



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated 23.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

Crl. A. (MD)Nos.952, 964, 990 of 2023 and 500 of 2024

Crl.A(MD) No.952/2023

Johnson Kumar

.. Appellant/accused No.3

Vs.

The State through
The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli District
Crime No.665/2015

..Respondent/Complainant

Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of Criminal Procedure Code,
against the judgment and order dated 25.09.2023 in S.C.No.245 of 2018 on
the file of the II Additional Sessions Judge, Tiruchirappalli.



WEB COPY

Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

For Appellant

: Mr.N.R.Elango Senior counsel
for Mr.A.S.Aswin Prasanna

For Respondent

: Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

Crl.A(MD) No.964/2023

1.Nattamai @ Natarajan

2.Kanagaraj

3.Harikrishnan

.. Appellants/

accused Nos.4,6&11

Vs.

The State through
The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli District
Crime No.665/2015

..Respondent/Complainant

Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of Criminal Procedure Code,
against the judgment and order dated 25.09.2023 in S.C.No.245 of 2018 on
the file of the II Additional Sessions Judge, Tiruchirappalli.

For Appellants

: Mr.Abudu Kumar Rajarathinam
senior counsel for M/s.P.Jothi and P.Surya
for appellants 1 and 2

Mr.S.Srikanth for third appellant
for M/s.APN Law Associates



WEB COPY

Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

For Respondent

: Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

Crl.A(MD) No.990/2023

Senthil

.. Appellant/accused No.13

Vs.

The State through
The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli District
Crime No.665/2015

..Respondent/Complainant

Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of Criminal Procedure Code,
against the judgment and order dated 25.09.2023 in S.C.No.245 of 2018 on
the file of the II Additional Sessions Judge, Tiruchirappalli.

For Appellant

: Mr.S.Jeyakumar for
Mr.G.Sethu Surendhar

For Respondent

: Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

Crl.A(MD) No.500/2024

Ilayaraja

.. Appellant/accused No.2

Vs.

3/30



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli District
Crime No.665/2015

..Respondent/Complainant

Appeal filed under Section 374(2) of Criminal Procedure Code, against the judgment and order dated 25.09.2023 in S.C.No.245 of 2018 on the file of the II Additional Sessions Judge, Tiruchirappalli.

For Appellant : Mr.S.Vinayak
For Respondent : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by N.ANAND VENKATESH, J)

These appeals have been filed against the judgment of the II Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli, in SC No.245/2018 dated 25.09.2023 in the following manner:

Rank of the accused	Appeal No.
A2	500/2024
A3	952/2023
A4, A6 and A11	964/2023
A13	990/2023



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY 2. By the said judgment, the appellants have been convicted and sentenced as follows:

Rank of the accused	Offences for which convicted (IPC)	Sentence
A2,A3,A4 and A13	120B r/w 302	Life imprisonment with a fine of Rs. 2,000/- each
A6 and A11	148	Rigorous imprisonment for two years each
	341	One month simple imprisonment each
	302	Life imprisonment with a fine of Rs.2,000/-

The sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.12.2015 at about 20.50 hrs., near Sundara Mahal Marriage Hall at Samayapuram Main Road, the car was parked by the deceased and he had gone to his office and was coming back and at which point of time, A1,A6,A10,A11 and A12 are said to have attacked the deceased with deadly weapons indiscriminately and as a result, the deceased died on the spot. This incident is said to have taken place in the presence of PW1, who is the wife of the deceased. She gave a complaint (Ex.P1) to the Sub Inspector of Police, Samayapuram Police

5/30



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

Station (PW29), based on which, an FIR (Ex.P16) came to be registered in Crime No.665/2015 for offences under Sections 147, 148, 341 and 302 IPC.

3.1. PW30 took up the investigation and he went to the scene of crime and prepared the observation mahazar (Ex.P18) and rough sketch (Ex.P17). The dead body was sent for postmortem through Head Constable PW21. The Investigating officer seized the bloodstained soil and soil without bloodstain (MO6 and MO7) under mahazar Ex.P19. Thereafter the investigating officer went to the Government Hospital and conducted inquest on the dead body in the presence of panchayatdars and prepared the inquest report (Ex.P20).

3.2. The investigation was thereafter taken up by PW31, who arrested A1, A12 and A10 on 19.12.2015 at about 13 hrs. and based on their confession, MO4, MO5, MO8 to MO11 were recovered under mahazar Ex.P22. Thereafter, A6, A2 and A11 were arrested on the same day at about 16.30 hrs and based on their confession, MO1 to MO3 and MO12 to MO17 were recovered under Mahazar Ex.P23 and Ex.P24. All the accused persons



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

were produced before the concerned Court and they were remanded to judicial custody.

3.3. On 29.12.2025, at about 11 a.m., A8 and A7 were arrested and they were remanded to judicial custody. The material objects seized were sent to the Court under Form 95 with a request to send them for chemical analysis. He also recorded the statement of some of the witnesses under Section 161 Cr.P.C. He also received postmortem report from PW25, which was marked as Ex.P13 and the following injuries were recorded in the postmortem report:

“1) Vertical curved chop wound over the forehead, 16 x2 cm, brain deep; convexity facing left side, starting from midpoint of two eyebrows and ends on right frontal regions scalp, left margin visible, right margin undermined; On dissection, underlying frontat bone cut and fractured in same manner of size 9 * 1.2 cm; membranes Ton brain t injury of right frontal lobe of size 7 * 1 * 1 cm;

2) Horizontal chop wound at the lower end of injury no.1, over forehead and both eyebrows, 15 * 3 cm, bone deep; underlying orbital roof fractured on right side;

3) Nose-cut and severed off of size 5 * 3 cm, bone deep, nasal bone fractured; Cut piece is missing:



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

4) Oblique, upper end on left side, lower end- right side: upper front tooth and lower right side front tooth fractured, upper jaw severed off; 14 * 1

5) Horizontally placed multiple intersecting cut wounds along the lower jaw and adjoining neck, 27 * 3 cm, Transecting all the neck structures except the muscles and skin at the back of neck; hyoid bone cut and severed on left side; shirt collar is cut overlying the injury.

6) Oblique chop wound, over the left side of neck, upper end on side of the neck and lower end on midline of the body, of size 7 * 1 cm, muscle deep; lower margin is undermined and the upper margin is seen; situated 6 cm above the collar bone;

7) Oblique cut wound over the centre and front side of upper part of the chest of size 10 * 2.5 cm, muscle deep; upper end on right side, lower end on left side, situated 1 cm below suprasternal notch; shirt overlying is cut;

8) Horizontally placed reddish brown abrasion, 4 * 0.5 cm, situated, 1cm below the injury no 7.

9) Horizontal puncture wound over the centre of the front side chest, of size 1.5 * 0.6 cm, bone deep directed upward, backward, situated, 2.5 cm below injury no 8. Shirt overlying is torn;

10) Cut wound involving the back of the right hand.

a. Over the knuckle of size 8 * 2 cm joint cavity deep, involving 3rd and 4th and 5th finger underlying bones cut and severed, front side of the skin intact;

b. Over index finger of size, 2 * 0.5 cm, bone deep, situated 5.5 cm above from tip of the same finger,

c. Thumb, involving nails and adjoining part, circumferentially, of size 4 x 0.5 cm, bone deep,

d. Obliquely placed, over ring finger, 2.5 * 1 cm, bone deep and severed;



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

11) Oblique cut wound over back of the Left index finger, knuckle region, 2 x 0.5 cm, musile deep;

12) Oblique cut wound over back of the head, at midline of the body, of size 3.5 x 0.7 cm, bone deep upper end on right and lower end on left side, situated 10 cm below from top of head;

13) Oblique chop wound, over left side and back of the head, of size 11 x 0.5 cm, muscle deep, upper margin is visible and lower margin is undermined, front end is situated above on left side, back end at midline of the body on back; situated 15 cm below from top of the head;

14) Oblique stab wound over the front and left side of the neck, of size 2 x 0.5 x 3 cm, upper end clean cut placed on side of the neck and lower end is blunt placed towards the midline of the body; It is directed towards right, downward and back;

15) Vertically placed red colour linear abrasion over the back of the chest, on left side outer aspect, of size 26 x 0.3 cm starts from tip of the left shoulder.

...

No other ante mortem injuries anywhere on the body; blood in gauze piece for blood grouping.

Opinion as the cause of death – the deceased would appear to have died due to multiple injuries. ”

3.4. The investigation was thereafter taken up by PW32, who arrested A3 on 03.09.2016 and he was remanded to judicial custody. He collected all the relevant reports (Ex.P27 to Ex.P29). He had also sent MO18 to MO23 for chemical analysis and filed an alteration report (Ex.P26) for altering the offences to Sections 147, 148, 341, 302 r/w 120(b) IPC. He



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

further completed the investigation and filed the final report before the Judicial Magistrate No.3, Trichy as against 13 accused persons, which was taken on file in PRC No.18/2017. The learned Magistrate, after serving copies to the accused persons under Section 207 Cr.P.C., committed the case, which was made over to the II Additional District and Sessions Court, Tiruchirappalli and was taken on file in SC No.245/2018.

4. A1 died and therefore, the charges abated. The trial Court framed the following charges against the accused persons.

Offences u/s. (IPC)	Rank of the accused
120B	A2 to A13
148	A6,A10,A11 and A12
341	A6,A10,A11 and A12
302	A2 to A13

5. The accused persons denied the charges. A12 died during trial and the charges abated. Insofar as A10 is concerned, since he absconded, the case was split up and A10 was separately tried in SC No.197/2023.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

6. The prosecution examined PW1 to PW32 and marked Ex.P1 to P30 and also relied upon MO1 to MO23.

7. The incriminating evidence and circumstances were put to the accused persons when they were questioned under Section 313 (i)(b) of Cr.P.C., and they denied the same as false.

8. The accused persons did not examine any witness nor relied upon any documents.

9. The trial Court on considering the facts and circumstances of the case and on appreciation of oral and documentary evidence came to a conclusion that the prosecution has not made out a case against A5,A7, A8 and A9 and they were acquitted from all the charges. A2,A3,A4,A6,A11 and A13 were found guilty and they were convicted and sentenced in the manner stated supra. Aggrieved by the same, these criminal appeals have been filed before this court.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

10. This Court carefully considered the submissions made on either side and the materials available on record.

11. PW1 is the wife of the deceased and who was examined as an eyewitness to the incident. Even though PW3, who is the brother-in-law of the deceased, was projected as an eyewitness, effectively, the only eyewitness account that has to be considered by this Court is that of PW1.

12. Insofar as the motive is concerned, three different motives have been attributed by the prosecution.

- The first motive is that the deceased was serving as a Panchayat President of Madakudi Panchayat and during this period, there was a political rivalry and enmity between the deceased and A1 in connection with the panchayat elections.
- The second motive projected by the prosecution is that one year prior to the occurrence, the deceased along with others was involved in the commission of the murder of one Ambikapathi, who is the brother's son of A1 and there was animosity between A1 and the deceased in



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY this regard.

- The last motive that was projected by the prosecution is that A2 had duped the deceased in a real estate business and therefore, there was enmity between A2 and the deceased in this regard.

13. Insofar as the charge of conspiracy is concerned, PW10 has been examined on the side of the prosecution to substantiate the conspiracy of A1 and A4. PW15 has been examined to substantiate the conspiracy of A3. PW17 has been examined to substantiate the conspiracy of A4. PW27 has also been examined to substantiate the charge of conspiracy. These are the effective witnesses relied upon by the prosecution to substantiate the charge of conspiracy. There are other witnesses, who were examined in this regard and they all turned hostile.

14. Even though specific overt act has been attributed by the eyewitnesses only as against A1, A6, A10, A11 and A12, shockingly the trial Court has framed charges under Section 302 IPC simpliciter as against A2 to A13 without including the charge of criminal conspiracy for the other



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

accused persons. In other words, instead of framing a charge under Section 302 read with 120B IPC, the trial Court has framed a charge under Section 302 IPC simpliciter. Even while framing charges under Section 120B, the trial Court has not even cared to record the details of the place and time when the conspiracy is said to have taken place and it is completely bereft of details and it is not in consonance with Section 212 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. In short, the trial Court has framed the charges in a slipshod manner without understanding the importance and vitality of framing proper charges in a grave offence of this nature.

15. This Court will first go into the evidence of PW1, who is the wife of the deceased and who is said to be the eyewitness in this case. If the prosecution establishes the occurrence through the eyewitness account, atleast those persons, who were charged for offence under Sections 148, 341 and 302 IPC can be dealt with appropriately. Thereafter this Court can go into the charge of criminal conspiracy.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

16. PW1, in her evidence, states that she along with the deceased, who is the husband, had attended a bereavement on 16.12.2015 and came to Samayapuram Main road at about 8.30 p.m. and halted near Sundara Mahal. In the complaint (Ex.P1), she states that they reached the place at about 8.50 p.m. A perusal of the original complaint (Ex.P1), it is seen that there is clear correction in the time mentioned and what was originally stated as 8.30 p.m. in two places has been corrected as 8.50 p.m. Apart from that, there is also insertion of date as 16.12.2015.

17. PW1 further states that the deceased got down from the car in order to go to his office to bring some documents. At that point of time, at the entrance of Sundara Mahal, the deceased was attacked by A1 and four other persons whose identity was not known to PW1.

18. This Court will first take into consideration the exact place where the occurrence had taken place. As stated supra, a combined reading of the complaint (Ex.P1) and evidence of PW1 shows that the incident had taken place in the entrance of Sundara Mahal. The observation mahazar marked



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

as Ex.P18 and the rough sketch marked as Ex.P17 do not point out to any Advocate office in the entire vicinity. Apart from that, the dead body of the deceased is found far away from Sundara Mahal and a combined reading of the observation mahazar and the rough sketch clearly indicates that the incident had not taken place in the entrance of Sundara Mahal.

19. Admittedly, except A1, PW1 did not identify any of the accused persons during the incident and the same is evident from the complaint marked as Ex.P1. Admittedly, no test identification parade was conducted by the investigating officer. PW1, during cross examination specifically states that on 19.12.2015, at about 10.00 a.m., she was informed that the police have secured four accused persons and in the police station, she had identified those accused persons and the police informed to her about the names of those accused persons whom she never knew in the past.

20. The evidence was taken before the Court only on 22.06.2022, which is nearly after seven years and PW1 is said to have identified the accused persons in the dock. Even while identifying, A4 was not even



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COM

identified by PW1 in the Court. At this juncture, it will be relevant to take note of the decision of the Apex Court in ***Jafar v. State of Kerala*** reported in ***2024 (19) SCC 503***. That was a case where there was no test identification parade and the accused persons are said to have been identified in the police station and for the first time, they were identified in Court. While appreciating the evidence, the Apex Court held as follows:

“9. With the assistance of the learned counsel for the parties, we have scrutinized the evidence. The conviction of the appellant herein is basically based on the deposition of Babu Puttan (PW-1), who was working as a security guard and was sitting in a chair in front of the said room. No doubt that he narrates the version, as per the prosecution case. He has also identified accused No.2-Jafar, appellant herein and accused no.3-Saneesh in the Court. However, he has clearly admitted that police had shown him these two people and as such, he has identified them.

10. Anil Kumar (PW-8), who is the Investigating Officer (IO), has also admitted that PW-1 identified the accused persons by seeing them at the police station. He has further admitted that no identification parade was conducted. As



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

such, it can be seen that the identification of the appellant herein by PW1 is quite doubtful as no identification parade has been conducted. PW-1 clearly states that he has identified the accused persons since the police had shown him those two people.

11. In the absence of proper identification parade being conducted, the identification for the first time in the Court cannot be said to be free from doubt. We find that the other circumstance that the Courts relied for resting the order of conviction is with regard to the recovery of an iron rod. An iron rod is an article which could be found anywhere. It is not the case of the prosecution that any stolen article was recovered from the appellant herein.

21. In the case in hand, PW1 did not know any of the accused persons except A1 (who died and charges abated) and without any test identification parade, she is said to have identified the accused persons in the dock after seven years and certainly such identification made for the first time in Court cannot be said to be free from doubt. There is no straight jacket formula that in every case the police have to conduct test identification parade.



CrI. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

However, in a case where multiple accused persons are involved and the eyewitness has not seen or known these accused persons before the incident, it will be safer for the investigating officer to conduct a test identification parade to rule out the possibility of the Court entertaining a doubt in future regarding the identity of the accused persons. Ultimately, what the Court will look is the trustworthiness and the reliability of the identification of the accused during dock identification.

22. In the case in hand, except A1, PW1 did not know any of the other accused persons and she is said to have identified the accused persons after seven years in the Court. Prudence dictates that such identification can never be free from doubt.

23. PW1 is said to have given a statement to the investigating officer, which was recorded under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure on 17.12.2025. In this statement, she has only mentioned the name of A1 and merely stated known four others. Subsequently yet another statement was recorded under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. on 19.12.2015, where PW1



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

explained as to how she knows or identifies four other accused persons and this statement has reached the Court only on 24.08.2016.

24. PW1 in her evidence further states that her statement under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. was recorded only after the arrest of A2 on 19.12.2015. If that is so, there is no reason as to why this statement, recorded on 19.12.2015 reached the Court only on 24.08.2016. There is absolutely no explanation on the side of the prosecution as to why the statement did not reach the Court at the earliest point of time. This issue is very significant since the Court while testing the evidence of PW1, must ensure that the witness is not developing a case at a later point of time and to ensure that the earliest version is acted upon. That is the reason why Section 158 Cr.P.C. mandates that those vital documents reaches the concerned Magistrate Court without any delay. The important documents that has to be despatched without delay to the Magistrate includes the statements of important witnesses under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. and the law on this issue has been dealt with in a judgment in ***Re. Karunakaran and another*** reported in ***1975 (1) MLJ Crl. 106***. If no explanation is

20/30



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

forthcoming from the investigating officer with regard to the delay or in other words, the delay is not explained by the investigating officer, that becomes a vital factor that has to be taken into consideration by the Court while appreciating the evidence.

25. In the case in hand, PW1 has certainly improved the earlier version while the 161 statement was once again recorded on 19.12.2015 and even this statement had reached the Court only on 24.08.2016 and this delay has not been explained by the investigating officer.

26. A conspectus of the above discussion only cautions this Court that the so called eyewitness account of PW1 is not wholly reliable and it is not free from doubt. In such a case, as held by the Apex Court in ***Vadivelu Thevar v. The State of Madras*** reported in ***AIR 1957 SC 614***, the case in hand falls under the third category of neither wholly reliable nor wholly unreliable and therefore the Court has to be circumspect and has to look for corroboration in material particulars.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

27. When this Court is searching for corroboration, nothing much is available except the evidence of PW3, who is none other than the brother-in-law of the deceased. He states in his evidence that he was standing at a distance of 50 meters and he suddenly heard his sister PW1 shouting and when he went to the scene of crime, the accused persons fled away from the scene in two vehicles. When the statement of PW3 was recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C., he never stated that he was present 50 meters from the scene of occurrence and he only states that he was informed about the incident by PW1. A specific question was put to PW31 in this regard and he has admitted that PW3 had only heard about the incident later. Hence, the evidence of PW3 does not in any way corroborate the evidence of PW1.

28. On carefully going through the rough sketch that was marked as Ex.P17, it is seen that there were many shops near the scene of occurrence and investigating officer did not even care to examine atleast an independent witness in this case. It is quite unbelievable that no independent witnesses were available when the rough sketch speaks otherwise.

22/30



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

29. As held by the Apex Court in *State of Rajasthan and others v. Bablu @ Omprakash and others* reported in **2022(1) MLJ CrL. 396 SC**, if multiple accused persons are involved, it will always be safe to examine more than one eyewitness to confirm the role played and overt act attributed against each accused person.

30. In the light of the above discussion, this Court cannot proceed to act only on the evidence of PW1 to sustain the charges under Sections 148, 341 and 302 IPC as against A6, A10, A11 and 12. This is more so since corrections have been made in the complaint (Ex.P1) regarding the time of the incident by correcting it as 8.50 in the place of 8.30 and also by inserting the date. This is purportedly done to suit the evidence of PW3, who comes up with a version that he saw the accused persons fleeing from the scene of crime at 8.50 p.m. The statement that were recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C from various witnesses had reached the Court only on 24.08.2016 and this delay has not been explained by the investigating officer. This also adds to the fact that there is every possibility of the prosecution trying to develop a case at a later stage.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY 31. This Court now proceeds to deal with the charge of conspiracy.

As stated supra, PW10, PW14, PW15, PW17 and PW27 have been examined by the prosecution to establish the charge of conspiracy. Insofar as PW10 is concerned, he states that he heard the accused persons conspiring to commit the offence four months prior to the date of occurrence and this witness did not even care to inform regarding the same to anyone. For the first time, he tells about this to the investigating officer when his statement was recorded under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. on 30.12.2015. This statement had also reached the Court only on 24.08.2016 and the delay has not been explained.

32. Insofar as the evidence of PW14 is concerned, he has turned hostile and therefore nothing turns out on his evidence.

33. The next is the evidence of PW15, who speaks about the conspiracy hatched by A3. He states that he was aware about this conspiracy three months before the date of occurrence and surprisingly he has not informed about this to anyone. For the first time he gives the

24/30



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

statement to the police recorded under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. on 30.12.2015 and this statement reaches the Court only on 24.08.2016 and the delay has not been explained. It is even more surprising that the police was aware of the involvement of A3 in the conspiracy, atleast on 30.12.2015, however, A3 was arrested only on 03.09.2016 after the alteration report was filed.

34. The next is the evidence of PW17, who also talks about being aware about the conspiracy 25 days before the date of occurrence. He has not informed about this to anyone and for the first time his statement is recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. on 03.01.2016 and it reaches the Court only on 24.08.2016 and this delay has not been explained.

35. The next witness is PW27, who talks about being aware of the conspiracy between the accused persons, even without stating as to when he became aware of the same. The statement of this witness was recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. only on 05.01.2016 and it reaches the Court on 24.08.2016 and the delay has not been explained.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

36. A consummate reading of the evidence of all the above witnesses shows that it is wholly unreliable and it has only been created by the investigating officer to substantiate the charge of conspiracy and their evidences is unnatural, which can never be acted upon.

37. In the light of the above discussion, the prosecution has not established even the charge of conspiracy against any of the accused person.

38. The upshot of the above discussions leads to the only conclusion that the prosecution has not proved the case beyond reasonable doubts as against the appellants and therefore, the benefit of doubt has to go in favour of the appellants A2,A3, A4, A6, A11 and A13 and they must be acquitted from all charges.

39. Accordingly the judgment made in SC No.245/2018 by the II Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli, dated 25.09.2023 is hereby set aside and A2,A3, A4, A6, A11 and A13 are acquitted from all the charges.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

40. In the result, all these appeals are allowed in the following terms:

(i) Crl.A(MD) No.952/2023 stands allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant/3 in SC No.245/2018 by the II Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli, are set aside and he is acquitted from all charges. Bail bond shall stand terminated. Fine amount paid, if any, is ordered to be refunded;

(ii) (a) Crl.A(MD) No.964/2023 stands allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant/A4 in SC No.245/2018 by the II Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli, are set aside and he is acquitted from all charges. Bail bond shall stand terminated. Fine amount paid, if any, is ordered to be refunded;

(b) As far as the appellants/A6 and A11 are concerned, the conviction and sentence imposed on them in SC No.245/2018 by the II Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli, are set aside and they are acquitted from all the charges; they are directed to be released forthwith unless their detention is required in connection with any other case.



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY (iii) Crl.A(MD) No.990/2023 stands allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant/A13 in SC No.245/2018 by the II Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli, are set aside and he is acquitted from all the charges. Bail bond shall stand terminated. Fine amount paid, if any, is ordered to be refunded;

(iv) Crl.A(MD) No.500/2024 stands allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant/A2 in SC No.245/2018 by the II Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli are set aside and he is acquitted from all charges. Bail bond shall stand terminated. Fine amount paid, if any, is ordered to be refunded;

[N.A.V, J.] & [K.K.R.K, J.]
23.03.2026

NCC : Yes
Index : Yes

RR



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

1.The II Additional Sessions Judge, Tiruchirappalli.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station,
Trichy District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

4.The Section officer (English Records)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl. A(MD)No.952 of 2023

**N.ANAND VENKATESH, J
AND
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, J.**

RR

Judgment made in
Crl. A. (MD)Nos.952, 964, 990 of 2023 and 500 of 2024

23.03.2026