



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

<i>Reserved on</i>	<i>18.06.2024</i>
<i>Pronounced on</i>	<i>25.07.2024</i>

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.A.No.222 of 2019
and Crl.M.P.No.12718 of 2023

Sethuraj

... Appellant

Vs.

State rep. by its,
The Inspector of Police,
R7, K.K.Nagar Police Station,
Chennai – 600 078.
(Crime No.2401/2015)

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of the Criminal Procedure Code to set aside the judgment of convicting the appellant for the offence alleged u/s. 302, 201 r/w. 511 of IPC and appellant sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/- in default to undergo further period of 6 months S.I. for the offence u/s. 302 of IPC; is sentenced to undergo 3 years S.I. and to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/- in default to undergo further period of 6 months S.I. for the offence u/s. 201 r/w. 511 IPC. The sentences of imprisonment are ordered to run



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

concurrently. Total fine payable by the accused is Rs.10,000/- passed in S.C.No.141/2016 dated 11.03.2019 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Special Court for Cases under POCSO Act 2012/Mahila Court at Chennai – 600 104 and consequently thereby allow this Criminal Appeal.

For Appellant : Mr.M.Murugesan

For Respondent : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C.Aravind

JUDGMENT

M.S.RAMESH,J.

The appellant herein has been convicted and sentenced to the imprisonment, through the judgment of the learned Sessions Judge, Special Court for Cases under POCSO Act 2012/Mahila Court, Chennai, passed in S.C.No.141/2016 dated 11.03.2019, in the following manner:-

<i>Conviction</i>	<i>Sentence</i>
under Section 302 IPC	Life imprisonment along with a fine of Rs.5,000/- in default to undergo further period of 6 months S.I.
under Section 201 r/w. 511 IPC	3 years S.I. along with a fine of Rs.5,000/- in default to undergo further period of 6 months S.I.

The sentences of imprisonment were ordered to run concurrently.

2. The aforesaid judgment of the Sessions Court is put under challenge in the present appeal. For the sake of convenience, the parties



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

to the appeal are addressed according to the rank in the trial Court.

WEB COPY

3. The case of the prosecution in brief is that the deceased Dhanalakshmi and the accused were live-in partners at No.2/14, 3rd Cross Street, Packiri Garden, Virugambakkam, which house belongs to one Lakshmi. Both the deceased and accused had frequent quarrels, since the accused did not have a regular job and he also suspected the fidelity of the deceased. On 03.08.2015, during one such quarrel, Lakshmi and one Selvam, who were both residing close by, had pacified the couple. At that time, the accused warned the deceased that he would finish her that night itself. Accordingly, during the night hours of 03.08.2015, the accused had strangled the deceased and murdered her. Thereafter, in order to conceal her body, he had cut her legs and packed it in a tarpaulin sheet and kept it in his house.

4. On discovery of the body and after investigation, the Inspector of Police, R7, K.K.Nagar Police Station, Chennai, filed a final report against the accused for the offences under Sections 302 and 201 r/w. 511 IPC. The final report was taken up as P.R.C.No.19 of 2016 by the learned



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and after compliance of the requirement under Section 207 Cr.P.C., the case was committed to the Mahila Court, Chennai, which was taken up as S.C.No.141 of 2016. The Sessions Court had framed charges against the accused for the offences under Sections 302 & 201 r/w. 511 IPC and when questioned the accused for the charges, he denied the same as false and pleaded that he was 'not guilty'.

5. To prove the charges against the accused, the prosecution had examined 16 witnesses namely P.W.1 to P.W.16 and marked Exs.P.1 to P.14, apart from material objects M.O.1 to M.O.10 before the Trial Court. On the side of the defence, the accused examined himself as D.W.1 and stated that he was a stranger to the deceased and that he had no connection to this case.

6.1. Before the Trial Court, P.W.1 – Raja, who was residing in the same building where the accused and the deceased were residing, was examined. According to this witness, both of the accused and the deceased had occupied the building as tenants about 3 months prior to the



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

incident. While he states that the deceased was a housemaid, who leaves the house daily at 6.30 A.M. and returns at 1.30 P.M., the accused claimed to be working as a security guard. He had stated that on 03.08.2015, he had seen the accused and the deceased at 7.00 P.M. and thereafter, the deceased had not come out of the house in the early hours of 04.08.2015 for drawing kolam, which was her regular practice. When P.W.1's sister P.W.2 had knocked the doors of the accused at about 2 P.M., the accused alone answered the door claiming that the deceased was admitted at Royapettah Government Hospital. When heavy perfume smell emanated from inside the house of the deceased and the door was also locked, she had alerted her brother (P.W.1), who in turn informed the Police. He also stated that the chappals of the deceased and the accused were found outside the house. The Police had then broke open the door and found the mutilated body of the deceased packed in the bag. The complaint given by P.W.1 to the Police was marked as Ex.P1.

6.2. P.W.2 - Lakshmi is the sister of P.W.1 and the house owner.



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

According to her statement, she confirmed the stay of both the deceased and the accused in the portion of her house as tenants, as well as the working hours of the deceased as a housemaid. She had also spoken about the regular practice of the deceased putting kolam in front of her house in the early morning and that on 04.08.2015, she had not come out of her house for putting kolam. When she had knocked the door of the deceased on 04.08.2015, the accused informed her that the deceased was admitted in Royapettah Government Hospital. She also stated that the chappals of the deceased and the accused were found outside the house. Later, when heavy perfume smell came from the house, she informed her brother (P.W.1), who in turn informed the Police. When the Police had broke open the door, she saw the mutilated body of the deceased wrapped in a tarpaulin sheet, inside the house.

6.3. P.W.3 - Selvam is a neighbor, who knows the accused and is also one of the tenants of P.W.2. On 03.08.2015 at about 2 P.M., when P.W.3 came to P.W.1's house, the accused and the deceased were quarreling. According to him, when he had pacified the couple, the accused had cast a threat to the deceased. At about 7 P.M., when P.W.3



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

went to see P.W.1, he witnessed both the accused and the deceased in the house. On 04.08.2015, at about 9.00 P.M., P.W.2 informed him that the deceased had not put kolam in her house and that she had not come out for a long time. P.W.3 also states about the information given by the accused to P.W.2 about the deceased being admitted in Royapettah Government Hospital. He also stated that the chappals of the deceased and the accused were found outside the house. The information given to the Police by P.W.1 was spoken by him. When the Police had broke open the door, he was also present and witnessed the mutilated body of the deceased.

6.4. P.W.4 – Dass, who is a neighbor, did not know the accused but knew that the accused used to visit the house of the deceased and speaks about the frequent quarrels between them.

6.5. P.W.5 – Suresh is known to the accused and was the witness to the confession statement given by the accused to the Police, the admitted portion of which was marked as Ex.P2. He was also a witness to the recovery of the knife (M.O.1) under a seizure mahazar (Ex.P3).



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

6.6. P.W.6 – Thamizhvanan was a witness to the observation mahazar (Ex.P4). He also affixed his signature in the seizure mahazar (Ex.P5), through which the Police had recovered a blue colour tarpaulin sheet (M.O.2), cotton cloth pieces with red flowers (M.O.3), bed sheet (M.O.4), rose colour inskirt (M.O.5), white colour tape (M.O.6), scissors (M.O.7), small covers (M.O.8) and white colour fevicol box (M.O.9) from the place of occurrence.

6.7. P.W.7 is the Police Constable, who on information, had gone to the place of occurrence and broke open the door with the help of one Selvam (P.W.3) and discovered the concealed mutilated body of a woman, which was identified by P.W.1 and P.W.2 to be the body of the deceased.

6.8. P.W.8 – Kamalraj speaks about the presence of Police at the scene of occurrence on 04.08.2015 at 11.30 P.M. and he had also witnessed the recovery of the body.



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

6.9. P.W.9 – Pazhani speaks about the relationship of Dhanalakshmi with one Chellappan as husband and wife and is a hearsay witness to the occurrence.

6.10. P.W.10 – Chellappan is the husband of the deceased and a hearsay witness, who has spoken about his estranged relationship with the deceased.

6.11. The deceased was working in the house of Uma – P.W.11, who confirms that the deceased had come for work on 03.08.2015 at 7.00 A.M. and left at 8.15 A.M. She also speaks about the deceased working in 6 to 7 houses and that the deceased did not report for work on 04.08.2015.

6.12. P.W.12 – Mary, who knows both the deceased and the accused, speaks about the accused working as a security guard in the Apartment, where the deceased was working as a housemaid.

6.13. P.W.13 - Senthil is the duty doctor in the Casualty



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

Department of the Government Royapettah Hospital, who speaks about the body of the deceased being brought there at 3.00 A.M. He had noted down the cut injuries on the legs and thighs of the deceased and issued the Accident Register (Ex.P6).

6.14. P.W.14 - Vinoth is the postmortem doctor, who had recorded the antemortem and postmortem injuries on the deceased and issued the postmortem certificate (Ex.P7). The report of the Forensic Science Department was also marked by him as Ex.P8. According to him, the following injuries were found on the body of the deceased:-

“On further Dissection: following antemortem injuries found

1.Neck: oblique linear brown abrasion 1.6x0.5cm on the middle part of left side of the neck. Two punctate brown abrasion 03x0.1cm on the lower part of left side of front of neck; these two abrasions were placed side by side in a horizontal plane. On dissection of neck: Dark red contusion 5x4-2x0.5cm on the lower part of right sternocleidoid muscle; 5x4x1cm dark red contusion on the lower part of right side of the strap muscle. Incomplete irregular fracture of superior horn of left side thyroid cartilage with surrounding soft tissue contusion. 4x3x1cm



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

*dark red contusion on upper part of left side of the neck;
2.5cm below the left side of the angle of the mandible.
Hyoid bone intact.*

*Postmortem injuries: i) complete circular incised wound on
upper third of both thighs 8 cm from groin; ii) deformity
above both ankle joints; on dissection postmortem fracture
of lower third of tibia and fibula with absent soft tissue
contusion.”*

As per his final opinion in Ex.P7, the deceased appeared to have died of asphyxia due to strangulation.

6.15. P.W.15 - Chandru is the Investigating Officer, who had registered the case in Crime No.2401 of 2015 under Sections 302 & 201 r/w. 511 of IPC and prepared the First Information Report (Ex.P9) and sent the same to the XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate. He had then visited the place of occurrence and prepared rough sketch and observation mahazar in the presence of the witnesses. He conducted the inquest on the body of the deceased in the presence of the Panchayatars and prepared an inquest report (Ex.P11). He thereafter seized M.O.1 to M.O.9 under seizure mahazar (Ex.P5). After sending the body of the deceased to Royapettah Government Hospital, he inquired the witnesses and recorded



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

the evidence. In the presence of the witnesses, he took photographs of the dead body in his mobile phone, which were marked as M.O.10 series and a certificate issued by him under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act was marked as Ex.P14. Based on the confession statement of the accused, a knife (M.O.1) was recovered under a seizure mahazar (Ex.P3) and the accused was thereafter arrested and remanded. After inquiring with the doctors P.W.13 and P.W.14, he prepared the death report (Ex.P12). He had also obtained a certificate from Chennai Corporation (Ex.P13) that there was an uninterrupted power supply on 04.08.2015.

6.16. When P.W.15 was transferred, P.W.16 – Baskar, Inspector of Police had taken up the investigation and on completion, had filed a final report against the accused, charging him of having committed the offences punishable under Section 302 r/w. 511 of IPC.

7. Before the Trial Court, when the accused was questioned under Section 313(1)(b) Cr.P.C., on the incriminating circumstances against him, he denied the same as false. However, on the strength of these oral



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

and documentary evidences, the Sessions Court had found the accused guilty of the charges against him and sentenced him as aforesaid.

8. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the present case being one of circumstantial evidence, the prosecution has miserably failed to connect each and every link in the chain of circumstances. He submitted that the oral testimony of Lakshmi (P.W.2) and Selvam (P.W.3) cannot be relied upon for the last seen theory, in view of several contradictions in their statements. He also submitted that, apart from P.W.2 and P.W.3, none of the other witnesses had either seen the accused and the deceased together, immediately before the occurrence. According to the learned counsel, the motive attributed by the prosecution also has not been clearly established through any of the witnesses, which is an important link in the chain of circumstances.

9. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the motive for the occurrence has been clearly spoken to by P.W.1 to P.W.4, who were all residing in and around the building where the occurrence took place and who have spoken about the frequent quarrels



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

between the couple and the threat given by the accused to the deceased on the fateful day. He also submitted that the accused has failed to give a proper explanation, as to the presence of the mutilated body inside his house, which fact is only within his knowledge and hence, the burden of proving this fact is upon him. He also placed reliance on the evidence of P.W.11 in whose house the deceased was working and who had deposed that the deceased had worked on 03.08.2015, but did not come to work on 04.08.2015. By drawing attention of this Court to the defence of P.W.13, who had issued the Accident Register and P.W.14, who had conducted the postmortem, he submitted that it was a clear case of homicidal death and from the circumstances put forth by the prosecution, the chain consistently leads to the conclusion of guilt of the accused.

10. We have given our anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective counsels and have perused the original records relating to the case in hand.

11. This is the case based on circumstantial evidence and the burden cast on the prosecution to establish the circumstances from which



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn, should be fully established and that the chain of evidence be completed, with no room to leave any reasonable ground indicating the innocence of the accused.

12. The prosecution had put forth the following circumstances to establish the guilt of the accused:-

(a) the accused and the deceased were living together in one of the portions of P.W.2's house;

(b) while the deceased was working as housemaid in a nearby apartment, the accused also worked there as security guard for sometime;

(c) both the accused and the deceased frequently quarreled; that on 03.08.2015, at 2.00 P.M., the accused during a quarrel, had threatened the deceased that he would finish her, which was witnessed by P.W.3.

(d) on 03.08.2015 at 7.00 P.M., P.W.2 and P.W.3 saw both the deceased and the accused together in their house;

(e) on 03.08.2015, the deceased had come to work in the house of P.W.11, but failed to report for work the next day;

(f) the mutilated body of the deceased was discovered from her house, which was locked from outside and the body attempted to be



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

concealed;

(g) arrest and confession of the accused leading to discovery of facts and recovery of material objects, motive for the offence, the medical evidence establishing that it was a case of homicidal death and the deceased may have died of asphyxia due to strangulation.

13. P.W.13 is the doctor, who had given a copy of the Accident Register (Ex.P6), wherein, he had recorded the injuries found on the body of the deceased. P.W.14 is the doctor who conducted postmortem and had rendered his final opinions holding that the deceased appears to have died of asphyxia due to strangulation. In Ex.P6, he had recorded the injuries of dark red contusion 5x4-2x0.5 cm on the lower part of right sternocleidoid muscle; 5x4x1cm dark red contusion on the lower part of right side of the strap muscle; incomplete irregular fracture of superior horn of left side thyroid cartilage with surrounding soft tissue contusion; 4x3x1cm dark red contusion on upper part of left side of the neck, 2.5cm below the left side of the angle of the mandible. All these *antemortem* injuries would indicate that the deceased neck has been strangled. Insofar as the *postmortem* injuries are concerned, P.W.14 had recorded the



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

cut injuries on both the thighs and anti-joints. These injuries would indicate that they have been caused for folding the body into a package for causing easy disappearance. When the viscera report (Ex.P8) has not detected any poison in the body and there are no other contra evidence to suspect the death due to any other reason, we have no hesitation to rely upon the final opinion of P.W.14 that the death was due to asphyxia by strangulation.

14. The place of occurrence is a rented portion of a building belonging to P.W.2, which fact was spoken by P.W.1 and P.W.2. Both these witnesses, along with P.W.3 – neighbour and P.W.4 – co-tenant, have confirmed this fact and the defence could not discredit the witnesses on this aspect.

15. As per the oral testimony of P.W.2 and P.W.3, on 03.08.2015, both of them had seen the deceased in the company of the accused in the house. Likewise, at 2.00 P.M., on the same day, P.W.3 had witnessed the accused and the deceased quarreling with each other and when P.W.3 had



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

pacified them, the accused gave a death threat to the deceased. P.W.1 and P.W.2 also speak about the routine of the deceased in putting kolam in front of her house in the early morning hours and then leaving for work at 6.30 A.M. and returning back at 1.30 P.M. after performing housemaid duties. P.W.2, who had seen both the accused and deceased together at 7.00 P.M. of 03.08.2015, has added that on 04.08.2015, she did not come out of her house to put kolam, but had found 2 pairs of chappals at her doorstep. On suspicion, when she had knocked the door at about 2.00 P.M., the accused alone answered the door and stated that the deceased was admitted in the Government Royapettah Hospital. This incident was also corroborated by P.W.3 in his oral testimony.

16. On an overall appreciation of the evidences of P.W.1 to P.W.3, it stands clearly established that the accused and the deceased were living in Door No.2/14, 3rd Cross Street, Packiri Garden, Virugambakkam, as a couple; that they had frequent quarrels; that on 03.08.2015 at 2.00 P.M., the accused gave a death threat to the deceased over a quarrel; that on the same day at 7.00 P.M., both of them were seen together by P.W.2; that in the early hours of 04.08.2015, the deceased did not come out of her house



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

to put kolam; that on 04.08.2015 at about 2.00 P.M., when P.W.2 knocked the door of the accused, the accused alone answered the door and informed her that the deceased was admitted in the Hospital; that the deceased though had worked in the house of P.W.11 on 03.08.2015, did not report for duty on 04.08.2015; though the door was locked from outside, a pair of chappals were found outside the house of the deceased and there was strong smell of perfume coming from inside the house; that on information, when the Police broke open the door, the body of the deceased was found mutilated, packed and prepared to be concealed later. All these statements of P.W.1 to P.W.3, could not be discredited by the defence.

17. P.W.2 is the owner of the rented portion of the house where the deceased and the accused were residing. P.W.1 is the brother of P.W.2 and P.W.3 is a friend of P.W.1 and a neighbour. All these 3 witnesses are neither relatives nor in any other close relationship with the deceased and there is nothing in the evidence to show that they are interested witnesses. The entire testimony of P.W.1 to P.W.3 is cogent and corroborates with the events narrated by them. Apart from D.W.1, giving a chain of denial



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

that he neither knows the deceased nor the facts of the prosecution case, no other evidence has been put forth by him to discredit the testimonies of the witnesses who spoke about his relationship with the deceased. In this background, we do not find any reason, as to why the oral testimony of P.W.1 to P.W.3 should be disregarded. On the other hand, we find the statements of these 3 witnesses to be credible and that they could be relied upon.

18. Thus, on an overall appreciation of the evidence of P.W.1 to P.W.3 & P.W.11, the statements establish the fact that the accused and the deceased were living together in a portion of the house belonging to P.W.2, where the deceased used to put kolam in front of her house at about 6.30 A.M. and then leave for her duty as a housemaid in the nearby apartments and return back by 1.30 P.M. It is also clearly established that the deceased and the accused used to have frequent quarrels. On 03.08.2015 at about 2.15 P.M., when there was a heated quarrel between them, the accused had given her a death threat. After that, they were seen together on the same day at 7.00 P.M. Thereafter, though a pair of her slippers were found outside her house, she had not come out of the house



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

and the accused alone was seen in the house at about 2.00 P.M. of the next day. Thereafter, the accused had locked the house and left and when a suspicion arose, the Police were called to the house of the deceased, where they found the mutilated body of the deceased concealed in a bag. In the light of these facts, the circumstance of the accused, being last seen in the company of the deceased before her death, stands clearly established.

19. The Investigating Officer – P.W.15 had arrested the accused on 05.08.2015 and recorded his confession statement. Based on his confession, he had recovered a blue colour tarpaulin sheet (Ex.P2), cotton cloth pieces with red flowers (M.O.3), bed sheet (M.O.4), rose colour inskirt (M.O.5), white colour tape (M.O.6), scissors (M.O.7), small covers 4 Nos. (M.O.8), white colour fevicol box (M.O.9), from the place of occurrence under seizure mahazar (Ex.P5). He had also taken photographs (Ex.P10) in the place of occurrence using his cellphone and had issued a certificate under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act. P.W.15 has stated that he had arrested the accused near a TASMACH shop at Arcot Road, which fact was also corroborated by P.W.5, who stood as a



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY

witness to the confession statement of the accused. P.W.5 had stated that a knife (M.O.1) was recovered from the slab of P.W.1's house, while P.W.15 stated it was recovered from the slab of the accused's house. Though there is a minor contradiction with regard to the place from where M.O.1 was recovered, it requires to be kept in mind that the house of both P.W.1, as well as the deceased were in the same building belonging to P.W.2. Hence, this minor contradiction may not adversely go to the root of the investigation, so as to discredit all the other materials collected during the course of investigation. In these given circumstances, the circumstance of the accused leading to discovery of facts and other material objects based on his confession, stands well established.

20. The motive attributed by the prosecution on the accused is the frequent quarrels between the accused and the deceased and the specific incident on 03.08.2015, when the accused was witnessed by P.W.3, at which point of time, the accused had given a death threat to the deceased. We have already discussed the evidence leading to the fact that the deceased and the accused were living together in the same house and that



CrI.A.No.222 of 2019

they used to frequently quarrel. The quarrel that took place on 03.08.2015 at 2.00 P.M. was seen by P.W.3, who had pacified them. After that, though both of them were last seen together at 7.00 P.M., the deceased alone was never seen again. P.W.4, who is a neighbour of the deceased, has also spoken about the frequent quarrels between the accused and the deceased. Thus, it stands well established that the motive for the occurrence were the frequent quarrels, coupled with the execution of the death threat caused by the accused during one such quarrel on 03.08.2015.

21. When the evidences of P.W.1 to P.W.3 confirm the presence of the accused in the house of the deceased, immediately prior to the occurrence, and the body of the deceased having been discovered inside the house, the burden of proving and explaining the circumstances under which the body was found inside the house, shall be within his knowledge alone. When the accused was questioned on the incriminating circumstances against him under Section 313 Cr.P.C., he had just replied that it was a false case, without giving any further explanation. Even in his evidence, when he was examined as D.W.1, he had not explained the



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

facts with regard to the presence of the body inside the house where he was last seen together with the deceased. Thus, when Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act casts a burden on the accused to explain the facts, which were established within his knowledge and he, having failed to discredit the evidences of the prime witnesses, we are constrained to hold that the evidence let in by the prosecution witnesses are credit worthy and reliable.

22. On a conjoint appreciation of these facts, which stands supported by the evidences of P.W.1 to P.W.3, we are of the view that it was the accused, who was last seen with the deceased, who must have caused the death of the deceased by strangulating her and thereafter, attempted to conceal her body, by inflicting further postmortem injuries on her body by wrapping it up in a tarpaulin sheet and that he had caused her death, owing to the frequent quarrels with the deceased and more particularly, the quarrel on 03.08.2015. Thus, all these circumstances put forth by the prosecution through various witnesses, clearly establishes the motive, as well as the role of the accused in causing the death of the deceased and therefore, he is guilty of having committed the offence of



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

murder, punishable under Section 302 of IPC.

WEB COPY

23. The evidences of P.W.1 to P.W.3, as well as P.W.7 and P.W.15, indicate that when the door of the house of the deceased was broke open, they had found the body of the deceased packed in a tarpaulin sheet and kept as a bundle. The medical evidence of P.W.14 also indicates that the arms and other joints of the deceased's body was sliced, so as to fold the body and wrap it up in a bundle. We had already held that it was the accused who had committed the offence of murder of the deceased and apparently after committing the crime, he had also attempted to conceal the body and dispose of the same, when the neighbours had discovered before its concealment. In view of all these preparations made by him by causing postmortem injuries for the purpose of concealment of the body, he is also guilty of having committed the offence under Section 201 r/w. 511 of IPC.

24. The Trial Court, through its judgment, had in detail analyzed the entire evidences let in by the prosecution and had come to the conclusion that the accused was guilty of the leveled charges and we do



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

not find any reason to interfere with such a finding and decision arrived therein.

WEB COPY

25. In the result, the Criminal Appeal stands dismissed. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

[M.S.R.,J.] [S.M.,J.]
25.07.2024

Index: Yes
Speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes

Sni



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

WEB COPY To

1.The Inspector of Police,
R7, K.K.Nagar Police Station,
Chennai – 600 078.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Sni

judgment made in
Crl.A.No.222 of 2019

25.07.2024