

**IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE, ALAPPUZHA**  
**Present:- Smt.Honey M.Varghese, Sessions Judge**  
**Tuesday the 9<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2026**

**B.A.No.651/2026 & B.A.No.665/2026**

(Crime No.1574/2023 of Alappuzha South Police Station)

**B.A.No.651/2026**

Between:-

1. Shaiju V. K , Aged 46 Years,  
S/o K. Viswanathan, Assistant Sub  
Inspector [Grade], SSB Security,  
SSB HQ, Pattom,  
Thiruvananthapuram residing at  
Valikonathu Veedu, Irinchayam,  
Irinchayam P.O, Nedumangadu,  
Thiruvananthapuram. PIN: - 695561
2. Arun R, Aged 37 Years,  
S/o Ramachandran .K, SSB  
Security DHQ,  
Nandavanam, Thiruvananthapuram  
residing at Karthika Bhavan,  
Arayattukonam, Perad P.O,  
Thiruvanthapuram. PIN: - 695573
3. Vipin V.V, Aged 37 Years,  
S/o Balan .V, SSB Security residing  
at Chirammal House, Kottayam,  
Malabar P.O, Kuthuparamba via,  
Kannur PIN:- 670643

Petitioners/  
Accused Nos.3,4 & 5

AND

State of Kerala represented by the  
Home Secretary, Government of  
Kerala through the DySP, Investigation  
Officer, SIT, Alappuzha South Police  
Station, Alappuzha by the Public  
Prosecutor, Alappuzha

Respondent/Defacto  
complainants

(As per Order in CrI.M.P.No.1/2026 in  
B.A No.651/2026 dated 02.06.2026 the  
defacto complainants are permitted to  
take part in the proceedings of the Bail  
application)

**Defacto complainants**

1. Ajay Juel Kuriakose, Aged 32  
years, S/o Saji Kuriakose,  
Punnackal House,  
Maruthorvattom P.O, Cherthala,  
Alappuzha 688539

2. Thomas A.D, Aged 30 years,  
S/o Dominic Jackson,  
Arassarkadavil house, Ward 14,  
Mararikulam North Panchayath,  
Alappuzha

**B.A.No.665/2026**

Between:-

1. Anil Kumar.S, Aged 54 years, S/o  
Sathyavrithan, Nandanam, PVRA 61  
H, Nila Gardens, Palamvila Lane,  
NCC Road, Ambalamukku P.O,  
Perurkada, Thiruvananthapuram –  
695 005
2. Sandeep.S,Aged 39 years, S/o  
Sasidharan, PRA – 167,  
Chendanivila Veedu, Pottakuzhy,  
Pattom P.O, Thiruvananthapuram –  
695 004

Petitioners/  
Accused Nos.1 & 2

AND

State of Kerala represented by the  
Home Secretary, Government of Kerala  
through the DySP, Investigation Officer,  
SIT, Alappuzha South Police Station,  
Alappuzha by the Public Prosecutor,  
Alappuzha

(As per Order in Crl.M.P.No.2/2026 in  
B.A No.665/2026 dated 02.06.2026 the  
defacto complainants are permitted to  
take part in the proceedings of the Bail  
application)

**Defacto complainants:**

1. Ajay Juel Kuriakose, Aged 32  
years, S/o Saji Kuriakose,  
Punnackal House,  
Maruthorvattom P.O, Cherthala,  
Alappuzha 688539
2. Thomas A.D, Aged 30 years,  
S/o Dominic Jackson,  
Arassarkadavil house, Ward 14,  
Mararikulam North Panchayath,  
Alappuzha

Respondent/Defacto  
complainants

Petitions filed u/s. 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 to release the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest.

Petitions were presented on : 26.05.2026 & 02.06.2026

These petitions coming on 06.06.2026 for hearing before me in the presence of Adv.B.Sivadas; Counsel for the petitioners; Adv.P.Roy & Adv.T.Saji, Counsel for the Defacto complainants; Public Prosecutor for the Respondent; the Court on 09.06.2026 passed the following:-

### **COMMON ORDER**

The petitioners in B.A.No.651/2026 are A3 to A5 and the petitioners in B.A. No.665/2026 are A1 and A2 in crime No.1574/2023 of Alappuzha South Police Station. The offences alleged against the accused are punishable under Sections 294(b), 324 and 308 r/w S.34 of IPC.

2. The prosecution case, in nut-shell, is that the then Chief Minister and his Cabinet colleagues organized a programme by name 'Nava Kerala Sadas' and as part of that programme, they travelled throughout Kerala, conducted public events and held interactions in connection with the future developmental programmes for the State. On 15.12.2023 at about 4:08 pm, as part of the programme, the specially designed KSRTC bus carrying the then Chief Minister and his Cabinet colleagues, alongwith convoy vehicles reached at General Hospital Junction, Alappuzha. While so, the defacto complainant and the injured person, who are the activists of Youth Congress and KSU approached the bus in which the then Chief Minister and his Cabinet colleagues were travelling and shouted slogans to demonstrate their protest. The police officers, who were deployed at the junction, restrained the protesters and removed them to the road side, enabling the smooth movement of the Chief Minister and his team. The accused persons, who were members

of the Permanent Escort and Security Team attached to the then Chief Minister got out from the escort vehicle with lathis, assaulted the protesters despite the fact that they are already under the control of police personnel deployed there. The petitioners/accused caused injuries to the protesters with knowledge that such injuries would lead to their death and thus committed the offences alleged against them.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that on 15.12.2023 at about 4:00 pm, the vehicle of the then Chief Minister and his cabinet colleagues reached the traffic junction of General Hospital, Alappuzha and the unruly mob protesting against the programme jumped towards the vehicle by shouting slogans against the programme. They also hit and pelted objects against the bus. The Chief Minister, who was covered under 'Z-plus' category, was sitting in the bus exposed to public visibility. When the protesters reached close proximity by raising slogans, the escort team of the Chief Minister attempted to prevent the attack alongwith the police officers engaged in law and order duty. The protesters were aggressive enough to commit any act of violence and atrocity. The defacto complainant, thereafter, lodged a complaint before the jurisdictional Magistrate and that was forwarded to Station House Officer, Alappuzha South Police Station, under Section 156 (3) of CrPC and consequentially the present case was registered, alleging the offences under Sections 294 (b), 324 and 325 of IPC against A1 and A2. The DySP, District Crime Branch, thereafter, filed a refer report stating that A1 and A2 discharged their official duties and the same is protected under Section 113 of the Kerala Police Act. It is also stated that no sufficient materials are available to establish

that the A1 and A2 exceeded their duties. The defacto complainant filed complaint as CMP No.8197/2024 against the refer report. The jurisdictional Court directed to conduct further investigation enabling the defacto complainant to produce CCTV footage. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that there is change in the Government in the State and in the very first Cabinet Meeting of the new government, a Special Investigation Team (SIT) was constituted to conduct further investigation with a direction to file Final Report within one month. There was a further direction to file reports fortnightly to the DGP. The SIT filed report adding A3 to A5 also. According to the learned counsel, the petitioners never committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution. They discharged their duties in their capacity as the Special Security Officers to the Chief Minister and his cabinet members. They have never indulged in any criminal acts. They have no criminal antecedents. They have co-operated with the investigation so far. They appeared before the investigating officer whenever they have been directed to appear before him. According to the learned counsel, all the highhanded allegations were raised presently as a result of political agendas and ulterior motives. The petitioners are maintaining an unblemished career throughout. Their custodial interrogation is not necessary in the case. The weapons allegedly used are also seized. They are ready to abide by any conditions imposed by this court in the event of granting bail. Therefore, pleaded to grant pre-arrest bail to them.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor objected the bail application and filed detailed report. It is submitted that the SIT commenced investigation on 21.05.2026 and therefore, the investigation is presently at a developing stage.

According to them, the KSRTC bus carrying the then Chief Minister had already passed the area and moved ahead without any obstruction. The escort officers were primarily entrusted with the duty of providing close protection to the Chief Minister and they were not expected to stop elsewhere unless the vehicle of Chief Minister stopped. During the course of alleged manhandling, the vehicle carrying the Chief Minister had already moved several hundred metres ahead without the close escort team and motorcade. These acts are *prima facie* contrary to the security protocol available to the 'Z-plus' security category as prescribed in the 'Yellow Book'. It is also submitted that they violated Advisory No.27/21 issued by Police Head Quarters which provides that Personal Security Guards (PSG) shall perform their duties so as to provide security cover and safe evacuation to the protectee.

5. The SIT seized the visuals of the incident and also recorded the statements of injured persons and others. They filed report before the jurisdictional Magistrate on 23.05.2026 arraying five persons as accused. The investigation conducted so far has revealed *prima facie* materials indicating the involvement of all the five accused persons in the incident. Similarly, the findings of the expert Medical Board read together with the visual evidence, wound certificates, witness statements and other materials collected during investigation disclosed *prima facie* materials attracting the ingredients of Section 308 of IPC. The accused continuously assaulted the injured even after sustained a head injury during the initial assault. The investigation is still in progress and the applicability of additional penal provisions is also under examination. The presence and custodial interrogation of the accused remain

indispensable for effective investigation, confrontation with documentary, electronic, scientific and medical evidence, verification of security protocol violations, recovery and identification of material objects, examination of the circumstances leading to the preparation of allegedly false records and for ascertaining the exact nature, gravity and extent of the offences committed.

6. The investigating officer filed additional report clarifying the incorporation of Section 308 of IPC and reiterated the submissions. The learned Public Prosecutor argued that the accused persons inflicted blows to the head of the injured person violating the police standing orders. The learned Public Prosecutor produced a Pen Drive containing the visuals of the incident captured by private persons. On the basis of above submissions, the learned Public Prosecutor pleaded to dismiss the bail applications.

7. The defacto complainant appeared before this Court through Adv.P.Roy and Adv.T.Saji and filed objection. The crux of the objection is that the defacto complainant and the injured being the members of subsidiary organizations of Indian National Congress decided to stage protest all over Kerala against the 'Nava Kerala Sadas' organized by the then Government of Kerala led by Chief Minister and his Cabinet Ministers. According to them, the said programme is a total wastage of public money. As part of the protest, on 15.12.2023, while the bus carrying the Chief Minister and other Ministers of the State was passing through the General Hospital Junction, Alappuzha, the defacto complainant raised slogans by standing on the eastern footpath of the road. The local police officials encircled the defacto complainant and his associates restraining them from moving towards the bus. After the bus

carrying the Chief Minister and other Ministers passed through the place, two cars came behind the said bus abruptly stopped near the injured persons. Five persons came out of the said car with long sticks and started to unleash brutal attack with deadly weapon aiming the heads of the injured persons. The accused persons inflicted blows with the knowledge that the same would result in their death without any justification or authority. Though they warded off the blows with hands, one of the blows hit on the head of the injured and caused serious injury on his head. Had the blows been not blocked, their death ought to have been resulted. The learned counsel produced **Annexure 1** Pen Drive containing video footage of the incident captured in different angles received from the mobile phones of media personnel. The learned counsel also produced **Annexure 2 series** print out of the screen shots taken from Annexure 1 video. **Annexure 3** is the copy of complaint filed by one of the injured persons before the jurisdictional Magistrate.

8. The petitioners were under the strong protection of the top most power centres of Kerala and they even went to the extent of destroying the case by manipulating and substituting false evidence by the help of the top ranked police officials of the State. The case diary was taken to Thiruvananthapuram and they hatched a conspiracy with the top ranked police officials and tampered the entire case diary. The Crime Branch police filed a refer report in the case, stating the reason 'mistake of fact'. The injured person filed an objection before the jurisdictional Magistrate. The learned Magistrate rejected the refer report and directed to conduct further investigation. The investigating officers did not conduct any further investigation in compliance

with the direction till 21.05.2026. This would show that the petitioners are highly influential and they will go to any extent to interfere with the administration of justice. Hence they are not entitled to get a relief under Section 482 of BNSS. They also denied the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners. Moreover, the learned counsel also advanced submissions in tune with the submissions made by the learned Public Prosecutor. According to the learned counsel for the defacto complainant, the act of the petitioners at any stretch of imagination cannot be considered as official duty of providing protection to the 'Z-Plus' category protectee. The brutal attack against two promising youngsters without any reason had shocked the conscience of the entire public all over Kerala. The contention of the learned counsel for petitioners that the incorporation of offence under Section 308 of IPC is due to political rivalry is absolutely false. Since the petitioners are highly influential having support of top level politicians and higher police officials, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners will definitely destroy the proper and effective investigation in this case and prayed to dismiss the bail applications.

9. Heard both sides and perused the records.

10. I had considered the rival contentions. The allegations of the prosecution is that the then Chief Minister alongwith his Cabinet members conducted 'Nava Kerala Sadas' with an intention to call discussions with public regarding the future developmental programmes and the programme held in Alappuzha on 15.12.2023. The Chief Minister and his colleagues were travelling in a specially designed KSRTC bus. The bus while travelling through General Hospital Junction, Alappuzha, the defacto complainant and another

person, who are the members of the subsidiary organizations of the then opposition party raised slogans as part of their protest. The petitioners herein, who were functioning as the Personal Security Guards of the Chief Minister got out from the convoy vehicle moving on the back of the KSRTC bus and assaulted the injured persons using lathis with the knowledge that their death would be caused.

11. For the sake of easy understanding of the factual events involved in this case, the chronology of the events are to be mentioned in brief. The prosecution was launched on the basis of complaint moved by the defacto complainant before the jurisdictional Court and accordingly, the present case was registered incorporating bailable offences. The investigating officer filed refer report before the jurisdictional Court. The defacto complainant filed objection and accordingly, the jurisdictional Court directed further investigation. It is to be noted that on 21.05.2026 Special Investigation Team (SIT) was constituted for the investigation of this case. On 23.05.2026, the investigating officer filed report before the Court adding A3 to A5. In the meantime, A1 and A2 filed Bail Application No.631/2026 before this Court. The investigating officer filed report before this Court stating that the offences alleged are bailable in nature and accordingly, vide order dated 26.05.2026, this Court dismissed the bail application.

12. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the accused persons filed petition before the jurisdictional Court on 29.05.2026 for advancing the hearing so as to enable them to surrender before the Court. According to him, on 30.05.2026, the investigating officer filed report before the

jurisdictional Court stating that all the offences alleged are bailable in nature, but there are chances to add non bailable offence. According to him, even at the time of filing that report, the offence under Section 308 of IPC was not added. The learned counsel submitted further that within a time gap of 2 hours another report is filed by the investigating officer without any basis stating that the offence under Section 308 of IPC is added. The learned counsel submitted that the said report is filed by the Investigating Officer with an ulterior motive to deny bail for the petitioners. The learned counsel also added that had the materials been relied on by the Investigating Officer are sufficient to add the offence under Section 308 of IPC, the Investigating Officer ought to have been mentioned that fact in the first report itself.

13. The investigating officer filed a clarification report before this Court justifying the filing of second report adding Section 308 of IPC. It is reported that the statements and materials including the visuals were verified and arrived at a finding that had the blow against the head of injured person been not resisted, his death would have been caused. Except this averment, nothing is mentioned in the second report to add the offence under Section 308 of IPC. On the other hand, in the first report, the Investigating Officer mentioned the need for verifying the wound certificates, visual evidence, forensic reports relating to the extraction and analysis of the visuals and other material evidence. It is also submitted that considering the nature of the injuries, manner of occurrence, appropriate penal provisions can be determined only after completion of the ongoing forensic and medical evaluation by an expert panel. On a perusal of these reports, it is seen that though in the first report, the

Investigating Officer mentioned about the need for detail examination of materials, they, on that day itself within a short span of time, filed second report adding the offence under Section 308 of IPC, i.e., the one and only non bailable offence alleged against the petitioners. It is true that the investigation is going on and the Investigating Officer is at liberty to add or delete appropriate penal provisions at any stage. At the very same time, considering the reports available before this Court for perusal, it seems that in between the two reports, no investigation is conducted. The second report also appears to be filed based on the materials which were already available at the time of filing the first report. Moreover, the Investigating Officers were also present before the jurisdictional Court on 30.05.2026. Though the learned counsel for the petitioners raised a contention that the second report is filed for denying bail to the petitioners, as I pointed out since the investigation is going on it is the prerogative of the Investigating Officer to file reports at any stage. The contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioners that the second report is filed with ulterior motive need not be addressed by this Court at this stage, as this Court is not expected to delve into the details of those matters.

14. The learned counsel for the petitioners put up another contention that the allegations are insufficient to attract the offence under Section 308 of IPC. It is to be noted that the learned Public Prosecutor opened up the submissions based on the Police Standing Order Rule 241 (4) that the manner in which lathis may be used for dispersing a mob provides that "*as the intention is only to disperse the mob all lathis hits should be on the soft portions of the body from the thigh to the shoulder, and contact with the head or collarbone*

*should be avoided as far as practicable*". The learned Public Prosecutor also placed reliance on the visuals and argued that the petitioners inflicted blows on the head of the injured person and that is sufficient to attract the offence under Section 308 of IPC. The learned counsel for the petitioners per contra stoutly disputed this and also placed reliance on the very same visuals and submitted that no blows are inflicted on the head. The learned counsel also argued that the petitioners were engaged in the discharge of their duty. The learned counsel appearing for the defacto complainant also countenanced the submissions of the learned Public Prosecutor and argued that the petitioners inflicted blows on the vital part with knowledge that the injuries would be sufficient to cause death. The visuals were played before this Court. Both sides tried to explain the visuals and convince the Court as per their contentions. As I pointed out, this Court is not sitting on trial or rather considering the discharge petition. This Court is considering the bail application of the petitioners and expected to consider the materials to see whether the materials are sufficient to attract the allegations *prima facie*. The medical certificates are also produced before this Court alongwith the report. The medical certificates would show that one of the injured persons sustained laceration on his head measuring 1 x 1 cm. Suturing was done. As far as the defacto complainant is concerned, no external visible injuries are noted except contusions on left and right forearm. It is the basic principle of law that in order to attract the offence under Section 308 of IPC, there is no need for injury always. All the matters raised before this Court by both sides regarding the knowledge at the time of inflicting injuries, the body part on which the blows were allegedly inflicted and the force the

petitioners allegedly used to inflict the blows are the matters which ought to have been considered during the trial. Since the jurisdiction of this Court is restricted at this stage to arrive at a finding whether the petitioners are entitled to get pre-arrest bail, those matters do not arise for consideration meticulously.

15. While considering the bail applications, this Court is bound by the legal principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Courts. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the decision ***Pawan Khera v. State of Assam*** reported in **2026 (SCC) Online SC 749** held that while considering the pre-arrest bail application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the personal liberty of an individual enshrined under Article 21 cannot be put to jeopardy lightly. While adjudicating an application for bail, a careful balance must be struck between the states interest in ensuring a fair investigation and individuals' fundamental right to personal liberty under Article 21 has to be done. The deprivation of personal liberty must be justified on a higher threshold particularly where surroundings circumstances may indicate the presence of political overtones. It is further held that absence of any likelihood of applicant absconding does not by itself mandate the grant of anticipatory bail. Nature of the seriousness of proposed charges, context of the events, possibility of tampering and influencing witnesses and evidence, larger interest of the public or State are some of the considerations which the Court has to keep in mind while deciding such applications.

16. The Hon'ble Supreme Court also placed reliance in the decisions in ***Shri.Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia and Others v. State of Punjab (1980 2 (SCC) 565*** and ***Pradip N. Sharma v. State of Gujarat and Another (2025***

**(SCC) Online SC 457.** It is further held that if the custodial interrogation does not appear to be necessary and as flight risk of the accused is not there, the Court may grant pre-arrest bail. The Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case *Shri.Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia* observed that in regard to anticipatory bail, if the proposed accusation appears to stem not from motives of furthering the ends of justice, but from some ulterior motive, the object been to injure and humiliate the applicant by having him arrested a direction for the release of the applicant on bail in the event of his arrest would generally be made. On the other hand, if it appears considering the antecedents of the applicant, that taking advantage of the order of anticipatory bail, he will flee from justice such an order would not be made. There are several other considerations too numerous to enumerate the combined effect of which must weigh with the Court while granting or rejecting anticipatory bail. The nature and seriousness of the proposed charges, the context of the events likely to lead to the making of the charges, a reasonable possibility of the applicant presence not being secured at the trial, a reasonable apprehension that witnesses will be tampered with and the larger interest of the public or the State are some of the considerations, which the Court has to keep in mind while deciding an application for anticipatory bail. The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala also held in ***Pramod Prasannan v. State of Kerala (2025 KHC Online 2238)*** that the issue of bail is one of liberty, justice public safety and burden of the public treasury, all of which insists that a developed jurisprudence of bail is integral to a socially sensitized judicial process. After all, personal liberty of an accused or convict is fundamental, suffering lawful eclipse only in terms of

procedure established by law.

17. In the light of above decisions, the factual matrix involved in this case has to be analysed. This Court has already detailed the prosecution allegations and the contentions raised by both sides. The petitioners are admittedly police personnel. Similarly, the fact that they were engaged in their duty as police personnel on the date of occurrence is also remains undisputed. The date of occurrence was on 15.12.2023. It is true that the first Investigating Officer filed refer report and the injured person filed objection against the said report. The jurisdictional Court ordered further investigation. The learned counsel for the defacto complainant submitted that since the petitioners had the support of the power centre, nothing was happened during this period and that itself is sufficient to show that they are influential. According to the learned counsel, if bail is granted, there is every chance to exert influence and that would definitely affect the investigation. In this case, as I pointed out, the protest was organized against the programme arranged by the earlier Government. There is change in Government at present and accordingly SIT was constituted. If this be the situation, I hold that the alleged support of the power centre and the influence on the side of accused persons based on that support will not be available now. Moreover, the injured persons are not ordinary laymen. One among them is the Member of Legislative Assembly and the other is the State level office bearer of an organization. If this be the situation, the chances to influence the injured as well as the witnesses are less. Similarly, in the report filed by the Investigating Officer, it is reported that the investigation has to be conducted regarding the falsification of records at the

instance of high level police officials. The petitioners herein are police constables. So, it is difficult to believe that they influence the high level police officials. Moreover, the records would show that A1 and A2 appeared before the Investigating Officer as and when directed. Since they are police officials, there is no chance to flee away from the clutches of law and their presence can be secured for trial also.

18. In the report filed by the Investigating Officer, it is stated that the presence and custodial interrogation of the petitioners remain indispensable for effective investigation, confrontation with documentary, electronic, scientific and medical evidence, verification of security protocol violations, recovery and identification of Material Objects, examination of the circumstances leading to the preparation of allegedly false records and for ascertaining the exact nature, gravity and extent of the offences committed. It is to be noted that the weapon allegedly used are lathis. Contentions are raised by the prosecution and defacto complainant that the accused are not provided with such lathis. The learned counsel for the petitioners controverted this submission. Keeping aside all these matters, the fact remains is that the lathis were already surrendered by the petitioners. So, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners for effecting the recovery of weapons is not warranted. The report of the investigating officer would show that the statement of injured persons, police officials discharged duty in the scene of occurrence and persons who captured the visuals are recorded, collected the FSL reports pertaining for the visuals, constituted Medical Board and also obtained the report of experts regarding the injuries and weapons. Further, considering the above situations, the

requirement warranting the indispensable need of the presence of petitioners as claimed by the Investigating Officer can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions. Having regard to the circumstances brought out, I am of the view that petitioners are entitled to get pre-arrest bail, but on conditions.

In the result, both petitions are allowed on the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer on 11.06.2026 at 10:00 am for interrogation and the petitioners shall be interrogated for the next two days from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm on every day, if required, after giving adequate intervals;
- (ii) They shall be deemed to be under custody during the aforesaid period for facilitating the requirements of investigation;
- (iii) If the Investigating Officer intends to arrest the petitioners, they shall be released on bail on executing bond for ₹1,00,000/- each with two solvent sureties each for the like amount;
- (iv) They shall fully co-operate with the investigation;
- (v) They shall appear before the Investigating Officer between 10:00 am and 11:00 am on alternate Saturdays until further orders or till filing of the Final Report, whichever occurs earlier;
- (vi) They shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required;
- (vii) They shall not commit any offences, while on bail; and
- (viii) They shall not attempt to contact the witnesses directly or through any other person or in any other way tried to tamper with the evidence or influence any witnesses or other persons related to the investigation.

*Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, revised and corrected by me and pronounced on this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2026.*

Sd/-

**Honey M. Varghese**  
**Sessions Judge**