

COVER SHEET

1	Name of the Court	District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Watrap
2	Case Number	C. C. No. 179/2024
3	Date of judgment of Conviction / Dismissal / Reversal of Acquittal / Dismissal of Bail Application	25.05.2026
4	Name of Persons convicted / Acquitted / Reversed / Bail denied / Bail Cancelled	1) Sundarraj @ Poun Sundarraj, S/o Muthaiah. 2) Arun Kumar, S/o Sundarraj @ Poun Sundarraj. 3) Thiru Kumaran, S/o Sundarraj @ Poun Sundarraj. 4) Manokaran @ Poun Manokaran, S/o Muthaiah. 5) Siva Kumar @ Kumar, S/o Kaliyappan. 6) Kaliyappan, S/o Angkan. 7) Subbaiah, S/o Karuppan. 8) Jeyalakshmi, W/o Sundarraj.
5	Contact address of Legal Aid Committee of court complex in which the above court is situated	Taluk Legal Services Authority Watrap
5a	Designation of the Person to be	Assistant Legal Aid Committee

	contacted	
6	Phone number of above Legal Aid Committee Between <u>09:30</u> am to <u>05:30</u> pm	-
7	Alternative Mobile Number of Legal Aid Committee	9751490706

M. RAMANATHAN
DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
WATRAP



IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
WATRAP.

Present : **Tr. M. Ramanathan, B.A., B.L.,**
District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate,
Watrap.

Monday, this 25th day of May 2026

Calendar Case No. 179 of 2024
CNR No. TNVR250008302024

The State rep by.

The Sub Inspector of Police,
Watrap Police Station

... Complainant

//Versus//

- 1) Sundarraaj @ Poun Sundarraaj,
S/o Muthaiah,
West Street, Maharajapuram.
- 2) Arun Kumar,
S/o Sundarraaj @ Poun Sundarraaj,
West Street, Maharajapuram.
- 3) Thiru Kumaran,
S/o Sundarraaj @ Poun Sundarraaj,
West Street, Maharajapuram.

4) Manokaran @ Poun Manokaran,
S/o Muthaiah,
West Street, Maharajapuram.

5) Siva Kumar @ Kumar,
S/o Kaliyappan,
Kalamman Koil Street, Maharajapuram.

6) Kaliyappan,
S/o Angkan,
Kalamman Koil Street, Maharajapuram.

7) Subbaiah,
S/o Karuppan,
West Street, Maharajapuram.

8) Jeyalakshmi,
W/o Sundarraj,
West Street, Maharajapuram.

... Accused(s)

1	Serial Number	C. C. No. 179 of 2024
2	Name of the Police Station and Crime Number	Watrap Police Station Crime No. 635 of 2020
3	Name of the Accused Person(s)	Sundarraj @ Poun Sundarraj (A1) Arun Kumar (A2) Thiru Kumar (A3) Manoharan @ Poun Manoharan (A4) Siva Kumar @ Kumar (A5)

		Kaliyappan (A6) Subbaiah (A7) Jayalakshmi (A8)
4	Father's Name	Muthaiah (A1) Sundarraaj @ Poun Sundarraaj (A2 & A3) Muthaiah (A4) Kaliyappan (A5) Angkan (A6) Karuppan (A7) Sundarraaj (A8)
5	Occupation	Labourer (A1 to A8)
6	Residence	West Street, Maharajapuram. (A1 to A4, A7 and A8) Kaliyamman Koil Street, Maharajapuram. (A5 and A6)
7	Age	A1 – 56 A2 – 32 A3 – 30 A4 – 52 A5 – 45 A6 – 71 A7 – 72 A8 – 51
8	Occurrence date	16.08.2020
9	Date of Complaint	18.08.2020
10	Date of Apprehension	Not Applicable
11	Release on bail	26.08.2020 (A1 to A8)

12	Date of commitment	Not Applicable
13	Date of Commencement of Trial	30.09.2025
14	Date of closure of Trial	02.04.2026
15	Sentence or Order	(1) In result, the accused persons were not found guilty for the offence punishable under sections 148, 149 r/w 109, 294(b), 294(b) r/w 109, 324, 324 r/w 109, 506(2), 506(1) r/w 109 of IPC and therefore, they were acquitted from the aforesaid charges as per section 248(1) of Cr.P.C. (2) The bail bond of the accused persons shall stand cancelled after the lapse of the limitation period for preferring appeal. (3) MO1 to MO3 were ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of the appeal period.
16	Service of copy of judgment or finding on accused	Yes
17	Explanation of delay	Not Applicable

This case came up for final hearing before this court on 25.05.2026 in the presence of Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for the state and Thiru. B. BALASUBRAMANIAN, Learned Counsel for the Accused persons. This

case was taken on file before the Hon'ble Additional Mahila Court (Judicial Magistrate), Srivilliputhur, as C. C. No. 516/2020. Later, due to the change of jurisdiction, the case was transferred to this court and assigned new number as C.C. No. 179/2024. After having perused the records of the case, and upon hearing arguments of both sides and having stood over for consideration till, this day, this court delivers the following:

JUDGMENT

1. Summary of the final report filed by the investigation officer :-

Having enmity with the complainant's family over the property dispute, on 16.08.2020 at about 08.00 AM, A7 allegedly intimidated the complainant and in furtherance of the intimidation, the same day evening at about 05.30 PM, when the defacto complainant was standing nearby house of Muthu, A1 to A6 and A8 armed with stick, stone and sickle, had uttered unparliamentary words and A1 to A7 and A8 assaulted the complainant and complainant's uncle Mr. Perumal, thereby causing injuries over the complainant's right leg, small finger, left leg, toe and head. The accused persons assaulted and thereby caused injuries over the body of Mr. Perumal. When the incident was intervened and resolved by the witnesses, the accused persons jointly issued criminal threats to the complainant. Consequently, the Investigating Officer filed a final report for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 109 and 506(i) of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as "IPC").

2. Cognizance

Upon perusing the final report, this court was satisfied that a prima facie case was made out against the alleged accused. Hence, this court took cognizance of the offences U/sec. 147, 148, 294(b) 324 and 506(ii), 506(i) and 109 IPC .

3. **Framing of charges**

The accused persons appeared before this Court in pursuance of the summons issued them. Copies of the relevant documents were furnished to them free of cost, as mandated under Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter referred to as “Cr.P.C.”). Upon being satisfied that the accused persons had been provided with adequate time for reflection, the accusations for offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b) 324 and 506(ii), 506(i) and 109 IPC, were explained to them. The accused persons denied the allegations and claimed the case to be false.

Consequently, the charges were framed against the accused persons for the offences punishable as mentioned herebelow:

Section 148 IPC	A1 to A6 and A8
Section 148 IPC r/w Section 109 IPC	A7
Section 294 (b) IPC	A1 to A6 and A8
Section 294(b) IPC r/w Section 109 IPC	A7
Section 324 IPC	A1 to A6 and A8
Section 324 IPC r/w Section 109 IPC	A7
Section 506 (2) IPC	A1 to A6 and A8
Section 506(1) and 506(2) r/w Section 109 IPC	A7

The above mentioned charges were read over and explained to the accused persons and they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. Accordingly, the Court proceeded with the examination of the prosecution witnesses.

4. Prosecution Witnesses, List of documents and Material Objects

The prosecution examined PW1 to PW8 as witnesses and marked Ex.P1 to Ex.P9 in support of the prosecution case. No material object was involved in the present case.

5. Summary of the prosecution case as revealed in the prosecution evidence briefly summarized as follows:

(i) The accused persons and the complainant, PW1 Karthik, are known to each other and were on inimical terms due to a long-standing property dispute. On the date of occurrence, when PW1 questioned the 7th accused with regard to the alienation of property in favour of his sister-in-law, Lingammal, the 7th accused, uttered obscene words, and caught hold of the shirt of PW1 and pulled him. The 7th accused also contacted Sundarraaj, Manoharan, and the son of Sundarraaj over the phone, calling them to the place of occurrence. In the course of the ensuing incident, PW1 was attacked by the accused persons. The 4th accused assaulted PW1 on the head with a wooden log. The 2nd accused caused injuries to PW1 by attacking him, resulting in injury to his left small finger. The 1st accused also assaulted PW1 with a wooden log on his left knee. When PW3 intervened in an attempt to pacify the situation, the 5th accused attacked him with a sickle. PW2 was also assaulted by the 8th accused with a wooden log. Thereafter, the accused persons fled from the scene of occurrence, after jointly issuing threats amounting to criminal intimidation. The injured persons were taken to the hospital with the assistance of PW4, Santhanam, who transported them. Subsequently, PW1 lodged a complaint before the police, which has been marked as Ex.P1.

(ii) On receipt of information regarding the occurrence, LW12 Mathukumar registered a case in CSR No. 388 of 2020 on 16.08.2020 at about 21.30 hours and

conducted a preliminary enquiry. Thereafter, PW7, the Investigation Officer, on the basis of the said enquiry, registered the First Information Report in Crime No. 635 of 2020, marked as Ex.P4, for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323 and 506(2) IPC. Subsequently, he prepared an Alteration Report, marked as Ex.P5, altering the provisions of law to Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 506(2), 109, and 506(1) IPC. PW7, in the presence of the said witnesses, recovered the material objects, namely wooden logs and a sickle, from the place of occurrence and prepared the seizure mahazar (Attachi), marked as Ex.P3. The said material objects, marked as MO1 to MO3, were forwarded to the Court under Form-91, marked as Ex.P7, and assigned Property Register numbers. He thereafter examined the witnesses and recorded their statements.

(iii)PW1 and PW3, who sustained injuries in the occurrence, were treated by LW11 at the Government Hospital, Watrap. PW8, who assumed charge as Sub-Inspector of Police upon the transfer of PW7, continued the investigation. In the course of investigation, PW8 examined LW11 and recorded his statement. He also obtained the wound certificates and Accident Registers pertaining to PW1 and PW3, which have been marked as Ex.P8 and Ex.P9 respectively. It is further elicited in evidence that PW8 did not arrest the accused persons, as they had already obtained anticipatory bail from the Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Court, Virudhunagar District at Srivilliputtur. Upon completion of investigation, PW8 laid the final report before the Court.

6. 313(1)(b) Cr. P. C., Proceedings

The incriminating circumstances arising from the prosecution evidences explained to the accused persons in a manner understandable to them. In response, they claimed as false evidence and false case. After that, the defence counsel

endorsed as they have no witness to examine on their side. In view of the endorsement, defence side witness was closed and posted for arguments.

7. Heard both sides. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would submit that the prosecution has established its case beyond all reasonable doubt through the cogent and consistent evidence of the prosecution witnesses and the documentary evidence marked on its side, and therefore prayed for the conviction of the accused. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the accused would contend that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges levelled against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. It is further argued that though PW1, in his evidence, has categorically stated that he was standing near the house of one Muthu at the time of occurrence, the said Muthu has not been examined as a witness by the prosecution, which creates a serious doubt in the prosecution case. The learned defence counsel would further submit that the case has been falsely foisted against the accused persons due to prior enmity arising out of a civil property dispute. It is also contended that the prosecution has failed to satisfactorily establish the genuineness of the complaint as well as the exact place of occurrence. On the above grounds, the learned counsel would finally contend that the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt and prayed for their acquittal.

8. **Appreciation of evidence and discussion:-**

(1) Whether the prosecution has established, beyond reasonable doubt, that the accused persons have armed with weapons and thereby attracting the provisions of Section 148 IPC?

(a) According to the prosecution, on the date of the alleged incident, while PW1 was present at the scene of occurrence, the accused persons, armed with weapons and acting with the common intention of creating a riot, unlawfully assembled there. It is

alleged that the accused, in furtherance of their unlawful design, used obscene and abusive language and thereafter assaulted PW1, PW2, and PW3 with the said weapons, thereby causing injuries to them.

(b) The prosecution examined PW1 to PW5 as eyewitnesses to the alleged incident. However, during the course of trial, PW4 turned hostile and categorically stated that he was unaware of the occurrence. Consequently, his testimony was discarded from consideration. Upon perusal of the evidence of PW1, it emerges that he specifically deposed that A7 had allegedly contacted the other accused persons over the phone, pursuant to which they arrived at the scene. This version, when read in the light of the prosecution's case, appears to contradict the prosecution narrative. While PW1 attributes the assembly of the accused to the alleged instigation by A7, Ex. P1 records that all 8 accused persons were present at the scene, armed with deadly weapons, owing to long-standing enmity arising out of a property dispute. Thus, the evidence of PW1, instead of corroborating the prosecution case, introduces inconsistency regarding the manner in which the accused persons allegedly assembled and participated in the occurrence.

(c) The next eyewitness, PW2, specifically deposed that she arrived at the scene only after hearing the commotion. However, in her testimony, she failed to acknowledge the presence of all eight accused persons allegedly armed with deadly weapons. This omission assumes significance, as it undermines the prosecution's version that the entire group of accused had assembled at the spot with weapons in hand. Moreover, while PW1 asserted that PW2 and PW3 were present during the commotion, PW2 made no reference whatsoever to the presence of PW3. This contradiction between the testimonies of PW1 and PW2 creates a serious doubt regarding the reliability of PW2's account. The inconsistency not only weakens the prosecution's attempt to establish unlawful assembly under Section 148 IPC, but also

casts doubt on whether PW2 was indeed present at the scene and witnessed the alleged occurrence. In view of these contradictions, the testimony of PW2 cannot be safely relied upon as corroborative evidence to sustain the prosecution case.

(d) The next eyewitness, PW3, narrated a version distinct from that of PW1 and PW2. In his deposition, he stated that on 16.08.2020 at about 01.00 PM, an altercation had taken place, and later on the same day, at about 5.00 PM, the 4th and 6th accused, along with three other accused persons, assaulted him. This account materially differs from the prosecution's case as reflected in Ex. P1, which alleges that all the accused persons had assembled together, armed with deadly weapons, and committed rioting. The testimony of PW3, therefore, introduces a discrepancy regarding both the timing of the incident and the number of accused allegedly involved. Such inconsistency weakens the prosecution's attempt to establish the presence of all accused at the scene and casts doubt on the reliability of PW3's version in corroborating.

(e) The next eyewitness, PW5, claimed in his deposition that while he was conversing with PW1, the accused persons assaulted PW1 with a wooden log. However, PW1 in his testimony made no mention of any such conversation with PW5. Significantly, PW5 also remained silent regarding the presence of PW2 and PW3 at the scene, as well as the alleged assault said to have been inflicted upon them. This omission assumes importance, as it fails to corroborate the prosecution's version that multiple witnesses were present and that assaults were directed against PW1 to PW3. The contradictions between PW1 and PW5, coupled with the absence of reference to other eyewitnesses, cast doubt on the reliability of PW5's testimony.

(f) In view of the discussions set forth above, it becomes evident that the prosecution evidence suffers from a lack of corroboration among its own witnesses.

Each of the eyewitnesses has narrated a version distinct from the prosecution's principal case, thereby creating material inconsistencies. Taken cumulatively, these contradictions and omissions strike at the root of the prosecution's case. The absence of a consistent and reliable narrative from the eyewitnesses renders the allegation of unlawful assembly armed with deadly weapons under Section 148 IPC doubtful. The prosecution has failed to establish its case beyond reasonable doubt, as the evidence presented is neither cogent nor trustworthy. Consequently, the Court finds that the prosecution has not discharged its burden of proof, and the benefit of doubt must necessarily enure to the accused.

(2) Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the alleged accused person used obscene words in a public place, causing annoyance to others, thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 294(b) IPC?

(a) It is the case of the prosecution that the accused persons jointly uttered obscene words at the scene of occurrence. However, PW1 in his evidence specifically stated that A7 alone had uttered such obscene words, thereby materially contradicting the prosecution's version of collective utterance. Although PW1 narrated the obscene words allegedly spoken by A7, the prosecution case itself records that A7 was not even present at the place of occurrence. This contradiction assumes considerable importance, for while the prosecution attributes the obscene utterances to the entire group of accused, PW1's testimony isolates A7 as the sole person responsible. The inconsistency between the oral testimony of PW1 and the documentary record in Ex. P1 casts serious doubt on the veracity of the prosecution's allegation.

(b) Although the prosecution sought to project that PW2 to PW5 were present at the scene of occurrence, none of these witnesses deposed about the alleged utterance of obscene words by the accused persons. Equally, none of them stated that they

experienced annoyance or disturbance on account of such alleged obscene words. This collective silence assumes importance, as it directly weakens the prosecution's version that the accused jointly used obscene language in furtherance of their unlawful assembly. In the absence of corroboration from the eyewitnesses, and given the contradictions already noted in the testimony of PW1, the allegation of obscene utterances remains unsubstantiated and cannot be accepted as proved beyond reasonable doubt.

(3) Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused person allegedly voluntarily causing simple injury, thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 324 IPC?

(a) It is the case of the prosecution that the complainant was assaulted by the 4th accused with a wooden stick, aimed at his head, thereby causing injury. The 1st accused is alleged to have assaulted complainant with a wooden stick directed at his right knee, while the 2nd accused allegedly struck complainant with a wooden stick aimed at his left hand, injuring his small finger. The 3rd accused is said to have assaulted complainant with a stone aimed at his head, resulting in a contusion injury. Further, PW3, the uncle of complainant, and complainant's wife, Mrs. Kavitha (PW2), were also allegedly assaulted: PW3 by the 5th accused with a sickle aimed at his head, and by the 6th accused with a wooden stick aimed at his right leg; PW2 was allegedly assaulted by the 8th accused with a wooden stick directed at her left knee.

(b) Upon a perusal of the evidence of PW1, it is evident from his deposition that the 7th accused allegedly abetted the other accused persons, and based on such abetment, they arrived at the scene. PW1 further stated that he was assaulted with a wooden stick on his head, thereby sustaining a bleeding injury. The 2nd accused is alleged to have assaulted PW1 on his left hand, causing injury to his small finger, while the 3rd accused allegedly struck him with a wooden stick. When PW3 attempted

to intervene, he was assaulted by the 5th accused with a sickle, and likewise, when PW2 attempted to intervene, she was assaulted by the 8th accused with a wooden stick, striking her left leg.

(c) Subsequently, upon perusal of the evidence of PW2, it emerges that when she arrived at the scene of occurrence, her husband PW1 was allegedly assaulted by the 1st accused with a wooden stick on his head. The 2nd accused is said to have assaulted PW1 with a wooden stick on his right leg, while the 3rd accused allegedly struck PW1 on his left hand. PW2 further stated that when she questioned the accused about the incident, she herself was assaulted by the 8th accused with a wooden stick on her left leg. Although PW2 in her deposition speaks of the assaults directed against PW1 and herself, her omission to mention the assaults narrated by PW1 materially undermines her reliability. This inconsistency casts a serious doubt on her presence at the scene and her claim of having witnessed the alleged occurrence.

(d) Subsequently, upon a perusal of the evidence of PW3, it is noted that he stated he was assaulted by the accused persons. Significantly, however, his deposition makes no mention of the alleged assaults directed against PW1 and PW2. This omission materially undermines the prosecution's case, as it fails to corroborate the version advanced by PW1 and PW2 regarding the assaults upon them. The absence of reference to such crucial aspects creates a serious inconsistency and casts doubt on the reliability of PW3's testimony. On a collective perusal of the evidence of PW1 to PW3, it is apparent that their testimonies lack corroboration with one another and stand mutually contradictory. Each witness has presented a distinct version of the alleged occurrence, which materially weakens the prosecution's case. The absence of consistency among these key witnesses creates serious doubt regarding the reliability of their evidence and undermines the prosecution's attempt to establish the charge.

(e) Upon a perusal of Ex. P8 and Ex. P9, the Accident Registers issued by LW11, it is noted that although the treating doctor was examined as a witness in the present case, the wound certificates were taken into consideration by this Court. Ex. P9, being the Accident Register prepared by LW11 during the medical examination of PW1, records the following injuries:

- i. Laceration over the left parietotemporal region measuring $5 \times 1 \times 1$ cm.
- ii. Laceration over the right leg measuring $3 \times 1 \times 0.5$ cm, and another over the left little finger of the hand measuring $1 \times 0.5 \times 0.5$ cm.
- iii. Abrasion and contusion over the left forearm and the dorsum of the right foot.

(f) Further, upon a perusal of Ex. P8, being the Accident Register prepared by LW11 during the medical examination of PW1, the following injuries are recorded:

- i. Laceration over the scalp (parietotemporal) region measuring $16 \times 1 \times 1$ cm.
- ii. Laceration over the right leg measuring $5 \times 1 \times 1$ cm.
- iii. Abrasion and contusion over the right and left forearm and the right wrist and right index finger.

(g) While Ex. P9 corroborates the evidence of PW1 with respect to the injuries sustained, the testimony of PW1 suffers from lack of independent corroboration. It is noted that there existed admitted enmity between the parties owing to a long-standing property dispute. In such circumstances, the sole reliance on PW1's version, without consistent support from other witnesses, raises doubt regarding the credibility of his account. Furthermore, the manner of occurrence as narrated by PW1 stands contradicted by the prosecution's version. The discrepancies between PW1's account and the prosecution's case create a material inconsistency, thereby weakening the

reliability of the evidence. Such contradictions cast doubt on the truthfulness of the prosecution's narrative and diminish the probative value of PW1's testimony.

(h) Further, while Ex. P8 explicitly records the injuries sustained by PW3, his deposition makes no reference to those injuries. The omission of such a crucial detail, which forms the substratum of the alleged offence, materially weakens the prosecution's case. Moreover, the absence of any mention of the alleged assault sustained by PW1 in the course of the same transaction casts doubt on the presence of PW3 at the scene of occurrence at the relevant time. Coupled with the admitted enmity between the parties arising out of a long-standing property dispute, this silence raises serious doubt about the credibility of PW3's testimony and undermines the overall reliability of the prosecution's version.

(i) Further, it is an admitted fact by both sides that there was existing enmity between them. This court has placed his reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, In *Aslam @ Imran v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, reported in 2025 LiveLaw (SC) 365, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:

"It is a settled law that enmity is a double-edged weapon. On one hand, it provides motive, on the other hand, it also does not rule out the possibility of false implication. From the nature of the evidence placed on record by the prosecution, the possibility of the present appellant being falsely implicated on account of previous enmity cannot be ruled out. In our opinion, therefore, the appellant is entitled to benefit of doubt."

(j) Following the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Aslam @ Imran v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, reported in 2025 LiveLaw (SC) 365, it is evident that although the prosecution has succeeded in establishing the injuries sustained by PW1 and PW3, the material contradictions discussed above, coupled with the lack of

corroboration and the admitted previous enmity between the parties, materially weaken the case. In light of these circumstances, the possibility of false implication in the present matter cannot be ruled out, thereby entitling the accused to the benefit of doubt.

(4) Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the alleged accused persons criminally intimidated the complainant, thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 506(1) and 506(2) IPC?

(a) It is the case of the prosecution that the accused persons jointly criminally intimidated the complainant. However, except for PW1, none of the other witnesses examined as eyewitnesses have deposed about the alleged act of criminal intimidation. This absence of corroboration materially weakens the prosecution's version. Furthermore, to attract the offence under Section 506 IPC, both *mens rea* (the intention to cause alarm) and *actus reus* (the overt act of intimidation) must be established. The mere presence of *mens rea*, without proof of the corresponding *actus reus*, cannot constitute the offence. In the present case, the prosecution has failed to demonstrate any overt act of intimidation beyond the assertions of PW1, thereby casting serious doubt on whether the essential ingredients of Section 506 IPC stand satisfied.

9. Decision

In result, the accused persons were not found guilty for the offence punishable under sections 148, 149 r/w 109, 294(b), 294(b) r/w 109, 324, 324 r/w 109, 506(2), 506(1) r/w 109 of IPC and therefore, they were acquitted from the aforesaid charges as per section 248(1) of Cr.P.C.

The bail bond of the accused persons shall stand cancelled after the lapse of the limitation period for preferring appeal.

MO1 to MO3 were ordered to be destroyed after the expiry of the appeal period.

The judgment was typed by me in my personal computer at my chamber and corrected by me and pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 25th day of May 2026.

District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate
Watrap

Appendix – A

Prosecution side witnesses

S. No	Rank of the witnesses	Name of the Witness	Remarks
1	PW1	Mr. Karthick	Defacto Complainant
2	PW2	Mrs. Kavitha	Eye Witness
3	PW3	Mr. Perumal	Eye witness
4	PW4	Mr. Santhanam	Eye Witness
5	PW5	Mr. Sundarraaj	Hearsay Witness
6	PW6	Mrs. Marikani	Observation Mahazar Witness
7	PW7	Mr. Mahalingam	Investigation Officer
8	PW8	Mr. Chella Pandian	Investigation Officer

Appendix – B

Prosecution side Exhibits

S. No	Exhibit	Remarks
1	Ex. P1	Complaint
2	Ex. P2	Observation Mahazar

3	Ex.P3	Attatchi
4	Ex. P4	First Information Report
5	Ex. P5	Section Alteration Report
6	Ex. P6	Rough Sketch
7	Ex. P7	Form – 91
8	Ex. P8	Accident Register with wound certificate
9	Ex. P9	Accident Register with wound certificate

Appendix – C -

Prosecution side Exhibits

S. No	Exhibit	Remarks
1	MO1	Wooden log (3 Nos)
2	MO2	Stone
3	MO3	Sickle

Appendix – D - Defence side witness - Nil

Appendix - E - Defence side Exhibits - Nil

Note:-

1. No witnesses were detained more than three times.
2. Nature of the disposal communicated to the concerned police.
3. The accused is on bail during the pronouncement of Judgment.

District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate
Watrap