



Crl.M.P.No.1913 of 2024 in Crl.A.No.530 of 2023

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

and

A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

(Order of the Court was made by S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.)

The learned counsel for petitioner would submit that the case on hand is a case of no evidence. But the evidence of P.W.2 speaks about the prior motive of the accused for the commission of offence.

2. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that there are more than one eyewitness who have deposed to establish the prosecution case. P.W.2 & P.W.5, who are neighbours of the deceased, have deposed about the presence of the accused in the scene of occurrence.

3. With reference to the arguments advanced by the respective learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties to the lis, we have gone through the evidence of P.W.2, P.W.5 and the doctor's evidence. We do not find that there is a prima facie case made out by the petitioner/A2 for suspension of sentence. Consequently, the criminal miscellaneous petition stands dismissed.

(S.M.S.,J.)

(A.D.M.C.,J.)

26.09.2024

SS



WEB COPY



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

AND

A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

SS

Crl.M.P.No.1913 of 2024 in
Crl.A.No.530 of 2023

26.09.2024