused him using obscene language, "...ஏன்டா என் ஆபீஸ்க்கு போற பாதையை மறைத்து கொண்டு டீ குடிக்கிற ஓரமா நிலலுடா...", beaten him on his face with an object of Tea Glass on his head and caused simple injuries. Then he threatened him in dire consequences. Therefore, the accused person is punishable under sections 296(b), 118(1), 351 (3) BNS. Hence the Sub inspector of police, West PS, Thanjavur.

II. After taking final report on file this court issued summons to the accused person. On appearance of accused person, copies of case documents furnished to them in compliance of S.207 Cr.P.C/ s.230 BNSS. After hearing both sides and perusing case records and on prima facie materials of offences alleged above being found against the above mentioned accused person, formal charge framed against the accused under sections 296(b), 118(1), 351 (3) BNS read over and explained to the accused person u/s.251 CRPC/ u/s. 274 BNSS against which he was pleaded not guilty and claim to be tried.

III. To substantiate the case, the prosecution had examined **PW1 to PW5**, the Exhibits **ExP1** were marked. None property was remanded on the side of prosecution. Upon the closure of the prosecution side evidence, the accused was questioned under section 313(1)(b) of CRPC/ s. 351 BNSS regard to the incriminating circumstance that appeared against him, in the evidence of prosecution witness, he was denied the same as false evidence. The accused neither examined any witness nor documents.

IV. Analysis of evidences:-

Heard arguments of both sides. Perused the Case Records. My findings are as follows:-

1. The **LW1/ PW1 Sundar** deposed that he has doing a helper work to the document Writer. On the occurrence day 2024 August Month, at 6.30 pm.,(he does not remember the date of incident), when he and one Krishnamoorthy were drinking Tea in the Tea shop near at Thangasaratha hospital, South Street, Thanjavur, the accused was in a drunken state and uttered abusive words towards him and he asked why are you doing like this?, then the accused attacking him with 3-4 Tea Glasses on his front side head. The people who gathered in the spot were watching the incident. He admitted that he also attacked the accused for self defense. The he was admitted in the hospital. The **complaint** was marked as **ExP1**.

2. The **LW2/ PW2 Krishnamoorthy** deposed that he is a retired School Principal. He further deposed that he heard that the PW1 has assaulted by the complex owner. Due to his old-age, he does not remember about the occurrence. He does not remember whether he has been examined by the police. He denied all suggestions put forth by the defense side.

3. The **PW3 Swaminathan** deposed that on 13.08.2024 at 6.30 – 7.00 pm, when the PW1 was drinking tea in his Tea shop, the accused Sathiyamoorthy who is running a Consultancy said to him to step aside. The PW1 uttered abusive words, “..புண்டை மவனே நீ யாருடா என்ன கேட்க”, the PW1 pouring tea on the accused face, then slashing on his face with folding knife. In this case, the accused hitting on the front head of PW1 with a tea glass. The PW3 deposed a different story before this court. He said the same to the police officer also.

4. The **LW4/PW4 Ganesa Moorthy** deposed that on 13.08.2024 at 6.30 – 7.00 pm, when the accused was standing on the way to the PW1’s office, drinking tea, the PW1 said to him to step aside. Verbal altercation took place between them. He pacifies them. The PW2 does not know what the accused has done to the P W1. He send him to the hospital by Auto. The PW4 deposed a different story before this court. He said the same to the police officer also. The **PW5 Ranjan** who is the observation Mahazar witness deposed anything in favor of prosecution. Hence he was treated as hostile witness.

5. In the present case, the prosecution has examined the witnesses PW1 to PW5 on 05.11.2025, 13.02.2026 and 18.02.2026, thereafter posted the case for Medical officer and IO 20.02.2026, 23.02.2026, 27.02.2026, 04.03.2026, 07.03.2026, 11.03.2026, 13.03.2026 and 16.03.2026. The court has given a sufficient opportunity to produce the IO and medical officer. Since, they have not turned up to produce the witness before this court, hence this court has closed the Prosecution side evidence on 20.02.2026. The prosecution has filed a petition u/s.311 CRPC / u-s.348 BNSS to reopen and recall the PW’s and the

same was allowed on cost of Rs.200/- to the DLSA, Thanjavur on or before the date of hearing of witnesses. Thereafter also the court has given sufficient time (dates 23.02.2026, 27.02.2026, 04.03.2026, 07.03.2026, 11.03.2026, 13.03.2026 and 16.03.2026) to pay the cost and the prosecution failed to pay the same till questioning u/s.313 Crpc/u-s.351 BNSS. Then the court has closed the evidence and questioned u/s.313(1)(b) of CRPC/u-s.351 BNSS.

6. Thereafter, the Prosecution side evidence was closed and the matter was listed for recording the statement of accused U/s. 313 CrPC/ u-s.351 BNSS wherein both the accused persons stated that they have been falsely implicated in the present case and it was complainant who created the nuisance in front of Government Bus and making them defecate there.

7. During the course of arguments, Ld. APP has argued that the prosecution witnesses have supported the prosecution case and their testimonies have remained unrebutted. It has further been argued that on combined reading of testimonies of all the prosecution witnesses, offences u/s. **296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS** have been proved beyond reasonable doubt.

8. Per contra, Ld. Counsel for accused has argued that there is no legally sustainable evidence against the accused and that the accused has been falsely implicated by the police officials at the behest of complainant. Arguing further, Ld. Counsel for accused has inter-alia submitted that the story of prosecution cannot be believed as no independent public persons were associated in the investigation or were examined during the prosecution evidence. It has also been argued that the material prosecution witnesses have admitted that at the spot of incident none were found present nor any recovery of materials were affected either from the said spot, which makes the story of prosecution unbelievable. It has also been argued that on the date of incident i.e. an occurrence was happened on 13.08.2024 at 18.45 hrs and the complaint was given only on 14.08.2024 at 8.30 am and therefore, there was no motive on the part of accused to indulge in the alleged offence. It has also further been argued

that due to lacunae and in-coherency in the story of the prosecution, accused be given benefit of doubt and are therefore, entitled to be acquitted.

With the impression of prosecution side witnesses, let us discuss the case in detail,

9. The case of prosecution story is that, on 13.08.2024 at 18.45 hrs, when the accused Sathiyamoorthy going to his KDR Consultancy (Share Market business) office, the LW1 stood blocking/restraining the path and drinking tea. The accused said to step aside, then he accused verbally abused him using obscene language, "...ஏன்டா என் ஆபீஸ்க்கு போற பாதையை மறைத்து கொண்டு ம குடிக்கிற ஓரமா நிலலுடா...", beaten him on his face with an object of Tea Glass on his head and caused simple injuries. Hence the complaint.

10. To support the case of prosecution, the LW1 was examined as **PW1 and** it appears **in the cross of PW1 is that**, he was not stated in his complaint (Exp1) that the accused attacked him with Tea Glass. There is a ½ km distance from the West PS to Spot. He deposed that he first gone to the West to the PS, then to the Hospital. The Police have not reached the Spot, before he went to the Police station. There is a 6 km distance from the Hospital to the spot. The police wrote down the complaint as he dictated it. Admittedly, the said Krishnamoorthy also put a signature on it. He admitted that he also attacked him and the case was also registered as Cr.No.571 of 2024 and obtained an **Anticipatory bail**. He denied all suggestions put forth by the defense side.

11. It appears in the evidence of **PW2 Krishnamoorthy** that he is a retired School Principal. He further deposed that he heard that the PW1 has assaulted by the complex owner. Due to his old-age, he does not remember about the occurrence. He does not remember whether he has been examined by the police. He denied all suggestions put forth by the defense side.

12. It appears in the evidence of **PW3 Swaminathan** deposed that on 13.08.2024 at 6.30 – 7.00 pm, when the PW1 was drinking tea in his Tea shop,

the accused Sathiyamoorthy who is running a Consultancy said to him to step aside. The PW1 uttered abusive words, “..புண்டை மவனே நீ யாருடா என்ன கேட்க.”, the PW1 pouring tea on the accused face, then slashing on his face with folding knife. In this case, the accused hitting on the front head of PW1 with a tea glass. The PW3 deposed a different story before this court. He said the same to the police officer also.

13. It appears in the evidence of **PW4 Ganesa Moorthy** deposed that on 13.08.2024 at 6.30 – 7.00 pm, when the accused was standing on the way to the PW1’s office, drinking tea, the PW1 said to him to step aside. Verbal altercation took place between them. He pacifies them. The PW2 does not know what the accused has done to the PW1. He sends him to the hospital by Auto . **The PW3, PW4 have deposed a different story before this court. They have told the same to the police officer also.** The **PW5 Ranjan** who is the observation Mahazar witness deposed anything in favor of prosecution. Hence he was treated as hostile witness.

With the impression of above prosecution witnesses, let us discuss the case in detail,

14. As regards to the offence alleged against the accused person is under section 296 BNS, defacto complainant/PW1, had alleged that the accused came to his house at Poomalravuthan koil street, Keelavasal, Thanjavur uttered obscene words against him. However, he has stated about the slang words in his complaint that used by the accused at that time, he has not stated before this court that the word which was wounding him so much. The PW5 Ranjan is the observation Mahazar witness. The PW3, PW4 are interested witnesses of Sathiyamoorthy and they have also not stated about the word that spoken by the accused person. The PW’s including PW1, have not deposed that which accused uttered abusive words against him. Mere uttering of un parliamentary words shall not amount to an offence under Section 296 BNS unless the words used

are also obscene. Calling a person singularly will not amount to committing an obscene act. Hence, considering the above evidences, it cannot be said that the accused uttered obscene words against the defacto complainant.

15. In a case involving Section 296(b), the Hon'ble Madras High Court observed, in the case of **Vague Allegations (Thinakaran v. The State, 2025)**, that, merely stating "abused obscene words" without mentioning **specific words** or types of intimidation in the FIR is insufficient to constitute an offence. The court noted that bald allegations fail to meet the legal ingredients of the section. The prosecution has miserably failed to prove the guilt of the **accused Sathiyamoorthy** under Section 296(b) of BNS beyond all reasonable doubts.

16. At the time of occurrence, the accused was unarmed and they brought the case under **Section 351(3) of BNS**. On the occurrence day, the accused going to his office, in the staircase, the accused blocked the path way and drinking tea. Then there was a scuffle between them and the accused threatened him in dire consequences. Admittedly, there was a wordy quarrel between them and the accused assaulted the PW1 with **tea glasses(4)**. It is observed that the mere utterance of threatening words in the heat of an argument, without a deliberate intent to cause alarm or coerce action, does not constitute an offense. Further, to attract criminal intimidation the overt act of the accused must create instant, immediate fear in the mind of the victims. Telling a person that by mere saying that he left the world will not create fear. The fear must relate to danger to one's life. So, **Section 351(3) BNS** is not attracted. Hence the prosecution had miserably failed to prove the guilt of **the accused Sathiyamoorthy** under Section 351(3) of BNS beyond all reasonable doubts.

17. Let us discuss the offence under section **115(2) of BNS**, a person is considered to '**voluntarily cause hurt**', if they engage in an action, With the intention of inflicting hurt on another person. With the awareness that their actions are likely to cause harm. An action must lead to actual hurt to another individual. A person who voluntarily causes hurt, unless covered by special

circumstances under Section 120, is subject to, Imprisonment (either rigorous or simple) for a term that may extend to one year, A fine that may go up to ₹10,000. Both imprisonment and a fine.

18. It appears that, in the Medical report (AR Intimation, Wound certificate) that the PW1/Victim/Sundar has been admitted in the hospital on 13.08.2024 at 07.48 hrs and he was discharged on 15.08.2024 at 2.00pm. The PW1 said to the Medical officer that an occurrence was happened near at, Thanga Saratha Nursing Home with hand by un known persons using glass cup. He stated to the medical officer that the accused was hitting his head, laceration of size 3 cm x 1 cm depth He was in a conscious state of mind at that time. He has stated to the medical officer that he has assaulted with Tea glasses only. The prosecution failed to examine the medical officer to prove the wound of the victim. The prosecution failed to mark the medical documents in this case.

19. Further, the PW1 deposed that, when the accused told him to move away from the path to go to his office which was in the upstairs of the said complex. He deposed that the accused also attacked him with **tea glasses on his head**. During the ensuing argument, a physical altercation broke out between the them. He stated that he also attacked the accused for his self-defense from preventing the attack.

20. The accused version was that the PW1 pouring the tea on his face and he stomped on his chest, then he assaulted on his head with tea glasses which was in the tea shop and caused injuries on his head . The PW1 have not stated about the PW3-Swaminathan, PW4 - Ganesamoorthy in the complaint. It is a counter case, obviously, the witness in the first case arrayed as witness in this case and they have deposed in favor of accused only. The accused is the informant in that case in **CC. No. 142 of 2025 and the same was pending.**

21. It is to be seen that whether non examination of Investigation officer is fatal to the prosecution case or not. Regarding, non examination of investigation

officer, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that the non-examination of an **Investigating Officer (IO)** is not automatically fatal to the prosecution's case. It is not a rule of law that a conviction cannot be sustained without the IO's testimony if the case is otherwise proved by reliable evidence and no prejudice is caused to the accused. Non-examination of IO is not a fatal flaw in every case, provided the prosecution's case is otherwise corroborated. Even though the prosecution has not examined the medical officer and Investigation officer to prove the injury or wound of the Victim, if eyewitnesses or medical evidence reliably prove the incident and the place of occurrence, the absence of the IO's testimony does not invalidate the conviction.

22. The defense counsel has argued that in the facts of the present case, particularly conspicuous gaps in the prosecution case and the evidence of PW1 to PW5 not being wholly reliable, the Court holds the present case as one where examination of the Investigating Officer was vital since he could have adduced the expected evidence. His non- examination creates a material lacuna in the effort of the prosecution to nail the accused, thereby creating reasonable doubt in prosecution case.

23. Further, the **PW3-Saminathan, PW4-Ganesamoorthy** who are running shops in the complex of accused and obviously deposed in favor of accused and they were deposed that there was a verbal altercation took place between them, following that, a scuffle happened. So, it is clear, there was a verbal altercation took place on both sides and they fought each other. The PW's have not stated who started it first. However, it could be understood from the evidence of PW1, that the accused only told him to move away from path, so he only started it first. Further, the **PW3-Saminathan** deposed that he did not notice of injuries on the PW1. He also stated that there was a verbal altercation took place between them.

24. Further, he was admitted in the hospital on the same day and he was lodged a complaint on the next day **14.08.2024 at 8.00 hrs.** He was not stated the

reasons for the delay. The PW3, PW4 were stated to be present in the spot and it is not available in the records and evidence whether they were preventing the alleged incident. The PW1 stated in his complaint and evidence that he was assaulted by the accused with **tea glasses(4)**. The Medical officer and the investigation officer have not been examined and it was not clarified that the injury which sustained by the victim is only caused by that incident. The prosecution has not proved which type of weapon the accused used to assault in this case. Non recovery of weapon is fatal to the prosecution case and by using of that weapon only, an injury would be sustained by PW1 also not proved in this case. So, the prosecution is not proved that the alleged injury is caused to the victim by **Voluntarily causing hurt or grievous hurt by dangerous weapons only**. In absence of any medical evidence regarding injury, the accused cannot be held guilty under Section **118(1)of the BNS** and the court finds that the accused has committed an offence **u/s.115(2) of BNS and it was duly proved**.

25. In such situation, it was necessary for the prosecution to bring the evidence on record that the informant why he came to the spot. But the prosecution did not examine any independent witnesses in this case. Therefore, there is no strong reason to assume that the injury caused to the informant by **tea glasses** as stated by the PW1. Further, the spot witness (PW3, PW4) examined and they were deposed in his favor obviously they were working in the complex of accused. None independent witnesses have been examined in this case. Non examination of Investigation officer also fatal to the prosecution case. The court feels that the minor discrepancies has not affected the prosecution case.

26. Even though there were some discrepancies in the evidence of PW's, the court feels that it is a minor one and it would not affect the prosecution case. It is necessary to state that discrepancies on minor details such as precise timing or minor movements, do not erode credibility if the main testimony regarding

the offense is consistent. The **Hon'ble Supreme Court** also consistently held in many cases that minor discrepancies, trivial inconsistencies, or natural variations in witness testimony do not invalidate the entire prosecution case, provided the core narrative remains credible. Such discrepancies, often resulting from memory lapses or perceptions, are not fatal unless they shake the foundation of the prosecution's story.

27. In order to convict the accused under section **115(1) of BNS**, causing physical pain is sufficient for conviction for "**voluntarily causing hurt**," even without visible injuries, medical reports, or long-term damage. The pain must be physical, not merely mental or emotional, and must be inflicted voluntarily. The accused must have intended to cause pain or known that their actions would likely cause pain. In the instant case, the accused has assaulted him with tea glasses with an intention to cause injury to him. Evidently, there was a wordy quarrel and scuffle happened. Legal precedents indicate that even acts resulting in no external mark such as a kick, slap, or pulling hair can establish hurt if they cause pain. This Court finds that it has been established through prosecution witnesses that a verbal altercation occurred between them, which subsequently escalated into a physical altercation.

28. Here a cardinal principle of criminal law cannot be forgotten that the prosecution has to prove the case against accused beyond reasonable doubt. The standard of proof is not preponderance of probabilities but proof beyond reasonable doubt. If there arises any doubt, benefit should be given to the accused. At the cost of repetition I am to state that on careful perusal and scrutiny of the prosecution evidence the doubts are created regarding the prosecution case. The prosecution case suffers from infirmities. There is discrepancies in the evidence of material witnesses. There are discrepancies in the injuries stated by the witnesses and Medical evidence. Therefore, I hold that the prosecution failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Therefore, on considering all the evidences together, it can be said that

nothing reveals any commission of offence by the accused and the evidences reveals that there were only verbal quarrels, as such, the prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of the offence **u/s. 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS against the accused person SathiyaMoorthy S/o. Durairaj** beyond all reasonable doubts and thereby making him not guilty under the said Section. Further, the prosecution has successfully proved the alleged offence **u/s.115(2) of BNS** against the accused beyond all reasonable doubts.

29. Thus, the above from the evidence of PW's, it appears that the accused assaulted the PW1 with **tea glasses** and caused injuries. That apart, PW2 has corroborated the testimony of PW1 regarding injury. **The PW3 –Swaminathan and PW4- Ganesamoorthy** were deposed in the same line to that of PW1 and went on to state that on the day of occurrence the accused assaulted him. In their cross examination also they stuck to their version that on the day of occurrence the accused persons had assaulted them. Even though the PW4 did not state in favor of the PW1, this court considers the injuries sustained by the PW1, and the same was not denied by the defense side.

30. The prosecution has succeeded to show the facts that the accused had assaulted the complainant/PW1 and caused simple injury on back of his head. However, it is seen that the prosecution has a proof that the injury had been caused by any instrument for shooting, stabbing, cutting or any other object/means, which can be used as a weapon of offence. LW/Investigating Officer-Velayutham has not seized any weapon from the spot on being shown by the complainant /PW1. The medical report, and other documents (which was not marked) and the court marked the said documents suo moto as court document as CX.1 to CX.P5 (FIR, Observation Mahazar, Rough Sketch, AR Intimation, Wound Certificate) and it shows that the PW1 received a injury is Simple in nature.

31. Learned Defense Counsel argued that merely P.W.3 and P.W.4 described the incident being interested witnesses of accused and that there were no

independent witnesses and their evidence should be discarded being interested witnesses. The court has also accepted the view of defense counsel that non examination of the Investigating Officer must result into acquittal of the accused. However, on perusal of prosecution witnesses PW1 to PW5 and the court documents as It reveals that there was a verbal altercation took place between them. The court having no doubt upon the evidence of PW's and documents.

32. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that the non-examination of an Investigating Officer (IO) is not automatically fatal to the prosecution's case. It is not a rule of law that a conviction cannot be sustained without the IO's testimony if the case is otherwise proved by reliable evidence and no prejudice is caused to the accused.

33. To this I would like to refer to S. 134 of Indian Evidence Act where it has been laid down that no particular number of witnesses shall in any case be required for the proof of any fact. It is not the quantity but quality of evidence that matters. As a general rule, a court can and may act on the testimony of a single witness though uncorroborated. One credible witness outweighs the testimony of a number of other witnesses of indifferent character. Moreover, Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, time and again, reiterated that relationship with a witness does not affect the credibility of the evidence and such evidence cannot be rejected on that ground. A sole eye witness cannot be branded as related or interested witness because he is merely a friend or relative of victim. Moreover, the incident took place in the premise of the informant. Independent witnesses are hard to get except family members.

34. In respect of offence u/s 118(1) of BNS, generally the victim survives the injury inflicted upon him and becomes available for giving evidence about the author of the crime. Such a witness is the best witness, for it is unlikely that he would screen the real offender. Injured witness would not in any case substitute a wrong person for his actual assailant.

35. Thus the above discussion, the allegation that all the prosecution witnesses are related to each other thus interested witnesses having relationship with the victim, by itself is not sufficient for disbelieving their testimony unless any motive is alleged and proved against them". So, mere interestedness by itself is not a valid ground for discarding or rejecting the sworn testimony and nor can it be laid down as an invariable rule that interested evidence can never form the basis of conviction. Be it also noted that so far, the plea of previous enmity or cross case is concerned, I would say that it is settled law that every case is decided solely based on its own merit and not based on cross case or previous enmity unless the case in hand is disproved or found not believable. Therefore, the prosecution has successfully proved the offence **u/s.296(b), 351(3), 118(1) of BNS** against the accused person namely Sathiyamoorthy beyond all reasonable doubts.

36. In the instant case, the prosecution recovered the material involved in the offence (M.O), **Tea glasses**. Even though, the use of weapon has not been proved in the instant case, the victim/PW1 injury was clinically established by ocular evidence. Hence, this court holds the accused for the alleged offence under section 115(2) of BNS. Hence, the accused Sathiyamoorthy can't be convicted under the charged offence of Section-118(1) BNS. However, he can be convicted under Section-115(2) BNS as per Section-222 of Cr.P.C/ u-s.245 BNSS. The prosecution has succeeded to prove the offence of Section-118(1) BNS as its consisting of several particulars, constitutes a complete minor offence of Section 115(2) BNS. The said minor offence has been proved, but use of weapon has not been proved in the instant case, hence the accused can be convicted for the offence of Section 115(2) of BNS though he was not charged with it in view of Section-222 of Cr. P. C/ u-s. 245 BNSS.

37. Heard the Point of sentence. He prays to impose a lesser punishment.

38. **Finally**, In view of the above discussion, the prosecution has not successfully proved the alleged offence **u/s. 296(b), 351(3) of BNS beyond all**

reasonable doubts. The prosecution has successfully proved the offence u/s. **115(2) of BNS** against accused **beyond all reasonable doubts.** Hence this court convicted the accused for the alleged charges u/s. **115(2) of BNS** and he was sentenced to pay a fine of **Rs.1000/-** and having regard to the nature of the offence, submission of the convict as well as the facts and circumstances of the case, imposition fine is enough. Therefore, the accused persons is convicted u/s.271(2) of BNSS.

39. In view of the age, antecedents and also the conduct of the convict during the trial of the present case and also having considered the nature of the offences and the factual matrix of the present case, this Court is inclined to give the convict the benefits of **Section 3 of the Probation of offenders Act, 1958.**

40. Accordingly, in accordance with the provision of Section 3 of the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958, this Court hereby release the convict after due **admonition** that he should not repeat any similar offence and maintain a good behavior towards the victims and the society at large.

The bail bond of accused person shall stand for another period of six months as per the new amended provisions u/s.437 A CRPC. None property has been remanded to this court.

The judgment is dictated to the steno typist and taken print out and after effecting necessary corrections and pronounced by me in the open Court on this is the 23rd day of March 2026.

Judicial Magistrate, No. I
Thanjavur.

Annexure:-

List of prosecution side witnesses:-

1. PW 1 - Mr. Sundar (Victim/defacto complainant)
2. PW 2 - Mr. Krishnamoorthy (Eye witness)
3. PW 3 - Mr. Saminathan (Eye witness)
4. PW 4 - Mr. Ganesamoorthy (Eye witness)
5. PW5 - Mr. Ranjan (Observation Mahazar)

List of prosecution side exhibits:-

1. Ex.P 1: 14.08.2024 - Complaint Statement

List of Court exhibits:-

1. CX.1: 14.08.2024 - FIR

2. CX.2: 14.08.2024 - Observation Mahazar

3. CX.3: 14.08.2024 - Rough Sketch

4. CX.4: 13.08.2024 - AR Intimation

5. CX.5: 15.08.2024 - Wound Certificate

Material objects: Nil

List of witness on the side of accused: Nil

List of exhibits on the side of accused: Nil

Note: -

- 1.No witness has been retained for more than three times.
2. Accused remained on bail at the time of trial.
3. Result of this case is informed to the concerned police station.

Judicial Magistrate, No. I
Thanjavur.