



## Indian Law Reports - Kerala Series

### Abridged Index

#### ILR - INDEX OF REPORTED CASES dt. 15.07.2026

**Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)**—Legal principles on interference with acquittals, explained - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)**—Procedure—Judicial propriety—It is trite law that a Judge has to decide a case based on the evidence available in the case—There is no restriction for a Judge to try or to hear a case or an appeal arising out of a totally different case, merely on the ground that the appellant/litigant there was tried and convicted by the same Judge earlier in another case - Rajan V.K. v. State - [I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212](#).

**Criminal Law**—Sentencing—It is to be borne in mind that the SC/ST victims are full citizens entitled to the equal protection of the law and that those who deny them that dignity will face consequences that the ordinary law of crimes does not contemplate—The SC/ST (PoA) Act, being a special statute enacted for a specific protective purpose, overrides the general sentencing discretion available under the IPC and the Code of Criminal Procedure—Court highlighted that the judgment addresses all those persons who were present at the spot yet chose to look away—Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Central Act 33 of 1989)—Sections 3(1)(d), 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v) and 3(2)(va) – Penal Code (Central Act 45 of 1860)—Section 304 Part II - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Easements Act, 1882 (Central Act 5 of 1882)**—Section 15—Easement by prescription—Claim to prescriptive easement through reserved forest land—Right of way over forest land cannot be enforced unless recognised through an agreement under Section 16 of the Kerala Forest Act, 1961—Person claiming right of way over reserved forest obliged to alert authorities and have the right recognised under law—Failure to comply with requirements of Section 16 of the Kerala Forest Act, 1961—Civil Court cannot make unilateral declaration of right over reserved forest land without following procedure prescribed under the Kerala Forest Act, 1961—Use of reserved forest for non-forest purposes requires prior approval of Central Government and State Government cannot permit any person to use the reserved forest for non-forest purposes, unless so permitted—Kerala Forest Act, 1961 (Kerala Act 4 of 1962)—Sections 16, 18, 19, and 20—Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 (Central Act 69 of 1980)—Section 2 - Range Officer, Kottoor Forest Reserve and another v. Anil Kumar - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 210 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:37026](#).

**Evidence Act, 1872 (Central Act 1 of 1872)**—Section 114—Absence of motive, the absence of opportunity, combined with the medical impossibility as per the timing, as per the available evidence, together constitute a complete answer to the allegation of custodial torture—Routine corrections in the working registers of a busy government hospital, made by the examining Doctor by reference to a clock, are not evidence of manipulation—Documents prepared by officials in their official capacity, carry the presumption under Section 114 of the Evidence Act that official acts have been regularly performed—Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860)—143, 147, 323, 324, 326, 294(b), 342, 352, 364, 367, 368, and 302 r/w. Section 149—Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Central Act 33 of 1989)—Sections 3(1)(d), 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v) and 3(2)(va) - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Evidence Act, 1872 (Central Act 1 of 1872)**—Sections 22A, 59 and 65B—It is not the requirement of law that the contents of the video would become admissible only if it is reduced to a transcript in the words of a witness who created the video or is noticed in the video—They do not require each person visible in the footage to step into the witness box and narrate in their own words what is being shown—Oral narration of contents of electronic records is unnecessary, unless its authenticity is challenged—Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 293 - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Information Technology Act, 2000 (Central Act 21 of 2000)** – Section 79A – Absence of notification under Section 79A of the Information Technology Act does

not render the electronic and digital evidence inadmissible, nor does it vitiate the reports issued by the State Forensic Science Laboratory – In the absence of a specific statutory prohibition, the Court cannot read into Section 79A a consequence that has not been expressly provided by the legislature – Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 02 of 1974) – Section 293 – Evidence Act (Central Act 01 of 1872) – Sections 45, 45A and 136 - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860)**—Section 149—Twin principles relevant to the case at hand explained—Membership in an unlawful assembly requires proof beyond reasonable doubt that the person concerned shared the common object of the assembly or at least knew of such common object at the time of joining it - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860)**—Section 299, 300, 302 and Section 304 Part II—Court examined whether the case would fall within the ambit of culpable homicide amounting to murder, and held otherwise - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Central Act 33 of 1989)**—Sections 3(1)(d), 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v) 3(2)(va) and 8—As per Section 8, all that is required is proof that the accused had personal knowledge of the victim or his family—Once evidence establishing such knowledge is available, the Court is bound to draw the statutory presumption that the accused were aware of the caste or tribal identity of the victim, unless the contrary is proved—In view of the overwhelming evidence let in by the prosecution, the statutory presumption of knowledge of the victim's tribal identity should have been triggered automatically and the burden would have shifted to the accused to disprove that knowledge—Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860) —143,147, 323, 324, 326, 294(b), 342, 352, 364, 367, 368, and 302 r/w. Section 149 - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Central Act 33 of 1989)**—Sections 3(1)(d), 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v) and 3(2)(va)—Accused taking law into their own hands coupled with the humiliation meted out to deceased would establish their motive beyond any reasonable doubt—Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860)—143, 147, 323, 324, 326, 294(b), 342, 352, 364, 367, 368, and 302 r/w. Section 149 - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026: KER : 35892](#).

**Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Central Act 33 of 1989)**—Sections 3(1)(d), 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v) and 3(2)(va)—Object of the statute explained—Court lamented that Witness Protection Scheme, 2018, exists only in theory—Court highlighted the challenges faced by criminal justice process—Constitution of India—Articles 14, 15, 17 21, 38 and 46 - Hussain v. State of Kerala and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 212 : [Neutral Citation No.2026 : KER : 35892](#).

**Pl. visit our website- [www.ilrkerala.gov.in](http://www.ilrkerala.gov.in)**

**\*\*\*\*\***