

Bhuvanachandran Vs. State of Kerala and Another

Bhuvanachandran Vs. State of Kerala and Another

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1013510

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Feb-04-2013

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice P.Bhavadasan

Appellant : Bhuvanachandran

Respondent : State of Kerala and Another

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM PRESENT: THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.BHAVADASAN MONDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2013 15TH MAGHA 193 CrI.MC.No. 241 of 2010 ()

----- PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED: -----

BHUVANACHANDRAN, AGED 2 YEARS, S/O.RAJAPPAN,MELETHU VEEDU,PAZHANEERKONAM MURI, NOORANADU VILLAGE,FROM MALAYILKUNNATHU VEEDU, NEDUVARAMCODE P.O.,THURUTHUMMEL MURI, CHERIYANADU VILLAGE. BY ADV. SRI.V.ANIL (K/1480/98)
RESPONDENT(S)/COMPLAINANT(S)/STATE :

----- 1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGHCOURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM, (CRIME NO.283 OF 200.OF THE MANNAR POLICE STATION) 2. SURYA, AGED 2 YEARS, W/O.BHUVANACHANDRAN,MELETHU VEEDU, PAZHANEERKONAM MURI,NOORNADU VILLAGE, FROM MALAYILKUNNATHU VEEDU,NEDUVARAMCODE P.O., THURUTHUMMEL MURI,CHERIYANADU VILLAGE. BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR ADV. SMT. REMA

R. THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 04-02-2013, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING: NS CrI.MC.No. 241 of 2010 () APPENDIX PETITIONER(S) ANNEXURES : ANNEXURE 1 : CERTIFIED COPY FIR IN CRIME 28 OF 200.OF MANNAR POLICE STATION. ANNEXURE 2 : COPY OF THE REPORTS DATED 26 11.2006 SUBMITTED BY THE INVESTIGATING AGENCY. ANNEXURE 3 : AFFIDAVIT SWORN BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT. RESPONDENT(S) ANNEXURES : NIL / TRUE COPY/ NS P.A. TO JUDGE P. BHAVADASAN, J.

----- CrI.M.C. No. 241 of 2010 -----
- - - Dated this the 4th day of February, 2013. ORDER As early as on 29.1.2010, this court had passed an order directing the learned Public Prosecutor to ascertain whether the petitioner has married the second respondent as alleged. On 26.3.2010 the learned Public Prosecutor represented that the information received by the Investigating Officer and the Public Prosecutor was that there has been no such marriage. This court therefore directed the petitioner to produce the document to prove the marriage. There were two subsequent postings and there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Today also there is no representation. Therefore, this application is dismissed. P. BHAVADASAN, JUDGE sb.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com