

**IN THE COURT OF THE FAST TRACK SPECIAL COURT-II,
MANJERI**

Present:- Sri. Varun K. S., Special Judge

Dated, Monday this the 18th day of May 2026
(This the 28th of Vysagham 1948)

SESSIONS CASE No 754 / 2025

Complainant	:	State Represented by the SHO, Karuvarakundu Police Station, Karuvarakundu. In Crime No. 54/25 of the above Police Station.
Prosecution conducted by		Sri. A.N Manoj (Special Prosecutor, Manjeri)
Accused	:	Muhammed Safvan, Age 35, S/o. Said, Parakkal House, Maruthungal, Karuvarakundu, Malappuram District.
		[Rep. By Sri. Abdul Latheef, Adv.]
Offence	:	Punishable under Sections 376, 354A, 354B, 354C,

		354D, 509, 350, 447, 448 , 506(i) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code
Plea	:	Not guilty
Finding	:	Not guilty
Sentence or order	:	The accused is acquitted U/s 258 (1) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The bail bond executed by the accused stands cancelled, and the accused is set at liberty.

Description of Accused

Sl. No .	Name	Father's name	Occup ation	Residence	Age
1.	Muhammed Safvan,	Said,	Coolie	Parakkal House, Maruthungal, Karuvarakundu, Malappuram District.	35

Relevant Dates

Occurrence	Complaint	Apprehension	Release on bail	Commencement of trial	Close of trial	Sentence or order
From 30.11.21 onwards	11.7.25	20.3.25	6.5.26	17.7.25	13.5.26	18.5.26

Examination of witness commenced on 17.7.25 Evidence closed on 13.5.26 Judgment pronounced on 18.5.26.

JUDGMENT

In this case, the police report has been filed by the SHO, Karuvarakundu Police Station, in the above crime for the offence punishable U/s. 376, 354A, 354B, 354C, 354D, 509, 350, 447, 448 , 506(i) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

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

From 30.11.2021 onwards, the accused was allegedly in constant contact with the victim. On 02.07.2023, the accused allegedly criminally trespassed into the victim's house at Kizhakkethala, Karuvarakundu, with the intention of committing rape. Thereafter, the accused allegedly forcefully took the victim to the bedroom and committed rape on her. The accused also allegedly demanded sexual favours from the victim and used force to disrobe her. It is further alleged that the accused

watched and captured photographs and videos of the victim while sexually assaulting her. The prosecution further alleges that the accused constantly followed and contacted the victim to foster personal interaction. The accused allegedly exhibited his private parts to insult the modesty of the victim and thereafter forcibly raped her. It is also alleged that the accused used criminal force against the victim after trespassing into the compound and house of the victim. Thereafter, the accused allegedly criminally intimidated the victim by threatening to use the photographs and videos taken of her. The accused is also alleged to have destroyed evidence in order to escape legal punishment by destroying the mobile phone. By the aforesaid acts, the accused is alleged to have committed offences punishable under Sections 376, 354A, 354B, 354C, 354D, 509, 350, 447, 448 , 506(i) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. In this case, the police report was filed before the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court I, Manjeri and the case was numbered as CP 28/25. On appearance, the accused was released on bail and copies of the prosecution records were furnished to him. Thereafter, the case was committed to the Honourable sessions court and numbered as this case. From the Additional Sessions Court -1, Manjeri this case was made over to this court as per the order of the Hon'ble Sessions Court, Manjeri. The accused was on bail. The accused appeared before the court and was duly represented by an advocate chosen by the accused. The accused was furnished with copies of all relevant prosecution records.

4. The accused did not prefer any application for discharge. The prosecution and the accused were heard, and the prosecution records were perused. There were sufficient grounds for presuming that the accused had committed offences exclusively triable by this Court.

5. Accordingly, charges for the offences under Sections 376, 354A, 354B, 354C, 354D, 509, 350, 447, 448, 506(i) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code were framed against the accused in writing. The same was read over and explained to the accused in Malayalam. The accused pleaded not guilty to the charge and claimed to be tried. Hence, the case was scheduled for trial.

6. In evidence, PW1 to PW11 were examined, and Exhibit P1 to Exhibit P13 were marked on the prosecution's side. After the witnesses for the prosecution had been examined and before the accused was called on for his defence, the accused was questioned U/s 351 (1) (b) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the purpose of enabling the accused personally to explain any circumstances appearing in evidence against him.

7. The accused denied all the incriminating circumstances appearing in evidence. The accused stated that he is innocent and is falsely implicated in the case.

8. This Court heard the prosecution and the defence. On a consideration of the entire evidence on record, this Court did not find that there was no evidence against the accused. Hence, no order of acquittal under Section 255 of the Bharatiya

Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, was recorded.

9. Accordingly, the accused was called upon to enter upon the defence, and no defence evidence was adduced from the side of the accused.

10. Heard both sides

11. Now the points that arise for determination are:-

- 1) Whether the accused, from 30.11.2021 onwards, constantly contacted and followed the victim with the intention of fostering personal interaction against her will, as alleged?
- 2) Whether on 02.07.2023, the accused criminally trespassed into the house and compound of the victim at Kizhakkethala, Karuvarakundu, with the intention to commit offences as alleged?
- 3) Whether the accused used criminal force against the victim, demanded sexual favours, and forcibly disrobed her as alleged?
- 4) Whether the accused committed rape on the victim on 02.07.2023, as alleged?
- 5) Whether the accused captured photographs and videos of the victim during the alleged sexual assault as alleged?
- 6) Whether the accused exhibited his private parts with the intention of insulting the modesty of the victim, as alleged?
- 7) Whether the accused criminally intimidated the victim by threatening to use the photographs and videos taken of the victim, as alleged?
- 8) Whether the accused destroyed the mobile phone with the intention of causing the disappearance of evidence, as

alleged?

9) Whether the accused is guilty of any of the alleged offences?

10) If found guilty, what should be the proper order as to sentence?

12. **Point No.1 to 8:-** For the sake of convenience, both points are considered together.

13. In order to prove the prosecution's allegation, the prosecution examined the victim, her husband and other material witnesses. PW1 is the victim. According to PW1, she is residing with her husband and two children at Tharisha in Karuvarakundu. The accused initially came to her house to cut trees and, thereafter, they became acquainted with each other. Subsequently, the accused allegedly started calling PW1 from various phone numbers and continuously disturbed her. PW1 stated that she attempted to block such calls.

14. PW1 testified that the first incident occurred on 02.07.2023. On that day, the accused came to her house to cut trees and thereafter came into the house through the kitchen door. The accused requested water for drinking. When PW1 turned to take water, the accused allegedly caught hold of her from behind and forcibly took her to the bedroom. PW1 further stated that the accused closed her mouth and, when she attempted to raise an alarm, the accused administered some substance near her nose, causing her to become semi-conscious. According to PW1, the accused tore her dress and thereafter committed rape on her. PW1 stated that she was

initially afraid and therefore did not disclose the incident to her husband and children.

15. According to PW1, the second incident occurred on 24.01.2024. On that day, the accused also allegedly came to her house and forcibly took her to the bedroom. However, PW1 managed to escape and locked the accused inside the room. Thereafter, PW1 informed her husband and son over the phone, and they immediately came to the house. PW1 stated that her husband informed the mother and wife of the accused about the incident. They came to the house and requested that no legal action be taken against the accused.

16. PW1 further stated that she became mentally disturbed after the incident. Subsequently, the accused filed a criminal case against the husband of PW1, alleging assault. After three months, her mental condition became stable. So she preferred a complaint to the police. However, as no proper action was allegedly taken, she filed a complaint before the Magistrate Court, which was marked as Ext.P1. PW1 had also earlier submitted a complaint before the District Police Chief. The receipt of which was marked as Ext.P2. After registration of the crime, the police produced PW1 before the learned Magistrate, and she gave Ext.P3 statement. PW1 also handed over MO1 dress, allegedly worn at the time of the incident, to the Investigating Officer.

17. In order to substantiate the prosecution's case, PW1's husband was examined as PW2. PW2 stated that, on a day in January 2024, PW1 called him over the phone and asked

him to come home immediately. Accordingly, PW2 and his son reached the house. At that time, PW2 saw a person locked inside the bedroom. PW2 opened the door and found the accused inside the room. PW1 informed PW2 that the accused had attempted to sexually assault her and that she had locked him inside the bedroom. PW2 further stated that the mother and wife of the accused were informed about the incident. They came to the house, assured that no such incident would recur, and requested that no legal action be initiated.

18. PW2 further deposed that he subsequently came to know that the accused had been continuously following and harassing PW1 over the phone and that the accused had allegedly committed rape on PW1 on 02.07.2023. PW2 also stated that, on enquiry, he came to know that the accused had allegedly committed similar acts against other women. So the complaint was given. PW2 identified his signature in Ext.P4 seizure mahazar prepared by the Investigating Officer at the time of seizure of the dress.

19. PW5 is the doctor who conducted the medical examination of the victim while working at the Medical College Hospital, Manjeri. The medical report prepared by PW5 is marked as Exhibit P7.

20. The investigation was conducted by PW11, who was working as the Inspector and Station House Officer of Karuvarakundu Police Station during the relevant period. Based on Exhibit P1, PW11 registered Exhibit P1(a) FIR.

21. Thereafter, the Investigating Officer took steps to

subject the victim to medical examination. The accused was arrested by PW10, a sub-inspector of police attached to Karuvarakundu police station, as instructed by the investigating officer. Exhibit P10 series arrest memo, arrest notice, and arrest intimation were prepared while arresting the accused. The accused was also subjected to a potency examination. PW4, the doctor working at Medical College Manjeri, examined the accused and issued Exhibit P6 potency certificate.

22. The Investigating Officer thereafter visited the place of occurrence and prepared the scene mahazar, which is marked as Exhibit P5. PW3 was examined as an attester to the said mahazar and deposed that she witnessed the preparation of Exhibit P5 and signed the same.

23. The Investigating Officer seized the dresses worn by the victim. The dress worn by the victim was marked as MO1. The seizure mahazar relating to the same is marked as Exhibits P4.

24. During the course of the investigation, it was found that additional penal provisions were attracted. Accordingly, Exhibit P12 report was submitted for incorporating and modifying the relevant sections of law. The Investigating Officer also obtained the ownership certificate of the building in question and caused the preparation of a sketch of the place of occurrence.

25. PW8, while working at Karuvarakundu Grama panchayath issued Exhibit P9 ownership certificate. PW6, the Village Officer, Karuvarakundu, prepared Exhibit P8 sketch of the place of occurrence based on the scene mahazar furnished

by the police.

26. The Investigating Officer further collected the full name and address of the accused and filed the Exhibit P13 report to incorporate those particulars. As instructed by the investigating officer, PW9 ASI of police attached to Kruvarkundu police station, recorded statements of the victim on three occasions. After completing all the above formalities, the Investigating Officer filed the final report before the court.

27. Based on the above materials placed before the Court, the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the victim was subjected to forcible sexual intercourse by the accused without her consent. It was argued that PW1 clearly narrated the incident and that her version is consistent. Immediately after registration of the case, appropriate steps were taken, including medical examination and recording of her statement before the Magistrate. It was further contended that the materials collected during the investigation fully corroborate the testimony of PW1. It was submitted that the oral evidence of PW1 inspires confidence and that the accused is liable to be convicted for the offences charged against him.

28. Per contra, the learned counsel for the accused submitted that the prosecution's case is entirely false and fabricated. It was argued that there is no evidence to establish any relationship between PW1 and the accused. The accused never trespassed into the house and did not commit any rape as alleged. It was submitted that the victim refused to give consent for medical examination and, therefore, no medical evidence

could be collected in support of the prosecution's case. According to the learned counsel for the accused, in the absence of medical evidence, the prosecution's case becomes doubtful.

29. In support of the said contention, reliance was placed on the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Savithri v. State of Kerala* [(2015) 16 SCC 752] and *Rajesh Kumar v. State of Himachal Pradesh* [2025 INSC 331]. It was further submitted that even PW7, the son of the victim, did not support the prosecution's allegation of rape. The learned counsel also pointed out that no independent witnesses from the locality were examined by the prosecution to substantiate the alleged occurrence.

30. On the basis of the above aspects, the learned counsel for the accused contended that the prosecution witnesses are not trustworthy and that they have given false evidence before the court. According to the defence, the present case was instituted solely to extort money from the accused. It was therefore argued that the prosecution's case is liable to be disbelieved and that the accused is entitled to an acquittal.

31. In the case at hand, after hearing both sides and after considering the matters before the court, it is possible to hold that there is considerable force in the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the accused.

32. In the present case, the prosecution's case mainly rests upon the oral testimony of PW1. At the same time, it is pertinent to note that the prosecution was not set in motion on

the basis of any First Information Statement preferred by PW1. The case originated from a private complaint forwarded by the learned Magistrate to the Investigating Officer for investigation. PW1 herself admitted before the Court that the complaint in the present case was prepared by an advocate. It is this complaint that was produced and marked before the Court.

33. According to PW1, prior to filing the present complaint before the Magistrate Court, she had already submitted a statement before the police and another complaint before the Superintendent of Police. However, the documents were not produced before this Court. The prosecution produced only Exhibit P2 receipt obtained from the District Police Chief. Thus, the actual contents of the earlier complaints allegedly submitted by PW1 are not available before the Court.

34. The non-production of the earlier complaints assumes significance in the facts and circumstances of the present case. If the statement was given immediately after the occurrence, it is the earliest version of the allegations made by PW1. Production of such documents would have enabled the Court to ascertain whether the allegations contained in the present complaint are consistent with the earlier versions. Only in such a situation is it possible to hold that there were no subsequent deliberations, embellishments, improvements, or material additions. In the absence of the earlier complaints, it is not possible to hold that Exhibit P1 complaint is the earliest version of the incident.

35. Further, according to PW1, the incident had

allegedly occurred on 24.01.2024. However, the complaint before the Magistrate Court was filed only after considerable delay. PW1 attempted to explain the delay by stating that she was mentally disturbed and that the police initially refused to register the case. However, no convincing materials are placed before the Court to substantiate the said explanation. No copy of the earlier complaint allegedly submitted before the police has been produced. No material is available before the court to indicate the date on which such an earlier complaint was allegedly submitted. At the same time, no official witness from the police department was examined to show that PW1 had, in fact, approached the police earlier. In such circumstances, the claim of PW1 that the police declined to register the case remains unestablished.

36. It is also relevant to note that the present complaint admittedly came into existence after legal consultation and deliberation. PW1 herself admitted that the complaint was prepared by an advocate. Indeed, the preparation of a complaint by an advocate is not a suspicious circumstance. In this case, the earliest complaints alleged to have been given by PW1 were withheld from the court. A subsequently prepared complaint by a legally trained person is produced after considerable delay. The possibility of deliberation, embellishment, and improvement in the prosecution's version cannot be completely ruled out.

37. Thus, the unexplained delay in initiating the prosecution, coupled with the suppression of the earlier complaints allegedly submitted before the authorities concerned,

creates a serious doubt regarding the genuineness and spontaneity of the prosecution's version. These circumstances strike at the root of the prosecution's case and cast a suspicion over the reliability of the allegations raised against the accused.

38. In *Prithvirajan v. State* [2025 KHC OnLine 7241], *Pramod Suryabhan Pawar v. State of Maharashtra* [2019 KHC 6829], and *Maheshwar Tigga v. State of Jharkhand* [(2020) 5 KHC 322], the Honourable Courts observed that unexplained delay in lodging the complaint, absence of medical or forensic corroboration, and material inconsistencies in the prosecution version create doubt regarding the prosecution's version and entitle the accused to the benefit of doubt.

39. In that regard, it is important to note that PW7, the son of PW1, did not support the prosecution case. According to PW1, after the alleged incident on 02.07.23, PW7 came to the house along with PW2 and saw that the accused had been detained by PW1 inside the bedroom. PW1 also has a specific case that she disclosed the details of the alleged sexual assault to them immediately thereafter.

40. However, PW7 did not support the aforesaid version before the Court. PW7 has no case that he saw the accused detained inside the house by PW1. PW7 also did not depose before the Court that PW1 disclosed to him any allegation of rape committed by the accused. Thus, the testimony of PW7 does not corroborate the version given by PW1 regarding the alleged occurrence.

41. The evidence of PW7 assumes significance. PW7

is none other than the son of PW1. In such a situation, PW7 would ordinarily be expected to support his mother's version if the alleged incident had occurred in the manner stated by PW1. However, PW7 failed to support the prosecution's case on material aspects. No satisfactory explanation is forthcoming for PW7's failure to support the version given by his own mother. This circumstance creates further doubt regarding the reliability of the prosecution case.

42. At the same time, it is also important to note that PW5, the doctor who attempted to conduct the medical examination of PW1, categorically deposed that PW1 refused to undergo medical examination for the purpose of detecting evidence of alleged sexual intercourse. The said circumstance also assumes relevance in the facts and circumstances of the present case. If PW1 had in fact been subjected to rape in the manner alleged, PW1 would have subjected herself to medical examination. The said aspect further weakens the prosecution's case, which already suffers from serious infirmities and inconsistencies.

43. In such a situation, as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the accused, the principles laid down in *Savithri v. State* [2015 ICO 1476] and *State of HP v Rajesh* [2025 INSC 331], apply to the facts and circumstances of the present case.

44. In *State of Himachal Pradesh v. Rajesh* [2025 INSC 331], the Honourable Supreme Court categorically held that refusal by the alleged rape victim to undergo medical

examination raises negative inferences against the victim. Accordingly, in the present case also, the refusal of PW1 to undergo a medico-legal examination assumes considerable significance. The evidence of PW5 clearly shows that PW1 did not permit medical examination for detecting evidence relating to the alleged sexual intercourse. The conduct of PW1 in refusing medical examination creates a reasonable apprehension that PW1 intended to withhold certain facts, which might have been revealed through medical examination.

45. According to PW1, the accused contacted her several times over the phone from different numbers. PW1 also alleged that the accused captured her nude photographs and videos. However, no Call Detail Records (CDRs) were collected or produced before the Court to prove the alleged phone calls between PW1 and the accused.

46. Further, the device allegedly used by the accused for capturing the photographs and videos was not seized by the Investigating Officer. The said device was also not sent for forensic examination. Therefore, no scientific evidence was collected to prove the existence of such photographs or videos.

47. It is also important to note that PW1 refused to hand over her own mobile phone for scientific examination. Thus, no steps were taken by the investigating agency to verify the alleged mobile phone of the victim to collect messages, photographs, or videos from the victim's phone. Such important investigative steps were not taken in the present case.

48. According to PW1 and PW2, after the alleged

second incident, the mother and wife of the accused came to PW1's house and requested them not to take legal action against the accused. However, those persons were neither properly interrogated during the investigation . They were not examined before the court as witnesses to support the prosecution's case. If they had actually come to the house after the incident, they would have been important witnesses. The non-examination of such material witnesses also creates doubt regarding the prosecution's case.

49. At this juncture, it is further important to note that PW1 herself admitted before the court that her husband, PW1, i.e., PW2, had earlier assaulted the accused. PW1 also admitted that, in connection with the said incident, the accused had filed a criminal case against PW2 and that the said case is still pending.

50. It is significant to note that Ext.P1 complaint in the present case was filed only after the institution of the aforesaid criminal case against PW2. The sequence of events assumes importance while appreciating the defence's contention. The above circumstances create a reasonable inference that the present complaint might have been filed as a counterblast to the criminal proceedings initiated by the accused against PW2. The possibility of false implication arising out of prior enmity and pending criminal litigation between the parties, therefore, cannot be ruled out.

51. All these aspects create serious doubt regarding the overall reliability of PW1. It appears highly improbable that

the accused committed rape after criminally trespassing into the house, as alleged. PW1 cannot be treated as a sterling witness in the facts and circumstances of this case.

52. In the above factual background, it would be wholly unsafe to record a conviction solely based on the uncorroborated testimony of PW1. Though in law a conviction can be based on the sole testimony of the victim if it inspires confidence, in the present case, the evidence of PW1 does not attain that degree of reliability. The version given by her is not supported by convincing independent circumstances.

53. The evidence of PW2 also does not inspire confidence. His testimony does not furnish clear, cogent, and reliable corroboration of the version put forward by PW1. On the contrary, the above aspects emerging from the evidence probabilise the defence case.

54. As mentioned above, the medical evidence also does not advance the prosecution's case. Exhibit P7, the medical examination report of the victim, proved through PW5 doctor, does not disclose any findings that support forceful sexual intercourse as alleged by PW1. Thus, the allegation of a brutal and forceful act of sexual intercourse is not supported by the medical evidence. This circumstance further weakens the already doubtful prosecution case.

55. In such a situation, it is not safe to rely solely on the oral evidence of PW1 to conclude that the accused committed the alleged offences. The prosecution's evidence does not inspire confidence. The testimony of PW1 is not sufficiently

corroborated by reliable and convincing material evidence. The evidence of PW2 and the other witnesses also does not satisfactorily support the prosecution's case.

56. In this context, it is worthwhile to refer to the decision of the Honourable High Court of Kerala in *Christopher v. State of Kerala* [2025 (1) KLD 1 : 2024 KER 84099]. In the said decision, the Honourable High Court held that though a conviction can legally be based on the sole testimony of a survivor of sexual assault, such testimony must be subjected to strict and careful scrutiny. If the evidence does not inspire full confidence, or if it suffers from material contradictions and inherent improbabilities, it would be unsafe to base a conviction solely on such evidence.

57. The Honourable Court further explained that to sustain a conviction on the sole testimony of the survivor, the evidence must satisfy the test of a “sterling witness.” The testimony must be wholly reliable, consistent, natural, and free from material discrepancies. If the evidence reveals inconsistencies, contradictions, or inherent weaknesses, it cannot be treated as evidence of a sterling quality so as to form the sole foundation for conviction.

58. Applying the above principles to the present case, the testimony of PW1 does not satisfy the standard laid down by the Honourable High Court. In such circumstances, PW1 cannot be treated as a sterling witness, and it would be unsafe to record a conviction solely on her testimony without reliable corroboration. In these circumstances, the prosecution failed to

prove the case against the accused beyond a reasonable doubt. Therefore, the accused is entitled to the benefit of the doubt.

59. Resultantly, the accused is to be acquitted of all the alleged offences. All the points are answered against the prosecution and in favour of the accused.

60. **Point No 9 and 10:-** Both points are considered together for convenience.

61. In view of the findings in the above points, the accused is found not guilty of the offences punishable under Sections 376, 354A, 354B, 354C, 354D, 509, 350, 447, 448, 506(i) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

62. In the result, the accused is found not guilty of the aforesaid offences, and the accused is acquitted of the aforesaid offences U/s 258 (1) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The accused is set at liberty, and the bail bond stands cancelled.

63. MO1 shall be destroyed after the period of appeal, and if any appeal is preferred after the disposal of the appeal.

(Dictated to Adalath AI and corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this, the 18th day of May 2026.)

Varun.K.S.

Special Judge

APPENDIX

Witnesses examined for the prosecution:-

Rank	Name of Witness	Date of Examination	Category of Witness
PW1	Hajirumma	13.11.25	Informant
PW2	Anvar sadath	28.11.25	Occurrence witness
PW3	Moideen	16.01.26	Mahazar witness
PW4	Muhammad Mubarak	6.2.26	Official witness
PW5	Sinu	13.2.26	Official witness
PW6	Shibu	13.2.26	Official witness
PW7	Muhammad Reehan	13.2.26	Occurrence witness
PW8	Azeena Cherupallikal	13.2.26	Official witness
PW9	Sindhu	23.3.26	Official witness
PW10	Aravindakshan	23.3.26	Official witness
PW11	Sreenivasan	27.4.26	Official witness

Exhibits marked for the prosecution :

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by/ Attested by
1	Exhibit P1 & Exhibit P1(a)	Complainant / F.I.S. Dated:- 7.1.25 FIR registered in this case Dated : 24.1.25	PW1 & PW11
2	Exhibit P2	Receipt Dated:-29.7.24	PW1

3	Exhibit P3	Sec. 164 statement of victim Dated:-27.1.25	PW1
4	Exhibit P4	Seizure mahazar Dated:-25.1.25	PW2
5	Exhibit P5	Scene mahazar Dated:-6.2.25	PW3
6	Exhibit P6	Potency report of accused Dated:-20.3.25	PW4
7	Exhibit P7	Medical certificate of PW1 Dated:-27.1.15	PW5
8	Exhibit P8	Sketch plan Dated:-24.3.25	PW6
9	Exhibit P9	Ownership certificate Dated:-4.2.25	PW8
10	Exhibit P10 Exhibit P10(a) Exhibit P10(b)	Arrest memo Dated:-20.3.24 Inspection memo Dated:-20.3.25 Arrest intimation Dated :20.3.25	PW10
11	Exhibit P11	Property list Dated:-25.1.25	PW111
12	Exhibit P12	Report for add section Dated:-21.3.25	PW11
13	Exhibit P13	Report for add name and	PW11

		address of accused Dated:-20.3.35	
--	--	--------------------------------------	--

Witnesses examined from the side of the Defence:-: Nil

Rank	Name of Witness	Date of Examination	Category of Witness
----	-----	----	-----

Exhibits Marked from the Side of the Defence: Nil

:

Nil

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by/ Attested by
--	--	--	-----
Court Witness	:	Nil	
Court Exhibits	:	Nil	

Material objects Marked:- Nil		
Serial Number	Description	Proved by/ Attested by
MO1	MO1- Maxi- Dress worn by the victim and/or identified by PW1.	PW1

Varun.K.S.

Special Judge