

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 499 OF 2010

Ravi and another ..Appellants

versus

State of Tamil Nadu ..Respondents

O R D E R

The appellants were convicted under Sections 449, 302 and 392 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, for the murder of Sulochana, and other offences, by the Sessions Judge, Karur in S.C. No. 147 of 2005, vide judgment dated 20.12.2006, and upheld by the High Court of Madras, Madurai Bench, in Criminal Appeal No. 93 of 2007, vide judgment dated 6.2.2008.

It is not a matter of dispute, that the conviction of the appellants, was based on circumstantial evidence. The circumstantial evidence was of three kinds. Firstly, it pertained to the last seen evidence recorded through Abdul Rahim-PW16 and Dharmraj-PW17. Both the above witnesses affirmed, that the accused were seen in the vicinity of the house of the deceased at the relevant time. The said last seen evidence was corroborated by Veeraragahavan(Constable)- PW22. It is also relevant to mention, that the accused were subjected to a Test Identification Parade by the Judicial Magistrate at the Central Jail, Tiruchi, and they were duly and correctly identified by Abdul Rahim-PW16 and Dharmraj-PW17. Singaram-PW10 and Kanthilal-PW13 had also

identified the accused.

In addition to the above, the prosecution has been able to establish the presence of the accused in the residence of the deceased through finger prints, inasmuch as, finger prints of both the accused tallied with the finger prints taken from the place of occurrence.

The statements of the accused also led to the recovery of the ornaments belonging to the deceased - Sulochana. The aforesaid ornaments were recovered from two jewellers, Singaram-PW10 and Kanthilal-PW13. Both the above witnesses affirmed, that the accused had sold the said ornaments to them.

In view of the above, we find no justification whatsoever to interfere with the impugned orders passed by the trial Court and upheld by the High Court.

The instant appeal is accordingly dismissed.

.....J.
[Jagdish Singh Khehar]

.....J.
[Kurian Joseph]

New Delhi;
July 21, 2016.

.....J.
[Arun Mishra]

ITEM NO.103

COURT NO.3

SECTION IIA

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Criminal Appeal No(s). 499/2010

RAVI & ANR.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF T.NADU

Respondent(s)

Date : 21/07/2016 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGDISH SINGH KHEHAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KURIAN JOSEPH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRAFor Appellant(s) Mr. Rutwik Panda, Adv.
Ms. Anshu Malik, Adv.For Respondent(s) Mr. K. Venkata Ramani, Sr. Adv. (AAG)
Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, Adv.
Mr. Jayant Patel, Adv.UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The appeal is dismissed in terms of the signed order.

(Renuka Sadana)
Court Master(Parveen Kumar)
AR-cum-PS

[signed order is placed on the file]