

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE III, TIRUPATHUR,**  
**TIRUPATHUR DISTRICT**

**Present: Tr. S. Kovendhan, B.A., LL.B., (Hons.)**

Judicial Magistrate III (FAC), Tirupathur

Wednesday the 25<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026

**C.C. No. 148 of 2019**

**F.No.2336/2019**

**{ CNR No.TNTU02-002339-2019 }**

State rep by.

The Inspector of Police,

GRP Jolarpet Police Station,

Crime No. 53/2017

....Complainant

--Vs--

A1. Alamelu W/o. Rajendiran

A2.Pagalammal W/o. Balan

A3. Rajendran S/o. Ramu

....Accused

**CASE SUMMARY**

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

<i>Statement as per Rule 106 of the Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019</i>		
1.	Serial Number	<b>Calendar Case (C.C.) No. 148 of 2019</b>
2.	Name of the Police Station and Crime Number	The Special Sub Inspector of Police, GRP Jolarpet Police Station, Crime No. 53 of 2017 <b>...Complainant</b>
3.	Name of the Accused	A1. Alamelu W/o. Rajendiran A2.Pagalammal W/o. Balan A3. Rajendran S/o. Ramu <b>...Accused</b>
4.	Father's name	A1. Alamelu W/o. Rajendiran A2.Pagalammal W/o. Balan A3. Rajendran S/o. Ramu

5.	Occupation	--
6.	Residence	A1,A3 - No.02/149, Paiyamekam, Arukunta Village, Chittoor Dist, Andhrapradesh State. A2 – No.69/4, Vadivel Nagar Main road, Sainathapuram, Vellore.
7.	Age	A1 – 38 A2 – 67 A3 - 47
8.	Date of Occurrence	02.01.2017
9.	Date of chargesheet and Date of which chargesheet was filed into Court	Date of Charge sheet: 20.12.2018 Date of filing of Chargesheet in Court: 19.03.2019
10.	Date of Apprehension	A1- 28.11.2017 A2 - 03.11.2017 A3 – 03.12.2018
11.	Date of Release on bail	A1 – 24.01.2018 A2 – 24.01.2018 A3 – 29.12.2018
12.	Date of Commitment	Not Applicable
13.	Date of Commencement of Trial(The date of furnishing of documents u/s.207, Cr.P.C.)	08.08.2019
14.	Charge framed against the accused u/s. 240(1) of the Code	The charge for the offences u/s. 379 r/w 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 was read out and explained to the accused as per section 240(1) of the Code. When the accused was questioned on the charge, he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The plea of the accused was recorded and case was posted for trial in accordance with section 242(1) of the Code.
14.	Closure of Trial	25.03.2026
15.	Sentence or Order	In light of the discussion and conclusions drawn under the previous head, this Court holds that the prosecution HAS FAILED TO PROVE the charges against the A1 to A3 accused beyond all reasonable doubts. Hence, the accused, 1. Alamelu W/o.Rajendran, 2. Pagalammal W/o.Balan, 3. Rajendran

		S/o.Ramu is FOUND NOT GUILTY and <b>ACQUITTED</b> of the offences u/s.379 r/w 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 in accordance with section 248(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
16.	Service of copy of judgement or finding on accused	Copy of the judgment was uploaded on CIS and made available for viewing on E-Courts portal.
17.	Explanation of delay	The delay was occasioned due to the delay in production of witnesses by the prosecution.
18.	Property order u/s.452 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973	Case properties in C.P.No.65/2018 dated 19.06.2018 i.e., 3 சவரன் எடையுள்ள தங்க காசுகள் - 1 அதில் ஒரு பக்கத்தில் GEORGIUSVDG, BRITTONN REX FBINO IMP மனித உருவ தலை மறுபக்கத்தில் குதிரையில் மனிதன் உட்கார்ந்த நிலையில் 1917 என்று எழுத்துள்ள தங்க காசு and C.P.No. 126/2018 dated 19.06.2018 i.e சுமார் 5 கிராம் எடைக்கொண்ட தங்க கட்டி இரு துண்டுகள் (4 கிராம் தங்க கட்டி -1, 1 கிராம் தங்க கட்டி -1) were handed over to the interim custody of the de-facto complainant vide Order of this Court dated 07.04.2018 in CrI.M.P.No.868/2018 and in CrI.M.P.No. 1291/2018 dated: 19.06.2018 respectively and shall be allowed to be retained in the permanent custody of the de-facto complainant/owner of property in accordance with section 452 of the Code. Bonds if any executed by the de-facto complainant and sureties shall be cancelled.

This case came up for final hearing before me on 25.03.2026 in the presence of **Mr. D.N. Amudanandan, M.A.,B.L.**, learned counsel for the accused and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, **Mrs.Usha** for the State. Having heard both sides, perused the records and having stood over it for consideration, this Court on 25.03.2026 delivers the following,

## **JUDGMENT**

### **I. CASE OF THE PROSECUTION**

- (a) The first informant in the case is Mrs. Rajeshwari W/o. Manikandan. The case of the prosecution is that, on 02.01.2017 at about 09:40 AM, when the complainant was travelling along with her husband and her son in Brindavan Express Train ( 12639) the A1 to A3 accused herein Conspired together and committed theft of her Purse kept in her bag.
- (b) Based on the written first information lodged by the first informant, First Information Report in Crime No.53 of 2017 was registered against unknown accused for the offences u/s. 379 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.
- (c) At the completion of investigation in the case, Final Report dated 20.12.2018 was laid out against the A1 to A3 accused for the offences u/s.379 r/w 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

### **II. THE CHARGE AND PLEA OF ACCUSED**

- (a) Upon service of the summons u/s.204 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (“Code”) and appearance of the accused; copies of the final report and documents were given to the accused in compliance with section 207 of the Code.
- (b) Thereafter, the charge for the offences u/s.379 r/w 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 was read out and explained to the accused as per section 240(1) of the Code. When the accused was questioned on the charge, they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The plea of the accused was recorded and case was posted for trial in accordance with section 242(1) of the Code.

### **III. EVIDENCE ADDUCED BY THE PROSECUTION**

- (a) In order to prove the charge against the accused, the prosecution examined witnesses, P.W.1 to P.W.13. Exhibits P.1 to P.10 were marked on behalf of the prosecution.

(b) P.W.1 is the first informant in the case. P.W.2 is only hearsay witnesses to the occurrence and P.W.3, P.W.4, P.W.6, P.W.7, P.W.8, P.W.9 and P.W.10 are witnesses to the confession statement of the accused Persons and seizure mahazar based upon that Confession Statement of respective Accused. P.W.5 and P.W.12 are Police Officers who aided the Investigation officers at the time of investigation. P.W.11 is the police officer who registered the FIR based upon the Transfer FIR from Katpadi Railway police Station. P.W.7 is the one of the Investigation Officer in the case.

#### **IV. QUESTIONING u/s.313(1)(b) OF Cr.P.C., 1973**

The circumstances appearing in the evidence against the accused was put to him and his answer was elicited. The accused replied that the case against him is false. The accused further stated that there are no defence witnesses and evidence.

#### **V. ARGUMENTS ADVANCED**

The prosecution did not place any oral arguments. The defence submitted that the prosecution story is false and that they failed to prove the charges against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. The defence prayed for acquittal of the accused.

#### **VI. POINT FOR DETERMINATION**

Whether the prosecution has proved beyond all reasonable doubts that the accused has committed the offences charged against him?

#### **VII. APPRECIATION OF EVIDENCE AND FACTS**

(a) As per the prosecution on 02.01.2017 at about 09:40 AM, when the complainant was travelling along with her husband and her son in Brindavan Express Train ( 12639) the A1 to A3 accused herein Conspired together and committed theft of her Jewels and Money in her Purse which was kept in her bag. Hence, the prosecution charged the accused of the offences u/s. 379 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

(b) A glance at the evidence of the prosecution witnesses will reveal that none of the witnesses have witnessed first-hand the act of theft by the accused. Hence, it can be perceived that the case is based on circumstantial evidence/indirect evidence.

(c) In *State of Uttar Pradesh vs. Dr.R.P.Mittal (1992 3 SCC 300)*, the essential ingredients to prove the guilt by circumstantial evidence were spelt by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as follows:

- i. Circumstances from which conclusion is drawn should be fully proved.
- ii. Circumstances should be conclusive.
- iii. All facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of guilt and inconsistent with innocence of the accused.
- iv. Circumstances should exclude the possibility of guilt of a person other than the accused.

(d) Therefore, in this background, this Court has to examine whether the prosecution through its witnesses has proved the circumstances leading only to the guilt of the accused.

• **With respect to the evidence of P.W.1**

(a) P.W.1, Mrs. Rajeshwari W/o. Manikandan is the first informant/alleged victim in the occurrence. P.W.1 states that on the date of occurrence when he was travelling in Brindavan Express with her husband and her son, her purse was missing in which she kept 5 ½ Sovereigns of Gold jewels and Money. Regarding that she gave a complaint in Jolarpet Police station. P.W.1 admits her signature on the first information and the same is marked as exhibit P.1.

(b) P.W.1 further states that, after 10 months, the Jolarpet Railway Police called him to the police station by stating that her jewels were seized. P.W.1 states that she identified the accused at the police station. Further stated that during the recording of 161 statement she told the police that accused were travelled with her on the same train at the time of incident. she identified the jewels in the photograph as her and the photograph is marked as Ex.P.2.

(c) In her cross-examination, P.W.1 stated that A2 was close to her at the time of boarding the train. There is no major discrediting circumstance with respect to the theft that is brought out by the defence through the cross-examination of P.W.1. **However, the evidence of P.W.1 is not helpful to the prosecution in establishing the involvement of the accused in the occurrence.**

• **With respect to the evidence of P.W.2 and P.W.3**

P.W.2, Mr.Sekar S/o. Mohan is only hearsay witnesses to the occurrence. Both P.W.2 and P.W.3 state that they came to know about the theft in the house of the first informant only from him. The evidence of P.W.2 is not of any use to the prosecution.

• **With respect to the alleged recovery of the case property in the case**

(a) The major incriminating circumstance relied upon by the prosecution in the case is the alleged recovery of the case property based on the confession statement of the accused persons. In this context, the evidence of Such witnesses, assume great significance. Before moving to the evidence of such witnesses, it is important to see what P.W.13/Investigation Officer has to say about the arrest of the accused, alleged confession statement of the accused and recovery of the case property from him.

(b) P.W.13, Mrs.Jayanthi D/o. Kiran kumar is the Investigation Officer in the case. With respect to the arrest of the accused and alleged recovery of the case property from them, the evidence of P.W.13 is as follows:

"1. பின்னர் கிடைத்த ரகசிய தகவலின்படி, காட்பாடி இருப்புப்பாதை காவல் நிலைய குற்ற எண். 155/2017 வழக்கில் சம்பந்த பட்ட எதிரி பகலம்மாள். சாட்சிகள் அஸ்வாக் அஜீஸ் மற்றும் மகபூப் பாஷா ஆகியோர் முன்னிலையில் கொடுத்த ஒப்புதல் வாக்குமூலத்தின் அடிப்படையில் எதிரி பகலம்மாள் இவ்வழக்கிலும் ஈடுபட்டது தெரியவந்ததால், இவ்வழக்கில் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வழக்கு சொத்தான சுமார் 5 கிராம் தங்க கட்டி அதே சாட்சிகள் முன்னிலையில் கைப்பற்றுதல் மகசர் மூலம் கைப்பற்றப்பட்டது. (அந்த கைப்பற்றுதல்

மகசர் என்னால் அசா.ஆ 9 ஆக குறியீடு செய்யப்படுகிறது.)

2. பின்னர் எதிரி பகலம்மாளை வேலூர் மத்திய சிறையில் வைத்து சம்பிரதாய கைது செய்து பின்னர் PT warrant மூலம் எதிரி பகலம்மாள் என்பவரை 03.11.2017 ஆம் தேதி கைது செய்து இவ்வழக்கில் நீதிமன்ற காவலுக்கு உட்படுத்தினேன். பின்னர். நீதிமன்ற காவலில் இருந்த எதிரி பகலம்மாள் என்பவரை நீதிமன்ற உத்தரவின்படி போலீஸ் காவலில் எடுத்து விசாரித்தபோது. சாட்சிகள் அஸ்வாக் அஜிஸ் மற்றும் மகபூப் பாஷா ஆகியோர் முன்னிலையில் எதிரி பகலம்மாள் தானாக முன்வந்து கொடுத்த ஒப்புதல் வாக்குமூலத்தின் அடிப்படையில் 2 ம் எதிரி அலமேலு இவ்வழக்கில் ஈடுபட்டது தெரியவந்தது. பின்னர் எதிரி பகலம்மாள் கொடுத்த ஒப்புதல் வாக்குமூலத்தின் அடிப்படையில், காட்பாடி இருப்புப்பாதை காவல் நிலைய குற்ற எண். 155/2017 வழக்கில் சம்மந்தப்பட்ட எதிரி அலமேலு இவ்வழக்கிலும் ஈடுபட்டது தெரியவந்தது.

3. பின்னர் எதிரி அலமேலுவை கடந்த 22.11.2017 அன்று சம்பிரதாய கைது செய்து 28.11.2017 ம் தேதி PT Warrant மூலம் நீதிமன்றத்தில் ஆஜர் படுத்தப்பட்டு நீதிமன்ற காவலுக்கு உட்படுத்தினேன். நீதிமன்ற காவலில் இருந்த 2 ம் எதிரி அலமேலு என்பவரை நீதிமன்ற உத்தரவின்படி போலீஸ் காவலில் எடுத்து விசாரித்தபோது. எதிரி அலமேலுவிடமிருந்து கடந்த 05.12.2017 ம் தேதி தானாக முன்வந்து கொடுத்த ஒப்புதல் வாக்குமூலமானது சாட்சிகள் முன்னிலையில் பதிவு செய்யப்பட்டது. அதன் அடிப்படையில் சுமார் 3 சவரன் எடையுள்ள தங்க காசு அதே சாட்சிகள் முன்னையிலே கைப்பற்றப்பட்டு, கைப்பற்றுதல் மகசர் தயார் செய்தேன்."

(c) As per P.W.13, the case properties were recovered through Seizure Mahazar, from the A1 and A2 accused based upon the Confession Statements given by them in the presence of respective witnesses.

- **With respect to the Confession based recovery from A1 accused in presence of P.W.3 and P.W.4**

(a) P.W.3, Mr.Ranjith kumar S/o. Mani is an alleged witness to the confession statement of A1 accused and seizure mahazar in the case. He identified the

accused in the dock. In his chief-examination, P.W.3 states that, before 3 – 4 years at jolarpet railway station police were enquired A1 accused. At the time of enquiry he signed in Confession statement as witness, which was marked as Ex.P.2. But, he did not state specifically in his chief-examination as to the Contents in the Confession statement given by accused and what are the items recovered from the A1 accused through Seizure Mahazar.

(b) P.W.4, Mr. Madhar basha S/o. Kareem basha is another alleged witness to the confession statement of A1 accused and seizure mahazar in the case. He didn't identified the accused in the dock. In his chief-examination, P.W.4 states that, one day on 2017 at 4.30 AM at jolarpet railway station, police were enquired one person, but he couldn't remember him. At the time of enquiry he signed in Confession statement as witness, which was marked as Ex.P.3. But, he did not state specifically in his chief-examination as to the Seizure Mahazar Prepared and what are the items recovered from the A1 accused.

(c) As Both P.W.3 and P.W.4 were not deposed in favour of the Prosecution case, their evidence doesn't Incriminate A1 accused with the crime.

• **With respect to the Confession based recovery from A1 accused in presence of P.W.6 and P.W.7**

(a) P.W.6, Mr. Kumar S/o. Govindaraj is an alleged witness to the confession statement of A1 accused and seizure mahazar in the case. He identified the accused in the dock. In his chief-examination, P.W.6 states that, On 05.12.2018 at 5.00 P.M at jolarpet railway station police were enquired A1 accused. At the time of enquiry A1 confessed about the crime committed by her connected to this case, by giving a confession statement, in which he signed in Confession statement as witness, Admitted Portion of the Confession Statement was marked as Ex.P.4. Then police took him and another witness named Anji along with the accused to Arakonda, where accused handed over the Jewels to the

Police which was seized through Seizure mahazar, in which he signed as a witness, such seizure Mahazar was marked as Ex.P.5.

- (b) P.W.7, Mr. Anji S/o. Duraisamy is another alleged witness to the confession statement of A1 accused and seizure mahazar in the case. He didn't identified the accused in the dock. In his chief-examination, P.W.7 states that On 05.12.2018 at 5.00 P.M Jolarpet Railway station Police, took him to vellore for recovering gold jewels. Further stated that from whom police were recovered those Jewels.
- (c) Even during the Cross examination of P.W.7, by Prosecution he stated that he didn't remember whether confession statement was recorded from the accused A1.
- (d) As Per the Prosecution the Confession Statement of A1 was recorded on 05.12.2018 at 05.00 AM and the Gold was recovered at Arakonda at 09.15 AM. Both P.W.6 and P.W.7 were deposed that they Signed in the Confession statement at 05.00 PM, which was contrary to the prosecution case. Hence their evidence in no way incriminate A1 accused with the crime.
- **With respect to the Confession based recovery from A2 accused in presence of P.W.8 and P.W.9**

- (a) P.W.8, Mr. Santhosh kumar S/o. Parasuraman is an alleged witness to the confession statement of A2 accused and seizure mahazar in the case. He stated that he can identify the A2 accused. But, due to the absence of the accused adverse inference taken against her. In his chief-examination, P.W.8 states that, 4 – 5 years before one fine day at morning time at jolarpet railway station, police were enquired one old lady. At the time of enquiry A1 confessed about the crime committed by her connected to this case, by giving a confession statement, in which he signed in Confession statement as witness, Admitted Portion of the Confession Statement was marked as Ex.P.6. Then 4-5 days after police took him and another witness named Palani along with the accused to

Vellore, where accused handed over the Melted Golden Ingot to the Police which was seized through Seizure mahazar, in which he signed as a witness.

(b) P.W.9, Mr.Palani S/o.Munusamy is another alleged witness to the confession statement of A2 accused and seizure mahazar in the case. He didn't identified the accused in the dock. In his chief-examination, P.W.7 states that around 5 – 6 years before one day at 06.00 A.M at jolarpet railway station, police were enquired one old lady. At the time of enquiry that old lady confessed about the crime committed by her and gave a confession statement, in which he signed as a witness, Then police took him and another witness named Santhosh along with the accused to Vellore, where accused handed over the Melted Golden Ingot to the Police which was seized through Seizure mahazar, in which he signed as a witness.

(c) As Per the Prosecution the Confession Statement of A2 was recorded on 12.11.2017 at 16.00 Hrs and the Melted Golden Ingot was recovered through seizure mahazar. Both P.W.6 and P.W.7 were deposed that they Signed in the Confession statement at Morning 06.00 AM, which was contrary to the prosecution case. Furthermore the Confession based recovery also not proved by the prosecution as they failed to mark the Seizure Mahazar through which they Seized those Melted Golden Ingot. Hence their evidence in no way incriminate A2 accused with the crime.

- **With respect to the Confession based recovery from A2 accused in presence of P.W.10**

(a) P.W.10, Mr.Ashwak S/o. Ajees is an alleged witness to the confession statement of A2 accused and seizure mahazar in the case. He stated that he can identify the A2 accused. But, due to the absence of the accused adverse inference taken against her. In his chief-examination, P.W.10 states that, On 2017 at jolarpet railway station, police were enquired one old lady regarding Theft committed by

her. Police enquired that lady and got Confession Statement in which he signed as a witness, which was marked as Ex.P.7.

**(b)** He didn't deposed any thing about the Seizure made from the Accused based upon the Confession. Furthermore, the Confession based recovery also not proved by the prosecution as they failed to mark the Seizure Mahazar through which they Seized those Melted Golden Ingot. Hence their evidence in no way incriminate A2 accused with the crime.

**(c)** Hence, the Court finds out that the evidence of above mentioned Confession and Seizure Mahazar witnesses and the Investigation Officer/P.W.13 are not consistent with each other.

**(d)** It is settled law that confession-based recovery is a weak form of evidence and the Court has to look for other circumstances too to link the accused with the occurrence. In the present case, there are several important contradictions between the evidence of Investigation Officer and witness to the recovery of the case property from the accused.

**(e)** **Therefore, having due consideration to the overall facts and circumstances of the case and the evidence of prosecution witnesses, this Court is of the view that it is not proved beyond all reasonable doubts that the case properties were recovered from the accused in the manner alleged by the prosecution. Apart from the alleged recovery of the case property from the accused, there is no other incriminating fact/material to connect the accused with the alleged occurrence. Hence, the involvement of the accused in the occurrence on 02.01.2017 is not proved beyond all reasonable doubts.**

- **With respect to the evidence of P.W.11 and P.W.13**

**(a)** P.W.11, Mr.K.M, Raja S/o. Chinna munisamy is the Special Sub-Inspector of Police who carried out the initial stage of investigation in the case. He deposed

with respect to receipt of the first information, registration of First Information Report and submission of the case records for further investigation to the Superior Officer. Ex.P.8 FIR marked through him.

**(b)** P.W.13, Mrs. Jayanthi W/o. Kiran kumar is the Investigation Officer in the case. Since, the evidence of P.W.13 with respect to arrest of the accused, recording of his confession statement and recovery of the case property has been elaborately dealt with in the preceding parts of the judgement, the other parts of the evidence of P.W.13 is dealt with herein. P.W.13 deposed with respect to taking over the investigation, arrest of the accused, interrogation of witnesses, recording of confession statement of accused, seizure of case property, forwarding the case property to the Court and submission of Case records to next Investigation officer Mrs. Sivagami Rani, then alteration report and filing of Final Report in the case made by her. Exhibits P.9 to P.10 were marked through P.W.13.

**(c) Upon analysis of the evidence deposed by the above witnesses, this Court holds that the prosecution has failed to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the A1 to A3 accused herein Conspired together and Committed theft from first informant and stole her purse along with the 5 ½ sovereigns of gold jewellery and Money of the first informant on the date, time and in the manner alleged by the prosecution. No other fact or circumstance was proved by the prosecution to link the accused and the alleged occurrence.**

## **VIII. THE DECISION**

In light of the discussion and conclusions drawn under the previous head, this Court holds that the prosecution HAS FAILED TO PROVE the charges against the A1 to A3 accused beyond all reasonable doubts. **Hence, the accused, 1. Alamelu W/o.Rajendran, 2. Pagalammal W/o.Balan, 3. Rajendran S/o.Ramu is FOUND NOT GUILTY and ACQUITTED of the offences u/s.379 r/w 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 in accordance with section 248(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.**

### IX. PROPERTY ORDER u/s. 452 OF THE CODE

Case properties in C.P.No.65/2018 dated 19.06.2018 i.e., 3 சுவரன் எடையுள்ள தங்க காசுகள் - 1 அதில் ஒரு பக்கத்தில் GEORGIVSVDG, BRITTON REX FBINO IMP மனித உருவ தலை மறுபக்கத்தில் குதிரையில் மனிதன் உட்கார்ந்த நிலையில் 1917 என்று எழுத்துள்ள தங்க காசு and C.P.No. 126/2018 dated 19.06.2018 i.e சுமார் 5 கிராம் எடைக்கொண்ட தங்க கட்டி இரு துண்டுகள் (4 கிராம் தங்க கட்டி -1, ஒரு கிராம் தங்க கட்டி -1) were handed over to the interim custody of the de-facto complainant vide Order of this Court dated 07.04.2018 in CrI.M.P.No.868/2018 and in CrI.M.P.No. 1291/2018 dated: 19.06.2018 respectively and shall be allowed to be retained in the permanent custody of the de-facto complainant/owner of property in accordance with section 452 of the Code. Bonds if any executed by the de-facto complainant and sureties shall be cancelled.

### X. BOND u/s.437-A OF THE CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, 1973

The accused shall furnish an own bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- in accordance with section 437A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 to appear before the Higher Court as and when such Court issues notice in respect of any appeal or petition against the judgment. The bond shall remain in force for six months from the date of its execution.

#### Particulars Under Rule 106 of Criminal Rules of Practice 2019

Sl. No	Name of the Police Station and Cr.No.	Description of the accused					Date of										Explanation of Delay
		Name	Fathers name or Husband name	Occupation	Residence	Age	Occurrence	Complaint	Apprehension	Release on bail	Commitment	Commencement of trial	Close of trial	Sentence or Order	Service of Copy of Judgment on accused		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
1	GRP Jolarp	A1. Alamelu	Rajendiran	-	Aruku nda	38	02.01.2017	21.03.2017	28.11.2017	24.01.2018	-	08.08.2019	25.03.2026	25.03.2026	-	-	

et PS Cr. 53/201 7	A2. Pagalamma l	Balan	-	Sainat hapura m	67	02.01 .2017	21.03 .2017	03.11 .2017	24.01. 2018	-	08.08. 2019	25.03.2026	25.03.2 026	-	-
	A3.Rajendr an	Ramu	-	Aruku nda	47	02.01 .2017	21.03 .2017	03.12 .2018	29.12. 2018		08.08. 2019	25.03.2026	25.03.2 026	-	-

*Directly typed by me on my personal laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.*

**Judicial Magistrate No. III(FAC),  
Tirupathur**

**Annexure :-**

**Prosecution side witnesses:-**

1)	<b>P.W-1</b>	:	Tr. Rajeswari W/o. Manigandan
2)	<b>P.W-2</b>	:	Tr. Sekar S/o. Mohan
3)	<b>P.W-3</b>	:	Tr. Ranjithkumar S/o. Mani
4)	<b>P.W-4</b>	:	Tr. Madharbasha S/o. Kareem bhasa
5)	<b>P.W-5</b>	:	Tr. Vinothkumar S/o. Devendiran
6)	<b>P.W-6</b>	:	Tr. Kumar S/o. Govindharaj
7)	<b>P.W-7</b>	:	Tr. Anji S/o. Duraisamy
8)	<b>P.W-8</b>	:	Tr. Santhoshkumar S/o. Parasuraman
9)	<b>P.W-9</b>	:	Tr. Palani S/o. Munusamy
10)	<b>P.W-10</b>	:	Tr. Ashwa S/o. Ajeesh
11)	<b>P.W-11</b>	:	Tr. K.M. Rasa S/o. Chinnamunisamy
12)	<b>P.W-12</b>	:	Tr. Elangovan S/o. Ammansi
13)	<b>P.W-13</b>	:	Tmt. Jayanthi W/o. Kirankumar

**Prosecution side Exhibits:-**

1)	<b>Ex.P-1</b>	:	Complaint
2)	<b>Ex.P-2</b>	:	Photograph
3)	<b>Ex.P.P2</b>	:	1 <sup>st</sup> signature at confession statement of the accused A1
4)	<b>Ex.P-3</b>	:	2 <sup>nd</sup> signature at confession statement of the accused A1

5)	<b>Ex.P-4</b>	:	Admitted portion of confession statement given by the accused A1
6)	<b>Ex.P-5</b>	:	Seizure Mahazar
7)	<b>Ex.P-6</b>	:	Admitted portion of confession statement given by the accused A2
8)	<b>Ex.P-7</b>	:	1 <sup>st</sup> signature at confession statement given by the accused A2
9)	<b>Ex.P-8</b>	:	FIR
10)	<b>Ex.P-9</b>	:	Seizure Mahazar
11)	<b>Ex.P-10</b>	:	Section Alteration report

**Prosecution Side Material Objects: - - Nil**

**Defense Side Witness, Exhibits and Material objects : NIL**

**NOTE :-**

- 1) No witness was detained for more than three days without examination.
- 2) The accused was on bail during trial.
- 3) The police had been informed of the judgment.
- 4) At the time of recording deposition, Ex.P2 was marked 2 times for separate documents. Hence, for avoiding confusion “ 1<sup>st</sup> signature at confession statement given by accused A1” was listed Ex.P.P2 in the list of exhibits.

**Judicial Magistrate No. III(FAC),  
Tirupathur.**