

WP(Crl.) No.1297/2024



2025:KER:88

-:1:-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE KAUSER EDAPPAGATH

MONDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF JANUARY 2025 / 16TH POUSHA, 1946

WP(CRL.) NO. 1297 OF 2024

CRIME NO.1149/2024 OF KANNUR TOWN POLICE STATION, KANNUR

PETITIONER:

MANJUSHA K
AGED 49 YEARS
W/O NAVEEN BABU, KARUVALLIL HOUSE, MALAYALAPUZHA
THAZHAM P.O,
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT, PIN - 689666

BY ADVS.
V.JOHN SEBASTIAN RALPH
RALPH RETI JOHN
VISHNU CHANDRAN
MARY GREESHMA
GEETHU T.A.
GIRIDHAR KRISHNA KUMAR
LIZ JOHNY
KRISHNAPRIYA SREEKUMAR



2025:KER:88

-:2:-

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
 REPRESENTED BY ITS STANDING COUNSEL, HIGH COURT OF
 KERALA. KOCHI, PIN - 682031

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

- 3 SHO, KANNUR TOWN POLICE STATION
 KANNUR DISTRICT REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC
 PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA,
 COCHIN, PIN - 682031

- 4 INSPECTOR, SPECIAL INVESTIGATION TEAM, CONSTITUTED
 FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF CRIME NO. 1149/ 2024 OF
 KANNUR POLICE STATION
 REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT
 OF KERALA, COCHIN, PIN - 682031

BY ADVS.

SRI.T.A.SHAJI, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF PROSECUTION
SRI. P.NARAYANAN, SENIOR G.P. AND ADDL.PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR

SHRI.SAJJU.S., SENIOR G.P.

Dr.K.P.SATHEESAN (SR.) FOR R1

THIS WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY
HEARD ON 12.12.2024, THE COURT ON 06.01.2025 DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:



-:3:-

"C.R."

J U D G M E N T

The distressed wife of the late Sri Naveen Babu, the former Additional District Magistrate of Kannur, has approached this court seeking a CBI probe into the unnatural death of her husband.

2. The petitioner's husband was found dead by hanging in his official quarters on October 15, 2024. At 10.15 a.m., on the same day, Kannur Town Police registered a crime as Crime No. 1149/2024 under Section 194 of BNSS. During the investigation, it was revealed that Sri Naveen Babu faced public humiliation at the hands of the former Kannur District Panchayath President, Smt. P.P. Divya, during his farewell function on the previous evening. It was further revealed that in her speech during the farewell function, Smt Divya had accused the deceased of corruption in connection with the issuance of a No Objection



-:4:-

Certificate (NOC) for opening a fuel outlet, threatened him of exposure within two days, recorded the visuals of the event to propagate the same through social media with an intent to publicly humiliate him and left the function before the memento was handed over to the deceased. This caused mental strain on Sri Naveen Babu, and he was forced to commit suicide. Hence, Section 194 of BNSS was deleted, Section 108 of BNS was added, and Smt P.P. Divya was arrayed as the sole accused. A report to that effect was submitted before the jurisdictional Magistrate on 17/10/2024.

3. Sri. Savyasachi, S.I., Kannur Town P.S. conducted the initial part of the investigation. Later Sri. Sreejith Koderi, Inspector of Police, Kannur Town took up the investigation on 16/10/2024. The accused surrendered at Kannapuram Police Station on 29/10/2024; her arrest was recorded, and she was produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate Court and remanded to judicial custody. She was released on bail on 08/11/2024 as per the order of the Sessions Court, Thalasserry.



-:5:-

Considering the sensational nature and gravity of the case, a Special Investigation Team (SIT) headed by Sri. Ajit Kumar, IPS, District Police Chief was constituted on 25/10/2024 for effective investigation of the case as per Ext. R4(c) proceedings of the I.G of Police. The case is currently being investigated by the SIT.

4. In her plea for a CBI probe, the petitioner claims that the 'namesake' SIT, comprising officers from the local police station, has failed to investigate the case fairly and impartially. According to her, the accused holds influential political positions, and the investigation team is attempting to conceal evidence and aiding the accused in fabricating evidence. The petitioner also alleges that the possibility of homicidal hanging cannot be ruled out.

5. The 4th respondent, on behalf of respondents 2 to 4, filed a detailed counter-affidavit refuting the allegations in the writ petition. It is contended that the SIT, which is led and supervised by high-ranking officers, has been conducting the



-:6:-

investigation expeditiously and in a free and impartial manner. It is further contended that considering the public interest involved, the investigation is being conducted with utmost priority, adhering to all best practices in a criminal investigation and taking all measures to avoid any loopholes. It is also contended that no exceptional circumstances have been canvassed to entrust the investigation with the CBI and ordering of an investigation in a case of this nature by the CBI is unwarranted.

6. I have heard Sri.V. John Sebastian Ralph, the learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri.T.A.Shaji, the learned Director General of Prosecution (DGP), Sri.P.Narayanan, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor and Dr.K.P.Satheesan, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for CBI.

7. The learned Counsel for the petitioner, Sri V. John Sebastian Ralph, submitted that the accused has strong political ties with the ruling party, and due to her political influence, she is receiving assistance from the police to fabricate evidence in her



-:7:-

favour. According to the learned Counsel, the petitioner does not expect a fair and impartial investigation from the SIT. It was alleged that the inquest was not conducted in the presence of relatives of the deceased. It was further alleged that forceful ligature marks were present on the neck of the deceased, which has not been investigated scientifically. Relying upon the post-mortem report, it was argued that the possibility of suicide could be ruled out due to lack of bodily fluids. The learned Counsel highlighted certain discrepancies between the inquest report and the autopsy report about the presence of bloodstains in the undergarment of the deceased and the ligature marks to suggest the possibility of a homicide. The learned Counsel also submitted that the investigation should be conducted in a way that instils confidence in both the victim's family and the public; however, in this case, the police investigation is unlikely to instil confidence. An impartial agency like the CBI must conduct the investigation to instil confidence in the victim's family and the public, added the Counsel.



-:8:-

8. *Per contra*, the learned DGP, Sri T.A Shaji, submitted that the SIT is investigating all possible angles of the case effectively and properly. It was argued that there are no allegations of bias or foul play from the side of the investigation team. It was further argued that the CBI probe was sought on mere inferences and surmises without any cogent evidence. There is not even a single flaw in the investigation, and the prosecution has not made out a *prima facie* case warranting a CBI investigation, submitted the learned DIG.

9. Dr. K. P. Satheesan, the CBI's Special Prosecutor, submitted that the CBI is ready to abide by any directions of the Court.

10. The learned DGP produced the entire case diary, which I have perused in detail. Both sides cited several precedents, which will be discussed in due course.

11. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and gone through the case diary, the only question that



-:9:-

falls under my consideration is whether the petitioner has made a case for transferring the investigation to the CBI.

12. The scope and ambit of the extraordinary power of the Constitutional Courts to transfer an investigation from the local police to investigating agencies such as the CBI has been expounded by the Supreme Court in a catena of decisions. It is now settled that a prayer for a direction of investigation by the CBI or any other similar agency should not be granted on mere asking or as a matter of routine. A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court, in ***State of West Bengal and Others v. Committee for Protection of Democratic Rights, West Bengal and Others*** [(2010) 3 SCC 571], has made the following observations pointing out the situations where the prayer for investigation by the CBI should be allowed:

“70.... In so far as the question of issuing a direction to CBI to conduct investigation in a case is concerned, although no inflexible guidelines can be laid down to decide whether or not such power should be exercised, but time and again it has been reiterated that such an order is not to be passed as



-:10:-

a matter of routine or merely because a party has levelled some allegations against the local police. This extraordinary power must be exercised sparingly, cautiously and in exceptional situations where it becomes necessary to provide credibility and instil confidence in investigations or where the incident may have national and international ramifications or where such an order may be necessary for doing complete justice and enforcing the fundamental rights. Otherwise CBI would be flooded with a large number of cases and with limited resources, may find it difficult to properly investigate even serious cases and in the process lose its credibility and purpose with unsatisfactory investigations."

The above principle has been reiterated by a three-judge Bench of the Supreme Court in ***K.V. Rajendran v. Superintendent of Police, CBCID South Zone, Chennai and Others*** [(2013) 12 SCC 480]. It was held thus:

"13. ...This Court has time and again dealt with the issue under what circumstances the investigation can be transferred from the State investigating agency to any other independent investigating agency like CBI. It has been held that the power of transferring such investigation must be in rare and exceptional cases where the court finds it necessary in order to do justice between the parties and to instil confidence in the public mind, or where investigation by the



-:11:-

State police lacks credibility and it is necessary for having “a fair, honest and complete investigation”, and particularly, when it is imperative to retain public confidence in the impartial working of the State agencies. ...”

Elaborating on this principle, the Court further observed:

“17. ... the Court could exercise its constitutional powers for transferring an investigation from the State investigating agency to any other independent investigating agency like CBI only in rare and exceptional cases. Such as where high officials of State authorities are involved, or the accusation itself is against the top officials of the investigating agency thereby allowing them to influence the investigation, and further that it is so necessary to do justice and to instil confidence in the investigation or where the investigation is prima facie found to be tainted/biased.”

In ***Himanshu Kumar v. State of Chhattisgarh*** (2022 SCC OnLine SC 884), the Supreme Court, relying on ***K.V. Rajendran*** (supra) reiterated the principle that the power to transfer an investigation to investigating agencies such as the CBI must be invoked only in rare and exceptional cases. Further, no person can insist that the offence be investigated by a specific agency since the plea can only be that the offence be investigated properly. Recently, in



-:12:-

Vishal Tiwari v. Union of India and Others [(2024) 4 SCC 115] while holding that the power to transfer an investigation must be used “sparingly” and only “in exceptional circumstances”, a three-judge Bench of the Supreme Court emphasised that unless the authority statutorily entrusted with the power to investigate portrays glaring, wilful and deliberate inaction in carrying out the investigation, the court will ordinarily not supplant the authority which has been vested with the power to investigate. It was further observed that such powers must not be exercised by the court in the absence of cogent justification indicative of a likely failure of justice in the absence of the exercise of the power to transfer and the petitioner must place on record strong evidence indicating that the investigating agency has portrayed inadequacy in the investigation or *prima facie* appears to be biased. In ***Central Bureau of Investigation v. Rajesh Gandhi*** [1996 (2) KLT OnLine 1188 (SC)], it was held that no one can insist that an offence be investigated by a particular agency. An aggrieved person can only claim that the offence he alleges be investigated



-:13:-

properly, but he has no right to claim that it be investigated by any particular agency of his choice.

13. The principle of law that emerges from the above precedents is that the power to transfer an investigation from the State Investigating Agency to any other independent investigating agency like the CBI must be used sparingly, cautiously, and only in rare and exceptional cases where the High Court, after considering the material on record, finds it necessary to do complete justice to the parties.

14. Bearing in mind the above position of law, now let me consider whether, in the facts of the present case, more particularly, from the materials on record, the transfer of investigation from SIT to CBI is called for.

15. In the writ petition, the petitioner has highlighted the following grounds to contend that the initial investigation conducted by the Inspector of Police and the ongoing investigation being carried on by the SIT is in a shabby and



-:14:-

perfunctory manner and without advertent to various material facts to rule out suicide and to suggest that it was a case of homicide.

(i) The inquest was carried out before the petitioner and her family members had arrived at the scene though it is mandatory for the police officer to ensure the presence of close relatives during the inquest.

(ii) Necessary CCTV footage, especially from the premises of the Collectorate, the Railway Station and the official quarters of the deceased were not seized by the SIT.

(iii) No positive steps have been taken to collect the Call Data Records of the District Collector, Kannur, the accused, and Sri. Prasanth who applied for a NOC before the deceased to start a fuel outlet.

(iv) The scientific evidence, such as cellophane lifting from the palm of the deceased and the ligature



-:15:-

allegedly used for hanging to confirm suicide, was not done with the assistance of the scientific expert.

(v) For a significant period, the SIT failed to record the statements of the deceased's relatives, including the petitioner.

(vi) The accused, who is a member of the District Committee of CPI(M) and State Joint Secretary of Janathipathya Mahila Association, has the strong backing of the ruling party, which naturally metamorphoses into influence with the police investigating the case.

(vii) There could be a possibility that the deceased had left a suicide note, but it was suppressed by the investigation team to favour the accused.

(viii) The very constitution of the SIT is not in accordance with the law.



-:16:-

16. On a perusal of the case diary, I find that most of the grounds mentioned above are contrary to facts and hardly sufficient to cast any doubt as to the impartiality and efficiency of the present investigating team. The case diary reveals that, Sri.Savyasachi, S.I., Kannur, took over the investigation immediately after the registration of the crime. He reached the scene of the crime accompanied by the Scientific Assistant, District Fingerprint Expert and Department Photographer without any delay. He conducted the inquest from 10.15 hrs to 11.45 hrs and thereafter sent the body to Government Medical College, Pariyaram, Kannur for post-mortem examination under police escort. Post-mortem was conducted by a team of doctors headed by Dr Prajith T.M., Professor & Head of the Department of Forensic Medicine. It is seen from the case diary that the District Collector, Kannur vide order No. DCKNR-772/2022 A6 dated 15/10/2024 had deputed Sri.Shaji C.K., Tahsildar (LA-NH) to coordinate the inquest and post-mortem proceedings. The inquest report shows that the inquest was conducted and completed in the presence of five



-:17:-

independent witnesses including revenue officials. The relatives of the deceased reached Kannur from Pathanamthitta only at about 11.00 p.m. on 15/10/2024 i.e., after 15 hours of receipt of intimation regarding the incident. It is not mandatory that the presence of close relatives of the deceased be ensured during the inquest. The statement of relatives needs to be taken only if they are present at the time of the inquest. It was not practical to keep the body in such a condition till family members reached Kannur from Pathanamthitta. Ext.R4(b) circular issued by the Government would show that the inquest proceedings should be completed within four hours in general cases and in exceptional cases within five hours. In the post-mortem report, it is clearly mentioned that “post-mortem findings are consistent with death due to hanging” and “no other injuries are seen on the body”. They did not express any doubt of homicidal hanging. In the inquest also, no such evidence has been traced out. However, the SIT is also investigating the possibility of a homicidal hanging.



-:18:-

17. The case diary further shows that during the course of the investigation, the CCTV footage near the Collectorate, Muneeswaram Kovil, where the deceased got down from his car on his way to the railway station after the farewell function, railway station and footage from approximately 30 metres near to the official quarters of the deceased had been collected, analysed and seized under seizure mahazar. It is also seen from the records that the CDR of the accused, District Collector, Kannur and Sri. Prasanth had been collected and verified in detail. The case diary also shows that the cellophane lifting and collection of ligature marks were done by the Scientific Officer (SO), DFSL, Kannur and the fingerprint expert of the Fingerprint Bureau. The statement of the petitioner, her two daughters viz, Niranjana and Nirupama and two neighbours viz., Malayalapuzha Mohanan and Akhil were seen recorded on 17/10/2024 itself i.e., within three days of the incident at their residence at Pathanamthitta. The further statements of the petitioner and relatives were taken by the SIT on 14/11/2024. Similarly, statements of the ADM in



-:19:-

charge and other officers at the District Collector, Kannur, were also recorded without delay. No suicide note was recovered either from the body of the deceased or from the place of occurrence. Two mobile phones of the deceased were recovered from the place of occurrence and produced before the court with a forwarding note to send it for scientific examination at RFSL. The phone of the deceased was subjected to inspection by the Cyber Cell, but no suicide note could be detected.

18. Apart from the grounds mentioned in the writ petition and discussed above, the learned Counsel for the petitioner, during arguments, pointed out the discrepancy between the inquest report and the autopsy report about the presence of bloodstains in the undergarment of the deceased. The learned Counsel submitted that the inquest report indicates the presence of blood stains on the undergarment of the deceased, but there is no mention of any blood or stains in the post-mortem findings. According to the Counsel, this discrepancy leaves the cause of the bloodstains on the undergarment unexplained, raising



-:20:-

suspicion. It is true that in the inquest, blood stains were noticed on the undergarment of the deceased. The investigation team questioned and recorded the statement of Dr. Prajith T.M., Professor and Head of the Department of Forensic Medicine, Government Medical College, Kannur, who conducted the post-mortem examination on the body of the deceased. He was questioned specifically with reference to the bloodstains found in the undergarment. The Doctor stated in his statement that the possibility of renal stone or any other pathology in the urinary bladder, ureter, or urethra can cause bleeding through the external genitalia. Thus, the investigation was conducted to ascertain the reason for the bloodstains found in the undergarment.

19. The SIT consists of the ACP, Kannur, SHO, Kannur P.S., SHO Kannur City, S.I. Kannur Town P.S., S.I. Women P.S., Kannur, and ASI, Cyber Cell. The City Police Commissioner, Kannur, is the head. No bias or malafides have been alleged against any of the members of the SIT. Ext. R4(c) is the Government Order



-:21:-

constituting the SIT. It shows that the constitution of SIT is perfectly legal and in accordance with the law. The major things done so far as part of the investigation as revealed in the case diary are as follows:

- i. Conducted inquest and prepared an inquest report in the presence of five independent witnesses, including revenue officials.
- ii. Prepared scene mahazar and submitted it before the Court.
- iii. Seized cellophane pressings collected from the left sole, right sole, right palm, left palm, and neck of the body of the deceased, from the chair and bed, part of the nylon rope collected from the window grill, sealed in eight packets with collection certificate and sample seal impression certificate, produced the same before the court, and forwarded for Forensic Examination.



-:22:-

iv. Lifted chance prints from the place of occurrence with the help of the District Fingerprint Bureau.

v. Seized the apparel that the deceased wore during the incident, collected ligature material from the ceiling fan, submitted the same before the court and forwarded it for forensic examination.

vi. Seized two smart mobile phones from the scene, examined the same with the assistance of Cyber Cell, Kannur, collected call history, e-mail details, G-Pay details, social media account details and Google Timeline and forwarded the same to the court with Section 63 BSA certificate.

vii. Took still photos and videographed body inquest formalities by the department photographer.



-:23:-

viii. The CDRs of mobile phone numbers (7907524373 and 9447001921 used by the deceased) were collected and verified.

ix. The CDRs of the mobile phone numbers of the accused (9947419446, 8281040013) and Sri Prasanth (9074969381, 9497300361) were collected and verified.

x. Seized the DVD containing the audio and video visuals of the farewell party arranged by the Collectorate Staff Council to the deceased on 14/10/2024 which was covered by Cameraman of Kannur Vision, Yadu P. and produced the same before the court with Section 63 BSA certificate.

xi. Seized the memory card containing the audio and video visuals of the farewell party arranged by the Collectorate Staff Council to the deceased on 14/10/2024, covered by Naveen A., the



-:24:-

Cameraman of Kannur Vision and produced the same before the court with Section 63 BSA Certificate.

xii. Seized the bank account statement of the deceased.

xiii. Seized the file containing the application filed by Sri. Prasanth for starting the BPCL petroleum retail outlet at Cherankunnu in Chuzhali village.

xiv. Seized certified copy of the lease deed of the property for starting BPCL petroleum retail outlet at Cherankunnu entered between landlord Father Paul Edathinakath and the applicant Prasanth.

xv. Seized the copy of the no-objection application submitted by Sri. Prasanth for setting up a BPCL petroleum retail outlet.

xvi. Collected and verified the bank account statements of Sri. Prasanth.



-:25:-

xvii. Seized the key and spare key of the official quarters of the deceased as per the seizure Mahazar.

xviii. Prepared the mahazar of the Collectorate Conference Hall, where the farewell party was arranged for the deceased by the Collectorate Staff Council on 14/10/2024.

xix. Collected and seized as per seizure mahazar, the available CCTV footages grabbing movement of the deceased from the Collectorate, Railway Station and near Muneeswaram Kovil.

xx. The statements of the material witnesses, such as the petitioner, her children, brother, relatives, ADM, staff at the Collectorate who attended the farewell function, the doctors who conducted the autopsy, officials, police officers, etc., were recorded.



-:26:-

20. It appears from the case diary that the investigation is proceeding in the right direction adhering to all the best practices in the criminal investigation. The petitioner could not point out any material flaw in the investigation conducted by the present investigation team warranting investigation by the CBI. As stated already, the transfer of investigation from the State Investigating Agency to the CBI should be directed by the superior courts sparingly, only in exceptional cases where the investigation already conducted is found to be so unfair, tainted, malafide and in violation of the settled principles of investigative canons. Certainly, this is not such a case. The mere reason that the accused has political allegiance to the ruling political party is not a ground to transfer the investigation of the crime from the State Investigating Agency to the CBI.

21. From a victimology point of view, the victim's plea for free and fair investigation holds absolute importance. The right to fair trial and fair investigation are basic fundamental rights that a victim has under Articles 20 and 21 of the Constitution of India.



-:27:-

The Supreme Court in ***Nirmal Singh Kahlon v. State of Punjab*** (AIR 2009 SC 984) remarked that the right to fair investigation and trial applies to both the accused and the victim and that such a right to a victim is granted in Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. The jurisprudence of the rights of the victims to be heard has evolved, and their scope for participation in criminal proceedings has expanded over time. The Criminal Procedure Code was amended in 2008 to strengthen the then-existing framework of victims' rights by recognising three rights - participatory rights, the right to information, and the right to compensation for the harm suffered. In ***Jagjeet Singh and Ors. v. Ashish Mishra @ Monu And Anr.*** (2022 LiveLaw (SC) 376), the Supreme Court had upheld the victim's right to take part in the investigation of the crime, holding that he/she has unbridled participatory rights from the stage of investigation till the culmination of the proceedings. The framework of the rights of the victim has been further expanded in the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, BNSS) by



-:28:-

primarily incorporating rights to information for the victim at various stages of investigation and trial (see Cls.173, 193 and 230). Under the BNSS, the victim's right to be informed about the progress of the investigation of the crime has been statutorily recognised. Section 193(3) of BNSS specifically requires the police to inform the victim of the progress in the investigation within ninety days and therefore allows the victim to be aware of possible lapses and delays in the investigation. Section 230 of BNSS provides victims with a crucial right to information about the details of their case through the mandatory provision of the police report, FIR, witness statements, etc., which is meant to enable effective and meaningful participation of the victim in the criminal process. Thus, viewed from the victimology point of view, though the grievances expounded by the petitioner fall short of justifying a CBI prob, they deserve meaningful consideration by the SIT. The SIT is bound to address



-:29:-

and probe into the concerns expressed by the petitioner, including the possibility of a homicidal hanging.

22. In the wake of the above discussions and findings, this writ petition is disposed of as follows:

(i) The prayer sought in the writ petition to transfer the investigation in Crime No.1149/2024 of Kannur Town Police Station from SIT to CBI is disallowed.

(ii) The SIT shall carry out and complete the investigation swiftly, efficaciously, with due diligence and in a free and fair manner.

(iii) The DIG, Kannur Range, shall scrupulously monitor and oversee the investigation being conducted by the SIT and ensure that it proceeds properly, effectively and legally.

(iv) The SIT shall submit the periodical reports to DIG showing the progress of the investigation.



-:30:-

(v) The SIT shall inform the progress of the investigation to the petitioner as contemplated under Section 193(3)(ii) of BNSS.

(vi) The SIT shall consider and probe into the grievances highlighted by the petitioner in this writ petition.

(vii) The SIT shall also investigate the possibility of a homicidal hanging as apprehended by the petitioner.

(viii) After the completion of the investigation, the draft final report shall be submitted before the DIG for vetting and approval.

(ix) The final report shall be filed only after getting approval from the DIG.

Sd/-

DR. KAUSER EDAPPAGATH

JUDGE

Rp



2025:KER:88

-:31:-

APPENDIX OF WP(CRL.) 1297/2024

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF FIR IN CRIME NO.1149 OF
2024 OF KANNUR TOWN POLICE STATION,
KANNUR DATED 15.10.2024

Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF AUTOPSY REPORT DATED
15.10.2024

Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE ANTICIPATORY BAIL ORDER
DATED 29.10.2024, ISSUED BY THE HON'BLE
COURT OF SESSIONS, THALASSERY IN
CRL.M.C.NO.1700/2024

Exhibit P4 A COPY OF COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY WITNESS
PRASANTHAN TO CHIEF MINISTER DATED
10.10.2024

Exhibit P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION FILED BY THE
PETITIONER FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE
CDR BEFORE THE HON'BLE FIRST CLASS
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE COURT, THALASSERY,
DATED 18.11.2024

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT R4(a) A COPY OF THE OBJECTION FILED BY THIS
RESPONDENT RESPONDING TO THE ALLEGATIONS
IN EXHIBIT P5 PETITION BEFORE THE JFCM
-1 KANNUR

WP(Cr1.) No.1297/2024



2025:KER:88

-:32:-

EXHIBIT R4 (b)

A COPY OF THE CIRCULAR NO: M3/12/2022-
HOME DATED 21-06-2022

EXHIBIT R4 (c)

A COPY OF THE ORDER NO: C1-16341/2024/NZ
DATED 25-10-2024 OF IG NORTH ZONE