



-:1:-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE KAUSER EDAPPAGATH

THURSDAY, THE 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026 / 23RD MAGHA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 14427 OF 2025

CRIME NO.1750/2025 OF Nemom Police Station,
Thiruvananthapuram

PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.1:

RAHUL B.R
AGED 36 YEARS
S/O RAJENDRA KURUP ATTUVILAKATHU VEEDU MUNDAPALLI
PARAKOOTTAM P.O
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT, PIN - 691551

BY ADVS.
SRI.S.RAJEEV
SRI.V.VINAY
SRI.M.S.ANEER
SHRI.ANILKUMAR C.R.
SHRI.SARATH K.P.
SHRI.K.S.KIRAN KRISHNAN
SMT.DIPA V.
SHRI.AKASH CHERIAN THOMAS
SHRI.AZAD SUNIL
SHRI.T.P.ARAVIND
SHRI.MAHESWAR PADICKAL
SMT.AKSHARA S.



-:2:-

RESPONDENTS/STATE:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
 REPRESENTED BY THE PUIBLIC PROSECUTOR HIGH COURT
 OF KERALA, PIN - 682031
- 2 THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER
 NEMOM POLICE STATION, NEMOM P.O,
 THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 695020
- 3 XXXXXXXXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX IS IMPEADED AS THE
 ADDITIONAL 3RD RESPONDENT AS PER ORDER DATED
 21.01.2026 IN CRL.M.A.NO.1/2026 IN BA
 NO.14427/2025

BY ADVS.

SRI.T.A.SHAJI, DGP

SRI.V.JOHN SEBASTIAN RALPH FOR ADDL.R3

SRI.P.NARAYANAN, SPL. G.P. TO DGP

SHRI.VISHNU CHANDRAN

SHRI. RALPH RETI JOHN

SHRI.GIRIDHAR KRISHNA KUMAR

SMT.GEETHU T.A.

SMT.MARY GREESHMA

SMT.LIZ JOHNY

SMT.KRISHNAPRIYA SREEKUMAR

SHRI.ABHIJITH P.S

SMT.DEVIKA MANOJ

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
28.01.2026, THE COURT ON 12.02.2026 DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:



-:3:-

“C.R.”

O R D E R

This application is filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, BNSS), seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. The applicant is the accused No.1 in Crime No.1750/2025 of Nemom Police Station, Thiruvananthapuram District (reregistered as Crime Branch Crime No.4275/CB/CU-1/TVPM/R/2025 on 12/12/2025). The 3rd respondent is the de facto complainant/victim. The accused No.2 is the friend of the accused No.1.

3. The offences alleged are punishable under Sections 64(2)(f), 64(2)(h), 64(2)(m), 89, 115(2) and 351(3), r/w Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, the BNS) and Section 66E of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (for short, the IT Act).



- :4: -

4. The applicant is a politician and Member of the Legislative Assembly representing Palakkad constituency. He is a 36-year-old bachelor. The 3rd respondent is a journalist working in a TV channel. She is a 27-year-old married woman; according to her, she is living separately from her husband due to marital discord. The prosecution alleges that the applicant established a friendship with the 3rd respondent, who was estranged from her husband, by communicating directly via messages on platforms like Facebook, WhatsApp and Telegram. Subsequently, the applicant feigned emotional support and promised lifelong togetherness to her. Based on these promises, the applicant engaged in sexual intercourse with her multiple times at his flat in Palakkad on 27/1/2025 and 28/1/2025. Later, on 4/3/2025, at the 3rd respondent's rented apartment in Thrikkannapuram, Thiruvananthapuram, the applicant again engaged in sexual intercourse with her. Following this, on 17/3/2025, the applicant threatened the 3rd respondent and recorded her nude visuals on his mobile phone and compelled her for oral sex. When the 3rd



-:5:-

respondent became pregnant, and the applicant became aware of it, he forcefully and brutally raped her again at her apartment in Thrikkannapuram on 22/4/2025. On the same day, he gave her two pregnancy aborting tablets named Mifepristone and Misoprostol and threatened her that he would commit suicide if she did not consume the tablets. Again, the 3rd respondent was sexually assaulted in the last week of May 2025 at the flat of the applicant at Palakkad. Following instructions from the applicant, the accused No.2 procured abortion pills and personally delivered them to the 3rd respondent on 30/5/2025. The applicant then coerced her through WhatsApp chats to consume the pills and through a WhatsApp video call to terminate the pregnancy.

5. The crime was initially registered by Valiyamala Police Station, Thiruvananthapuram as Crime No.896/2025 for the offences under Sections 64(2)(f), 64(2)(h), 64(2)(m), 89, 115(2) and 351(3), r/w Section 3(5) of the BNS and Section 66E of the IT Act based on the complaint sent by the 3rd respondent to the Chief Minister of Kerala. Since the place of occurrence was within



- :6: -

the Nemon Police Station limits, the case was transferred to Nemon Police Station, Thiruvananthapuram city. On 28/11/2025, the Station House Officer, Nemom Police Station, the 2nd respondent, reregistered the crime as Crime No.1750/2025 and submitted the original FIR before the Judicial First-Class Magistrate Court- VII, Neyyattinkara. On the same day, the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court- III, Neyyatinkara, recorded the statement of the 3rd respondent under Section 183 of the BNSS. The further investigation was entrusted to ACP, DCRB, Thiruvananthapuram City, as per the order of the Deputy Inspector General and Commissioner of Police, Thiruvananthapuram. He took up the investigation on 29/11/2025. On 11/12/2025, the investigation was entrusted to the State Crime Branch. The Crime Branch reregistered the crime as Crime Branch Crime No.4275/CB/CU-1/TVPM/R/2025 on 12/12/2025. As part of the investigation, a Special Investigation Team was constituted. Now the investigation is in progress.

6. Apprehending arrest, the applicant filed an application



-:7:-

for pre-arrest bail as CrI.M.C.No.3585/2025 before the Sessions Court, Thiruvananthapuram. The accused No.2 also filed a similar application for pre-arrest bail as CrI. M.C No. 3660/2025. The application filed by the accused No.2 was allowed, and pre-arrest bail was granted to him as per the order dated 3/1/2026. The application for pre-arrest bail filed by the applicant was dismissed by the Sessions Court as per the order dated 4/12/2025 (Annexure III). It is thereafter that the applicant has approached this Court with the above application for pre-arrest bail. This court, as per the order dated 6/12/2025, granted interim protection from arrest to the applicant. It is still in force.

7. I have heard Sri.S.Rajeev, the learned counsel for the applicant, Sri.T.A.Shaji, the learned Director General of Prosecution (DGP) and Sri.John S.Ralph, the learned counsel for the 3rd respondent.

8. The learned counsel for the applicant, Sri.S.Rajeev submitted that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the crime. The learned counsel further submitted



-:8:-

that the allegations against the applicant at the most would reflect only a consensual relationship between two adults, and hence an offence of rape would not be attracted. Relying on Annexures 5 to 7 transcripts of the WhatsApp chats between the 3rd respondent and the accused No.2, it was argued that the 3rd respondent consumed pills for abortion voluntarily, and hence Section 89 of the BNS is not attracted. The learned counsel further submitted that though the incidents of rape and assault were alleged to have occurred between March 2025 and May 2025, the 3rd respondent never rushed to the police station and on the other hand, she gave the complaint only on 27/11/2025, that too to the Chief Minister. The learned counsel also submitted that the applicant is a promising political leader of the youth congress and the case against him is completely politically motivated, initiated at the instance of the ruling political party and the 3rd respondent, whose husband is a district leader of the BJP. On the aforesaid basis, it was urged that further custodial interrogation of the applicant is not warranted and that he is



- :9: -

willing to cooperate with the investigation.

9. Sri.T.A.Shaji, the learned DGP, vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that custodial interrogation is necessary as the allegations are serious. He further submitted that in the investigation, sufficient evidence was collected against the applicant, and the offences alleged being serious and heinous, the grant of pre-arrest bail will not only prejudice the investigation but will also send a wrong signal to society. The learned DGP further submitted that the mobile phone used by the applicant for recording the nude videos of the 3rd respondent has to be recovered and examined, the potency test of the applicant is to be conducted, and for the said purpose, the arrest of the applicant is necessary. The applicant, who is a sitting MLA and a powerful person, will destroy the evidence and influence the witnesses if he is granted pre-arrest bail. In such circumstances, the benefit of pre-arrest bail ought not to be granted to the applicant, submitted the learned DGP.

10. Sri. John S. Ralph, the learned counsel for the 3rd



-:10:-

respondent, argued that the allegations against the applicant transcend a mere instance of sexual assault and disclose acts amounting to aggravated sexual violence, characterised by perverse conduct and extreme sexual brutality. The nature and manner of the acts alleged *prima facie* reveal disturbing and sadistic proclivities on the part of the applicant. These acts, compounded by criminal intimidation employed with the object of compelling the 3rd respondent to undergo an abortion, ultimately caused her complete emotional and psychological breakdown, submitted the learned counsel. The learned counsel added that the applicant is in the habit of developing sexual relationships with women in distress who are in troubled marriages or separated from their spouses, which is evident from the fact that three FIRs have been registered against him, all reflecting a consistent pattern of abuse, torture and coercion, including forced abortion.

11. Section 482 of BNSS (438 of Cr.P.C.) has conferred a discretionary right on the Sessions Court and High Court to



-:11:-

consider pre-arrest bail which ought to be granted under particular circumstances of a case. The discretion conferred on the superior courts of law, though not controlled by any specific guidelines, is not to be exercised arbitrarily. Law adjures such courts to utilise their trained discretion while considering an application for pre-arrest bail (*Vijay Babu v. State of Kerala*, 2022 (4) KLT 24). Pre-arrest bail requires courts to balance protecting individual liberty against ensuring an unhindered investigation, preventing both unjustified detention and undue interference with the law enforcement. The two Constitutional Benches of the Supreme Court in [*Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565 and *Sushila Aggarwal and Others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Another*, (2020) 5 SCC 1] after considering the entire gamut of law relating to pre-arrest bail, held that while considering an application for anticipatory bail, the court must be granted by considerations such as nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, the facts of the case, the character of evidence, position and status of the



-:12:-

accused with reference to the victim and witnesses, the likelihood of the accused being fled from justice and repeating the offence, the possibility of the accused tampering with the evidence and obstructing with the cause of justice. Seriousness of the allegation or the availability of the material in support thereof are not the only considerations for declining anticipatory bail (*Vinod Bhandari v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (2015) 11 SCC 502).

12. The 3rd respondent categorically stated both in the FIS and in her statement recorded before the learned Magistrate under Section 183 of BNSS, that she had been in an intimate relationship with the applicant since January 2025. She further stated that the genesis of the relationship could be traced to a friend request sent by the applicant on Facebook, pursuant to which he obtained her mobile phone number and thereafter initiated contact with her, being the first to place telephonic as well as video calls. That was a time she was living separately from her husband. Over time, the friendship became an intimate bond and turned into a physical relationship. She admitted that



-:13:-

on the previous day of her birthday, i.e., on 27/1/2025, she went to the flat of the applicant at Palakkad and stayed there for two days. During the said stay, they had consensual sexual intercourse multiple times. She further admitted that she had consensual sex with the applicant on 4/3/2025 at her rented apartment in Thrikkannapuram. However, it was alleged that on that day, the applicant bit all over her body and slapped her face. After the said date, she missed her periods suggesting pregnancy. According to the 3rd respondent, the first incident of assault took place on 17/3/2025 when the applicant visited her at her apartment. It is alleged that immediately upon his arrival, the applicant interrogated her as to whether she had disclosed their relationship to any third party. Upon her denial, the applicant became enraged, forcibly dragged her into the bedroom, pushed her onto the bed, coerced her into removing all her clothes and recorded the nude video. It is further alleged that, thereafter, on 5/4/2025, she conducted a pregnancy test and confirmed that she was pregnant.



-:14:-

13. The first incident of sexual assault alleged by the 3rd respondent was on 22/4/2025, at her apartment. It is alleged that on that day, the applicant subjected her to repeated acts of sexual assault throughout the day, knowing well that she was pregnant and physically weak. It is further alleged that on the same day, he gave her two pregnancy aborting tablets and threatened her that he would commit suicide if she did not consume the tablets. The second incident of sexual assault alleged by the 3rd respondent was in the last week of May, 2025 without specifying any particular date, at the flat of the applicant at Palakkad. It is alleged that the 3rd respondent went to Palakkad and stayed at his flat for two days, and during the said stay, the applicant forcefully sexually assaulted her. She further stated that the applicant persisted in attempting to coerce her into consuming the abortion pill, which she steadfastly refused. Thereafter, the applicant reiterated his threats, stating that he would pay with his own life should she refuse to undergo an abortion. According to her, acting under sustained intimidation



-:15:-

and coercion arising from repeated threats of suicide made by the applicant, she was compelled to consume the medication against her will on 30/5/2025.

14. The non-bailable offences alleged against the applicant are Section 64(2)(f) of the BNS (rape by a relative, guardian or teacher or a person in a position of trust or authority towards the woman), Section 64(2)(h) of the BNS (rape on a woman knowing her to be pregnant), Section 64(2)(m) of the BNS (repeated act of rape on the same woman), and Section 89 of the BNS (causing miscarriage without the woman's consent). The incidents constituting the offence of rape [Sections 64(2)(f), 64(2)(h), 64(2)(m) and 89] were alleged to have taken place on 22/4/2025 at the apartment of the 3rd respondent and in the last week of May, 2025 at the flat of the applicant. The incident constituting the offence of causing forced miscarriage had taken place on 30/5/2025. Out of the rest of the incidents, the sexual intercourse took place on 27/1/2025 and 28/1/2025 at the flat of the applicant at Palakkad, were purely consensual in nature and



-:16:-

no offence was attracted. The sexual intercourse that took place on 4/3/2025 at the apartment of the 3rd respondent was also consensual in nature. The other allegation that the applicant bit on the body of the 3rd respondent and slapped her face on that day would only attract the offence under Section 115 (2) of the BNS, which is bailable in nature. Similarly, the incident that took place on 17/3/2025 at the apartment of the 3rd respondent would attract the offence under Section 351(3) of the BNS and Section 66E of the IT Act, which are also bailable in nature.

15. While the 3rd respondent alleges that the sexual intercourse on 22/4/2025 and in the last week of May, 2025 was against her will, without her consent and forceful in nature, the applicant asserts that they were purely consensual in nature and a romantic relationship between him and the 3rd respondent has been converted into a case of rape without any basis, merely because subsequently the relationship turned sour. The learned Sessions Judge did not specifically enter into a finding whether the alleged sexual acts between the applicant and the 3rd



-:17:-

respondent were consensual or non-consensual. On the other hand, the learned Sessions Judge in paragraph 16 of Annexure -III order observed that the allegation of rape initially with the consent and thereafter against the will of the 3rd respondent and without her consent is not supported by any material. Holding so, the learned Sessions Judge went on to consider the allegation of forced miscarriage and concluded that there are *prima facie* materials to show instances of causing miscarriage by the applicant without the consent of the 3rd respondent; hence Section 89 of the BNS is attracted, and accordingly the bail was rejected.

16. The two incidents of alleged sexual assault that occurred on 22/4/2025 and in the last week of May 2025 should not be viewed in isolation to determine whether they are consensual or non-consensual. Instead, the entire relationship between the applicant and the 3rd respondent, from January 2025 until 27/11/2025, when the 3rd respondent filed a complaint against the applicant, must be considered holistically to



-:18:-

understand the true nature of their relationship to assess whether the applicant has made a case for pre-arrest bail. It is acknowledged that the 3rd respondent was a married woman who developed an intimate relationship with the applicant while her marriage was ongoing. The marriage of the 3rd respondent took place on 22/8/2024. She became acquainted with the applicant in January 2025. Although the 3rd respondent contended that her marriage lasted only four days, this claim is proven false upon examining Ext.P2, a photograph dated 8/1/2025, produced by the applicant. The 3rd respondent admitted that her initial brief interactions with the applicant quickly developed into a deeply committed relationship and on 27/1/2025, she voluntarily travelled from Thiruvananthapuram to Palakkad and stayed at the applicant's flat for two days, during which she had multiple consensual sexual encounters with him. She further acknowledged that, at the applicant's request, she leased an apartment in Thrikkannapuram, Thiruvananthapuram, and had consensual sex there on 4/3/2025. She also confirmed that she



-:19:-

became pregnant, which was confirmed on 5/4/2025. The two incidents of forced sexual assault are alleged to have occurred thereafter.

17. According to the 3rd respondent, the applicant allegedly subjected her to forceful sexual assault without consent on four to five occasions on 22/4/2025 and thereafter compelled her to consume tablets to terminate the pregnancy. However, in the last week of May 2025, the 3rd respondent voluntarily visited the applicant's flat at Palakkad and stayed there for two days. She claims that despite being mentally disturbed after the incident on 22/4/2025, she went to the applicant's flat again at his request. It appears improbable that the 3rd respondent, having suffered such a brutal assault on 22/4/2025, would willingly visit and stay at the applicant's residence within a month. She further alleges that another act of forceful sexual assault occurred during that stay, yet she continued to remain in the flat for two days without asserting that she attempted to leave but was restrained. This conduct *prima facie* suggests the existence of a consensual



-:20:-

sexual relationship, though the matter requires final adjudication at trial.

18. It is difficult to believe that the 3rd respondent, being a married and mature woman, would invite the applicant to her apartment and subsequently travel to Palakkad to stay with him unless she was willing to engage in a physical relationship. The absence of any contemporaneous complaint on these occasions reinforces this inference. Moreover, the WhatsApp chats between the applicant and the 3rd respondent, as well as between the 3rd respondent and the accused No. 2, reveal an intense personal relationship and do not indicate any element of coercion or force. Taken together, these circumstances point towards the likelihood of consensual sexual intercourse on 22/4/2025 and again in the last week of May 2025.

19. Not every instance of consensual sexual intercourse in a failed relationship can be characterised as rape. Where two adults voluntarily consent to engage in sexual relations and continue such activity over a prolonged period, it can only be



-:21:-

construed as an act of mutual choice or promiscuity, not as sexual assault by one partner against the other. The Supreme Court has expressed serious concern over the recent trend of invoking rape laws to criminalise the breakdown of consensual relationships. In ***Mahesh Damu Khare v. State of Maharashtra and Another*** [(2024) 11 SCC 398], the Court observed a disturbing tendency to treat long-standing consensual relationships as criminal once they collapse. Similarly, in ***Prashant v. State of NCT of Delhi*** [(2025) 5 SCC 764], it was held that the mere breakup of a relationship between consenting adults cannot justify the initiation of criminal proceedings. Most recently, in ***Pramod Kumar Navratna v. State of Chhattisgarh*** [2026 KLT OnLine 1217 (SC)], the Court emphasised that the offence of rape, being of the gravest kind, must be invoked only in cases involving genuine sexual violence, coercion, or absence of free consent. The Court has thus condemned the practice of converting every soured relationship into an allegation of rape, cautioning against the misuse of the criminal justice system for personal grievances.



-:22:-

20. Taking into account the circumstances discussed above, I am not persuaded that the sexual relationship, which both parties admit to having maintained, was devoid of the 3rd respondent's consent, as she now alleges.

21. It is undisputed that the 3rd respondent terminated her pregnancy by consuming tablets supplied by accused No. 2. According to her, this was the result of continuous pressure, threats, and coercion exerted by the applicant and accused No. 2. In support of this allegation, reliance has been placed on the WhatsApp chats between the applicant and the 3rd respondent including the voice clips which is described in the mahazar. The said chats indicate that the applicant was unwilling to continue with the pregnancy and insisted that the 3rd respondent should undergo an abortion. However, when considered alongside Annexures 5 to 7 transcripts of the WhatsApp chats between the accused No. 2 and the 3rd respondent, it appears that the 3rd respondent ultimately consented to terminate the pregnancy. Annexures 5 to 7 WhatsApp chats further reveals that the 3rd



-:23:-

respondent herself requested tablets for abortion, shared her location, and received the medicine from the accused No.2. These circumstances *prima facie* suggest that the 3rd respondent voluntarily consumed the pills. For Section 89 of the BNS to be attracted, the act must have occurred without the woman's consent. Whether such consent was vitiated by force, coercion, or undue influence as alleged by the 3rd respondent is a matter to be established through evidence during trial.

22. The learned DGP submitted that the applicant is in the habit of committing sexual assault against women through the same *modus operandi*, and three other FIRs filed against him would substantiate the same. Admittedly, all three of those crimes were registered after the registration of the present crime. Thus, it cannot be treated as criminal antecedents. The moral virtues or the lack of them in a person accused of an offence cannot be the criterion for determining the legality of any issue raised against him before a court of law. Law and morality are not equivalent to each other. That apart, it is settled that criminal



-:24:-

antecedents are not a bar to grant pre-arrest bail to an accused if he is otherwise entitled to it.

23. The learned DGP further submitted that the mobile phone used by the applicant for recording the nude videos of the 3rd respondent has to be recovered and examined, and for the said purpose, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary. In *Sushila Aggarwal* (supra), it was held by the Supreme Court that “limited custody” or “deemed custody” would be sufficient in appropriate cases to facilitate the requirements of the investigating authority, including for fulfilling the provisions of Section 27 of the Evidence Act. Therefore, the applicant can be directed to produce his mobile phone before the investigating officer. The prosecution has not been able to convince this court that custodial interrogation is necessary for any other purpose.

24. On consideration of the above-mentioned circumstances, I am of the view that the applicant ought to be given the benefit of pre-arrest bail, subject to the condition of



-:25:-

limited custody to the investigating officer as contemplated in the decision of the Supreme Court in *Sushila Aggarwal* (supra).

Accordingly, the bail application is allowed on the following conditions:

(i) The applicant shall appear before the investigating officer on 16/2/2026 at 10:00 a.m. for interrogation.

(ii) He shall surrender his mobile phone/s before the investigating officer on that day.

(iii) The applicant can be interrogated for the next three days from 10.00 a.m to 4.00 p.m. every day, if required, after giving adequate intervals.

(iv) The applicant shall be deemed to be under custody during the aforesaid period for facilitating the requirements of investigation, including to undergo medical examination or potency test.

(v) If the investigating officer intends to arrest the applicant, then he shall be released on bail on executing a bond for ₹1,00,000/- (Rupees One lakh only) with two solvent sureties



-:26:-

each for the like sum each before the investigating officer.

(vi) The applicant shall fully cooperate with the investigation.

(vii) The applicant shall appear before the investigating officer between 10.00 a.m. and 11.00 a.m. every Second Saturday until further orders. He shall also appear before the investigating officer as and when required.

(viii) The applicant shall not commit any offence of a like nature while on bail.

(ix) The applicant shall not attempt to contact the 3rd respondent or any of the prosecution witnesses, directly or through any other person, or in any other way try to tamper with the evidence or influence any witnesses or other persons related to the investigation.

(x) The applicant shall not leave the State of Kerala without the permission of the trial Court.

(xi) The applicant shall surrender his passport, if any, before the investigating officer.



-:27:-

(xii) The application, if any, for deletion/modification of bail conditions or cancellation of bail on the grounds of violating the bail conditions shall be filed at the jurisdictional trial court.

sd/-

DR. KAUSER EDAPPAGATH

JUDGE

Rp



APPENDIX OF BAIL APPL. NO. 14427 OF 2025

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

Annexure I	THE DECISION OF HON'BLE APEX COURT IN MAHESH DAMU KARE V. THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
Annexure II	THE DECISION OF THE HON'BLE APEX IN JOTHIRAGAVAN V. THE STATE REP BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE AND ORS
Annexure III	THE ORDER OF THE COURT OF SESSIONS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT IN CRL MC NO.3585/2025 DATED 4.12.2025
Annexure IV	CERTIFIED COPY OF FIR AND FIS IN CRIME NO.1750/2025 OF NEMON POLICE STATION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

RESPONDENT ANNEXURES

Annexure R3(a)	TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPH OF THE WOUND INFLICTED BY THE ACCUSED DATED 4/3/2025.
Annexure R3(b)	TRUE COPY OF THE WHATSAPP CHAT WHERE THE ACCUSED STATES HIS DESIRE TO HAVE A CHILD WITH THE DE FACTO COMPLAINANT, DATED FEBRUARY 2025
Annexure R3(c)	TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE WOUNDS INFLICTED BY THE ACCUSED DURING THE RAPE WHILE THE DEFACTO COMPLAINANT WAS PREGNANT, DATED 24.4.2025.
Annexure R3(d)	TRUE COPY OF THE WHATSAPP CHAT WHERE THE ACCUSED THREATENS TO COMMIT SUICIDE, DATED MAY 2025
Annexure R3(e)	TRUE COPY OF THE WHATSAPP CHAT BETWEEN THE ACCUSED AND DEFACTO COMPLAINANT WHERE THE ACCUSED DEMANDS THAT THE CHAT BE DELETED



-:29:-

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| ANNEXURE 5 | A TRUE COPY OF HTE SCREEN RECORDING OF THE WHATSAPP CHAT ON 30/5/2025 BETWEEN 2ND ACCUSED AND VICTIM |
| ANNEXURE 6 | THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE ANNEXURE 5 WHATSAPP CHAT DATED 30.5.2025 BETWEEN 2ND ACCUSED AND VICTIM |
| ANNEXURE 7 | THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE AUDIO MESSAGES DATED 30.5.2025 AT 9.28 AM AND 9.29 AM |
| Annexure-8 | A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28.01.2026 IN BA NO 43/2026 PASSED BY THE COURT OF SESSIONS, PATHANAMTHITTA |