

**IN THE COURT OF THE FAST TRACK SPECIAL JUDGE
(PoCSO), THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

Present : R.Jayakrishnan, Special Judge.

Thursday, 7th April, 2022 (17th Chaithra, 1944)

SESSIONS CASE 1295/2013

Name of Accused : Thrilok @ Ani, S/o.Appukuttan
'Thrippalayam', TC.10/1805, CKN-9
Kurumkulam, Chenchery Lane
Mannanthala Ward, Ulloor Village.

Charge : U/ss.366A, 376(f)(i) IPC and Secs.5(l)(m)(p)
r/w 6 and 9(l)(m)(p) r/w 10 of the Protection
of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

**Plea of the
accused** : Not guilty

**Finding of the
Judge** : Not guilty u/s.366A IPC.

Guilty u/s 376(f)(i) IPC and Secs. 5(l) (m) (p)
r/w 6 and 9(l) (m) (p) r/w 10 of the Protection
of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

**Sentence/
Order** 1. For the offence under section 5(l)(m)(p) r/w
6 of the PoCSO Act, the accused is sentenced
to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for life
and to pay fine of Rs.50,000/-(Fifty Thousand
only) with default sentence for One year Rigorous
Imprisonment.

2. For the offence under section 9(l)(m)(p) r/w 10 of the PoCSO Act, the accused is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 7 years and to fine of Rs.25,000/- (Twenty Five Thousand only) with default sentence for 6 months Rigorous Imprisonment.

The accused is entitled to set off for the period from 09/03/2013 till 11/06/2013 against the substantive sentences, if the sentence is remitted or commuted. The period of substantive sentences shall run concurrently. If the fine amount is remitted or recovered, the same shall be given to the victim, as compensation u/s 357(1)(b) of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Name of Police Station and Crime Number : Fort
351/2013

Prosecution conducted by : Special Public Prosecutor
Sri.Vijay Mohan.R.S

Accused defended by Advocate : Smt.P.M.Princy Lal

Date of which copy of Judgment was given to the accused : 07/04/2022

JUDGMENT

The accused who is an Autorickshaw driver raped a minor school going girl having aged 9 years, while traveled in his Autorickshaw is the crux of the case.

2. The prosecution unfolded this case in the following way:-

PW7 is the victim girl in this case. She and her grandmother along with her sister were residing at Mottamoodu. Originally the family of PW7 belonged

to Thirunelveli, Tamil Nadu. Her father, PW8 and mother were resided at Pathanamthitta in connection with their job. PW7 studied at Sanskrit High School, East Fort. The grandmother, PW9 of PW7 was conducted iron shop at Manjalikulam for ironing clothes. Usually in the morning she and her sister along with PW9 came to Manjalikulam by bus and thereafter PW7 and her sister went to the school by Autorickshaw. PW8, father of PW7 arranged an Autorickshaw of his close friend, the accused to bring back PW7 and her sister to Manjalikulam in the evening from the school. During 2012 – 2013 PW7 studied in 4th standard. The incident was between November 2012 and March 2013 when the sister PW7 went to Pathanamthitta and stayed there along with their parents due to illness. She along with PW9 were at Thiruvananthapuram at that time. At that time she alone went to the school and the accused brought back her in his Autorickshaw in the evening. One day evening while she was brought back from the school, the accused stopped the Autorickshaw near Ramachandran shop for taking food. He compelled PW7 also to take food. After taking food, the accused sat on the back seat of the Autorickshaw near to PW7. Thereafter he inserted his hand to inside the shirt of PW7 and held the breasts and pressed. When she cried due to pain, he told her that there will be happiness if did so. He also told her that not to tell the incident to anybody. She never disclosed the incident. On the next day also he repeated the same at the same spot. On that day also the accused sat on the rear seat of the Autorickshaw near to her and kissed on her cheek and pressed her breasts. On the third day also the accused repeated the same. He sat on the rear seat of the Autorickshaw near to her, he unfolded the curtain of the Autorickshaw. He removed the dresses of PW7 and laid her in the rear seat.

Thereafter he held the breasts of PW7 and pinched on the breast. When she cried. due to pain the accused closed her mouth with his hand. The accused tried to insert his penis into the vagina of PW7. The accused showed a nude photo of a lady and man in his mobile phone to her. Thereafter he called another person and he came there. He also tried to penetrate his penis into the vagina of PW7. When he felt that someone came to there, he left from the place. Thereafter the accused cleaned the rear seat of the Autorikshaw with water and brought back PW7 to near to her grandmother. Thereafter one day PW9, grandmother sent PW7 along with the accused to return the ironed clothes. On that day also the accused went to the above said place and repeated the atrocities against PW7. After some days the accused told PW9 that he wanted to take PW7 to his house in order to introduce PW7 to his wife. While they went to the residence of the accused, the accused purchased ice cream and gave it to PW7. After she ate the ice cream she fell asleep. When she woke up at 7 pm, she found a lady near to her. The accused gave one more ice cream to her and again after she ate the same she fell asleep. She woke up in the morning. At that time no clothes were on her body. The place was a lodge at Ayurveda College Junction. The accused brought back her near to her grandmother. On that day she went to the school. She had suffered stomach pain at the school. Hence she cried. When the class teacher, PW2 enquired about the matter, she disclosed entire incident to her. PW2 informed the same to PW1, Headmistress and she informed the incident to the police. On the basis of Ext.P1 statement given by PW1, PW10 recorded Ext.P1 statement of PW1. PW15 registered the case against the accused on the basis of Ext.P1 statement.

3.PW3 was the H.M, Fort Sanskrit LPS and issued Ext.P2 certificate. PW4 is an attester in Ext.P3 mahazar. PW5 was the Scientific Assistant who examined the scene of occurrence. PW6 was the Assistant Director in the Biology Division, FSL, Thiruvananthapuram who issued Ext.P4 report. PW11 was the doctor who examined the accused and issued Ext.P7 Potency Certificate. He also collected nail clippings of the accused as per Ext.P8 certificate. PW12 was the Village Officer, Vanchiyoor who prepared Ext.P9 scene plan. PW13 was the doctor who examined PW7 and issued Ext.P10 certificate. PW14 was the counselor at Nirbhaya Home and who counseled PW7. PW16 is the doctor who treated PW7. PW15 is the Investigating Officer in this case submitted the charge on 30/08/2013 before the learned Principal Sessions Court, Thiruvananthapuram. The case was transferred to the 1st Additional Sessions Court as per OM No.D7(A)78549/13 dated 01/06/2015 of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. Thereafter the case was made over to the Additional District and Sessions Court (for the trial of cases relating to atrocities and sexual violence against women and children), Thiruvananthapuram as per OM No.C4/8428/2013 dated 02/03/2016 of the Sessions Judge, Thiruvananthapuram. The accused is on bail.

4. The investigation in this case revealed that in order to satisfy his lust, the accused during the period 19/11/2012 to 06/03/2013 several times committed rape on PW7 and also called another person to the place of occurrence and allowed him to rape on PW7, a minor girl at his Autorickshaw and in room No.203 of MAS Hotel, Chettikulangara and thus committed the aforesaid offences.

5. On issuance of summons, the accused appeared before the Special Court. Copies of the prosecution records were furnished to the accused.

6. As per order No.1/21 dated 07.01.2021 of the Hon'ble Sessions Judge, Thiruvananthapuram, the case was transferred to this court for trial and disposal.

7. Notices were issued to the learned Special Prosecutor as well as the learned counsel for the accused. The Special Prosecutor as well as the accused appeared before this court. After hearing the prosecution and the accused and on perusing the prosecution records, a charge U/ss.366A, 376(f)(i) IPC and Secs.5(l)(m)(p) r/w 6 and 9(l)(m)(p) r/w 10 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 was framed. The charge was read over and explained to the accused. He pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

8. Thereafter the prosecution examined PW1 to PW16 and Exhibits P1 to P27 were marked.

9. When the accused was examined u/s.313 Cr.PC, he denied the incriminating circumstances. He reiterated his innocence. He filed an additional statement. In the additional statement he further stated that he did not commit any offence. The police manhandled him. He is innocent. Thereafter both, the accused and the prosecution were heard on the point u/s.232 Cr.PC. Since the acquittal of the accused was not felt warranted under that provision, the accused was called upon to enter on his defence. No witnesses examined, no documents were marked.

10. Both sides were also heard.

11. The following points arise for determination :-

1. Whether the victim in this case was a minor?
2. Whether the accused forced PW7 to intercourse with another person?
3. Whether the accused committed rape on PW7?
4. Whether the accused committed aggravated penetrative sexual assault on PW7?
5. Whether the accused committed aggravated sexual assault on PW7?
6. What are the offences if any, committed by the accused?
7. What is the sentence to be imposed?

12. **Point No.1:-** PW7 testified that now she is studying for 1st year Degree at Tamil Nadu. Her native place is Thirunelveli at Tamil Nadu. From 1st standard till 4th standard she studied in Sanskrit HS, East Fort. During 2012 – 2013 she was studying in 4th standard. At that time her age was 9 years. Ext. P2 and Ext.P26 are the certified Extracts of the School Admission Register/Certificate of PW7. Ext.P2 and Ext.P26 would show that her date of birth was on 03/09/2003. Ext.P2 is proved through PW3. The incident was during 2012 – 2013. As per section 35 of the Evidence Act 1872 “*An entry in any public or other official book, register or record, stating a fact in issue or relevant fact and made by a public servant in the discharge of his official duty, or by any other person in performance of a duty specially enjoined by the law of the country in which such book, register or (record or electronic record) is kept, is itself a relevant fact*”. PW7 testified that from the 1st standard onward she was studying at Sanskrit Sanskrit HS, East Fort. Ext.P26 also would show the same. In ***Madhu v. State of Kerala, 2021 (5) KHC 602***, Hon’ble High Court

held that The extract of the School Register to be from the school first attended by the victim is necessary to prove the age of the victim. The date of birth of PW7 was on 03/09/2003. The incident in this case was during 2012 – 2013. This was not seriously challenged. So it can be seen that on the date of incident PW7 was a minor. Point is found accordingly.

13. **Point Nos.2 to 5** :- PW7 who is the victim minor girl having aged 9 years at the time of incident testified before the court at the age of 18 years. She testified that the accused was a close friend of her father, PW8. During the period of incident resided along with her grandmother, PW9 at Thiruvananthapuram. Her father and mother were at Pathanamthitta in connection with their job. Basically the family of PW7 belonged to Thirunelveli, Tamil Nadu. Since the accused was the close friend of her father PW8 authorized the accused to bring back PW7 and her sister from the school in the evening. PW7 testified that while returned from school the accused sexually assaulted her. PW7 testified before the court that the accused held on her breasts and pressed several times. The accused tried to penetrate his penis in to her vagina several time. The accused also called a person and he also sexually assaulted her in front of the accused. The accused also took her to a Lodge near to Ayurveda College and sexually assaulted her at the Lodge also. The accused threatened her, who had only 9 years age during that period and hence she did not disclose the incident to anybody.

14. One day PW7 was crying in the class due to stomach pain. On seeing the same her class teacher, PW2 enquired about the matter and she disclosed the entire incident to PW2. PW2 told the incident to PW1, the H.M.

PW2 admitted the version of PW7. PW1 also admitted the version of PW7 and PW2. Hence PW1 gave Ext.P1 statement before the police.

15.PW8 testified that during 2012 – 2013 PW7 was at Thiruvananthapuram along with his mother and they were residing at Mottamoodu. PW8 testified that he authorized the accused to bring back PW7 and her sister from the school in the evening. He came to know about the incident only when her mother informed the same to him. PW9 is the grandmother of PW7. She testified that PW7 studied at Sanskrit School and resided along with her during the period. She also testified in tune with PW7 and PW8. She came to know about the incident only on the last date. Usually the accused brought PW7 near to her in the evening.

16. Ext.P10 is the Medical Certificate issued by PW13, doctor who examined PW7. Ext.P10 would show that there was a Hyper pigmented scar 2x2 cm on the right side of front of chest, 5 cm outer to the nipple in the 11'O' clock position. The local examination revealed that the hymen was highly tender and showed an ulceration in the middle just above its upper margin and just below the urethral orifice. There was an infected abrasion 0.4x0.1 cm on the inner aspect of the two labia majora in the mid-line. Hymenal orifice just admitted the tip of forefinger and was highly tender. The examination findings are consistent with the alleged history. At the time of cross examination PW13 stated that the injuries in the vaginal portion can be caused due to the attempt of sexual intercourse. PW16 is a doctor who treated PW7 and issued Ext.P27 treatment certificate. Ext.P27 would show that PW7 was treated as outpatient for vaginal infection. Her evidence would show that the vaginal infection can be possible due to sexual abuse or fingering. She further clarified that the

vaginal infection may can caused due to the attempt of sexual intercourse and local manipulation.

17. From the evidence of PW1, PW2, PW8, PW9, PW13 and PW16 would show that the version of PW7 is corroborated with the versions of PW1, PW2, PW8, PW9, PW13 and PW16. Exts.P10 and P27 would show that there was attempt of sexual intercourse with PW7 and due to that there was severe infection in the vagina of PW7, a minor girl having only 9 years. It is true that though PW7 testified that she was sent to a Lodge at Ayurveda College by the accused and at there also she was sexually assaulted by the accused. The evidence of PW15, the Investigating Officer would show that though they had made an earnest attempt to find out the Lodge, they could not succeed. Though the police searched MAS Lodge at Ayurveda College, no document was recovered from there. It is important to note that the accused was questioned in the presence of Jail Superintendent, since the custody application was rejected by the court. The investigating officer testified that the accused did not cooperate with the police and hence police could not traced out the details of Lodge as stated by PW7 and the person who sexually assaulted PW7 in the presence of the accused. In ***Santhosh v. State of Kerala, 2021(4)KHC 527***, Hon'ble High Court held that "*Sexual assaults of varying degrees committed on a minor aged eleven years on several occasions. Contention that no corroboration is available. Statement of prosecutrix, if found to be worthy of credence and is reliable, requires no corroboration*".

18. It is true that there is delay in filing complaint before the police. The version of PW7 would show that since the accused threatened her she did not disclose the matter to her grandmother, PW9 or her parents. It is also

important to note that from the evidence it can be seen that PW9 was very strict in home and hence PW7 had fear to disclose the incident to PW9. At last she forced to disclose the entire matter before PW2 who is her class teacher. In ***State of Himachal Pradesh v. Sanjay Kumar @ Sunny 2016 KHC 6846***, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "*Delay of three years in lodging FIR. Whether fatal. Matter has to be examined taking into consideration realities of life that prevail in Indian social milieu. When evidence on record contained positive proof, credible sequence of events and factual truth linking accused with rape of the prosecutrix and that accused had criminally intimidated her, High Court was not correct in holding that prosecution failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt*". In ***Mottammal Shaji @ Kakka Shaji and Others v. State of Kerala, 2017 KHC 155***, Hon'ble High Court held that "*It is also settled law that delay in giving FIR by itself cannot be a ground to doubt the prosecution case. Human nature is that kith and kin, who have witnessed the occurrence, cannot be expected to act mechanically with all the promptitude in giving a report to the police. At times, being grief - stricken because of the calamity, it may not immediately occur to them that they should give a report. Unless there are indications of fabrication, the Court cannot reject the prosecution version as given in the FIR and later substantiated by the evidence merely on the ground of delay. Suspicion about the credibility of FIR normally arises only when the delay remains unexplained*". There is no reason to disbelieve the version of PW7, PW1 and PW2. The medical evidence in this case would show that the version of PW7 is corroborated with Exts.P10 and P27 and the evidence of PW13 and PW16. In ***Santhosh v. State of Kerala 2021 (4) KHC 527***, Hon'ble High Court held that "*Sexual assaults of varying*

degrees committed on a minor aged eleven years on several occasions. Contention that there is delay in disclosure of alleged acts and there is delay in registering FIR. When evidence on record revealed that accused had threatened the victim of Police action, if the incidents were disclosed, which kept the victim silent and only in a medical camp the victim disclosed about the incident, it can only be said that delay is only natural. Moreover, there is no reason to disbelieve official witnesses, who were at the camp, who cannot be said to have any specific interest in seeing the accused punished". As I already stated above, it is true that the police has failed to identify the Lodge where the accused brought PW7. The police also failed to traced out the detailed person who also sexually assaulted PW7. But it would not negated the prosecution case against accused.

19. Here the allegation of the prosecution is that the accused had committed offences u/ss.366A, 376(f)(i) IPC and Sec.5(l)(m)(p) r/w 6 and 9(l)(m)(p) r/w 10 of the PoCSO Act. Section 376(i) is that whoever commits rape on a woman when she is under sixteen years of age. Section 376(f) is whoever being a relative, guardian or teacher of, or a person in a position of trust or authority towards the woman, commits rape on such woman. As per section 3(a) of the PoCSO Act. a person is said to commit penetrative sexual assault, if he penetrates his penis, to any extent, into the vagina, mouth, urethra, anus of a child or makes the child to do so with him or any other person. Sec.5 deals with the different kinds of aggravated sexual assault and Sec.6 is the punishment for aggravated sexual assault. As per Sec.5(l) and 9(l) whoever committed penetrative sexual assault or sexual assault on the child more than once or repeatedly is aggravated penetrative sexual assault or aggravated sexual assault.

As per Sec.5(m) and Sec.9(m) whoever committed penetrative sexual assault or sexual assault on a child below 12 years is aggravated penetrative sexual assault or aggravated sexual assault. As per Sec.5(p) and Sec.9(p) whoever being a post or trust or authority on a child committed penetrative sexual assault or sexual assault on the child in an institution or home of the child or anywhere-else is aggravated penetrative sexual assault or aggravated sexual assault. Here it is an admitted fact that the accused was the close friend of the father of the victim. Since he was the close friend of the father of the victim and on believing that he gave maximum care and protection to his children, he authorized the accused to bring back the victim from the school in his Autorickshaw. The evidence would show that the accused tried to enter into sexual intercourse with PW7 and inserted his penis into the vulval area of PW7, the victim several times. So there is evidence to show that the accused had committed rape on the victim and committed aggravated penetrative sexual assault and aggravated sexual assault on the victim.

20. It is settled proportion of law that the accused need not entered into the witness box and prove his innocence. This is not an offence comes under the IPC. This is an offence comes under the PoCSO Act. The Act is designed in such a way that once the prosecution proved the offence and the Court drawn the presumption under section 29 of the POCSO Act. It is for the accused to rebut the presumption. The accused has no case that PW7 or her family falsely implicated the accused in this case. On the other hand his contention is that he is innocent and police manhandled him. The accused did not adduce any evidence to show that he had not committed any offence. He never tried to rebut the presumption drawn against him. There is no reason to

disbelieve the version of PW1, PW2, PW7 to PW9, PW13 and PW16 the doctors and Exts.P10 and P27 Medical Certificates. Ext.P5 is the 164 statement of PW7. PW7 also gave a statement before the police. PW7 testified before the court in tune with her previous statement and Ext.P5 164 statement. No serious contradictions or omissions were brought out at the time of her cross examination. In the circumstances mentioned above, only lead to irresistible conclusion that the accused is the perpetrator to the crime. Considering the totality of the evidence and the circumstances which I narrated above, I hold that the accused had committed rape, aggravated penetrative sexual assault and aggravated sexual assault on PW7, minor victim girl. Points are found accordingly.

21. **Point No.6** :- In view of my finding on the earlier points the accused is not found guilty of the offence U/s. 366A and he is acquitted for the said offence. The accused is found guilty of the offences U/s.376(f)(i) IPC and Secs.5(l)(m)(p) r/w 6 and 9(l)(m)(p) r/w 10 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and I convict him for the offences.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on this the 7th day of April, 2022.

***R.JAYAKRISHNAN
SPECIAL JUDGE.***

22. **Point No.7**:- I heard the accused regarding the sentence to be imposed. But he has nothing to say except that he is innocent. He prayed for mercy. I have also heard the learned Special Prosecutor as well as the learned

counsel for the accused. The accused is a prudent man, well acquainted with the pros and cons of his misdeeds. His attitude shows his scant respect and honour for the legal system and morality. So he is not entitled to get the benevolent provisions of the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958.

23. In ***State of Punjab v. Bawa Singh, 2015 KHC 4036***, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that *“This Court reiterated the settled proposition of law that one of the prime objectives of criminal law is the imposition of adequate, just, proportionate punishment which commensurate with gravity, nature of crime and the manner in which the offence is committed. One should keep in mind the social interest and conscience of the society while considering the determinative factor of sentence with gravity of crime. The punishment should not be so lenient that it shocks the conscience of the society. It is, therefore, solemn duty of the Court to strike a proper balance while awarding the sentence as awarding lesser sentence encourages any criminal and, as a result of the same, the society suffers”*.

24. Children are precious human resources of our country. They are the country's future. The hope of tomorrow rests on them. But unfortunately, in our country, a girl child is in a very vulnerable position. A crime against a child in such a manner is a crime against humanity and the society. The victim, minor girl was having 9 years. The accused is aged 53 years. The accused made atrocities to an innocent minor girl very cruelly. He made atrocities to a minor girl who is old enough to have a grand daughter of the accused. The accused does not deserve any leniency for sentence. This court has a duty to consider and credit the trauma faced by minor victim girl and the family members. I have to keep in mind the guide-lines of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid

decision while determining proper sentence to be imposed on the accused. On considering the facts and circumstances of this case, the accused is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for life and to fine of Rs.50,000/-(Fifty thousand only) with default sentence for One year Rigorous Imprisonment under Sec.5(l)(m)(p) r/w 6 of the PoCSO Act and Rigorous Imprisonment for 7 years and fine of Rs.25,000/- (Twenty five thousand only) with default sentence for 6 months Rigorous Imprisonment 9(l)(m)(p) r/w 10 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act will meet the ends of justice. Though the accused found guilty of the offence punishable u/s 376(f)(i) IPC, no separate sentence is awarded for the offence as per limit of punishment in Sec.71 IPC and Sec.42 of the POCSO Act. Point is answered accordingly.

In the result, the accused is acquitted u/s 235(1)Cr.PC for the offence u/s 366 A IPC and he is convicted under Section 235(2) Cr.PC and the following sentence is awarded:

1. For the offence under section 5(l)(m)(p) r/w 6 of the PoCSO Act, the accused is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for life and to pay fine of Rs.50,000/-(Fifty Thousand only) with default sentence for One year Rigorous Imprisonment.
2. For the offence under section 9(l)(m)(p) r/w 10 of the PoCSO Act, the accused is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 7 years and to pay fine of Rs.25,000/-(Twenty Five Thousand only) with default sentence for 6 months Rigorous Imprisonment.

The accused is entitled to set off for the period from 09/03/2013 till 11/06/2013 against the substantive sentences if the sentence is remitted or commuted. The period of substantive sentences shall run concurrently. If the fine amount is remitted or recovered, the same shall be given to the victim, as compensation u/s 357(1)(b) of the Criminal Procedure Code.

The victim in this case is entitled to get the compensation under the Victim compensation Scheme. Send a copy of this Judgment to the District Legal services Authority, Thiruvananthapuram under section 357-A(3) Cr.PC.

The convicted accused will be sent to the Central Prison, Thiruvananthapuram to serve out the sentence.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on this the 7th day of April, 2022.

R.JAYAKRISHNAN
SPECIAL JUDGE.

Appendix

Prosecution Witnesses:

PW1.	Beena
PW2.	Jayamma
PW3.	Vijayalekshmy.K
PW4.	Nagendran Nair
PW5.	Deepa.A.S
PW6.	Dr.R.Vinod Kumar
PW7.	Victim
PW8.	Murugan.C
PW9.	Saraswathy

- PW10. Sudhamony.O
 PW11. Dr.Santhosh Joy
 PW12. P.Padmakumar
 PW13. Dr.K.Valsala
 PW14. Roja.S
 PW15. Suresh.S.Y
 PW16. Dr.Priyadarsini.S

Exhibits for Prosecution :

- P1. FI statement
 P2. Certificate issued from Govt. Sanskrit
 HS, LPS, Fort, Tvpm dtd.14/3/2013.
 P3. Scene mahazar
 P4. FSL Report
 P5. 164 statement
 P6. Mahazar (dress of the victim)
 P7. Potency Certificate of the accused
 P8. Medico Legal Certificate dtd. 08/03/2013.
 P9. Scene plan
 P10. Medico Legal Certificate dtd. 07/03/2013.
 P11. FIR
 P12. Date correction report
 P13. Section added report
 P14. Mahazar (Autorickshaw)
 P15. Remand application
 P16. Address report
 P17. RC Particulars of the Autorickshaw
 P18. Scene mahazar (MAS Hotel)
 P19. Inventory mahazar (Register)
 P20. Inventory mahazar (Note book)
 P21. Property list in KPF 151 A Form
 P22. Property list in KPF 151 A Form
 P23. Forwarding Note to FSL
 P24. Certificate of Chemical Analysis
 P25. Third Party Kychit (Autorickshaw)
 P26. Certificate issued from Govt. Sanskrit
 HS, LPS, Fort, Tvpm, dtd. 22/2/2022.
 P27. Treatment Certificate of the victim.

Material Objects : Nil
Defence Witnesses : Nil
Exhibits : Nil

Description of the Accused

Name of accused	Father's name	Occupation	Religion	Residence	Age
Thrilok.A.Y	C. Appukuttan	Coolie	Hindu	Mannanthala	53

Date of

Offence	Complaint	Apprehension	Released on bail	Commencement of trial	Close of trial	Sentence /order	Explanation of delay
19/11/12	07/03/13	09/03/13	11/06/13	21/02/22	31/03/22	07/04/22	No delay

**R.JAYAKRISHNAN
SPECIAL JUDGE.**

//True Copy//

**R.JAYAKRISHNAN
SPECIAL JUDGE.**