IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C. JAYACHANDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 20TH CHAITHRA, 1947

CRL.MC NO. 3422 OF 2025

CRIME NO.780/2023 OF VELLATHOOVAL POLICE STATION, IDUKKI

IN SC NO.102 OF 2024 OF FAST TRACK SPECIAL COURT, DEVIKULAM

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

1 VAISHNAV VALSAN
AGED 24 YEARS
S/O VALSAN, KILIKOD HOUSE, CHALINGAD KARA,
KAIPAMANGALAM VILLAGE, THRISSUR, PIN - 680681

BY ADVS.
LAL K.JOSEPH
P.MURALEEDHARAN (THURAVOOR)
T.A.LUXY
SURESH SUKUMAR
ANZIL SALIM
SANJAY SELLEN
SONIA SHIBU
AKASH GEORGE
ADITHYA S. PUTHEZHATH

RESPONDENTS/DEFACTO COMPLAINANT:

1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, PIN - 682031

2 THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER
VELLATHOOVAL POLICE STATION, VELLATHOOVAL - ANACHAL ROAD, VELLATHOOVAL, KERALA, PIN - 685563

BY ADV.SRI. E.C. BINEESH, PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10.04.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

C. JAYACHANDRAN, J.

Crl.M.C.No.3422 of 2025

Dated, this the 10th day of April, 2025

ORDER

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by condition no.(i) in Annexure-A1 bail Order, which directs the petitioner to report before the Investigating Officer on every alternate Saturday until conclusion of the trial in the subject crime.

3. Learned Counsel would point that the final report has already been filed and condition no.(i) was scrupulously followed by the petitioner, without fail. It was also argued that the petitioner needs to travel a distance of about 217 kms to report before the Police Station concerned. According to the learned Counsel, there is no necessity, whatsoever, to continue the said condition which warrants reporting before the S.H.O., inasmuch as the final report has already been filed.

4. This application was seriously opposed by the learned Public Prosecutor, especially in the context of the seriousness of the offences alleged.

5. This Court finds considerable force in the submissions made by the Counsel for the petitioner. It is important to note that the final report has already been filed and the presence of the petitioner is not required for any purpose in connection with the investigation. If that be so, an onerous condition directing the petitioner to report before the Investigating Officer until the culmination of trial, seems to be unnecessary. The purpose of reporting before the S.H.O. has already been served. In the circumstances, condition no.(i) is dispensed with, with the result, the petitioner will not be under any obligation to report before the S.H.O., except when the petitioner is specifically called by the S.H.O. in writing, to report so.

The Crl.M.C. is allowed as indicated above.

Sd/-

C. JAYACHANDRAN

JUDGE

SKP/10-04

APPENDIX OF CRL.MC 3422/2025

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES:

ANNEXURE A1	**THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 26.07.2024 IN BAIL APPL. NO. 5426 OF 2024 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT**
ANNEXURE A2	**THE TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION NUMBERED AS CRL. M.P. 59 OF 2025 IN S.C. 102 OF 2024 FILED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 29.01.2025 BEFORE THE HON'BLE FAST TRACK SPECIAL COURT, DEVIKULAM**
ANNEXURE A3	**THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE HON'BLE FAST TRACK SPECIAL COURT, DEVIKULAM DATED 06.02.2025**

RESPONDENTS' ANNEXURES: NIL

TRUE COPY

P.A. TO JUDGE