

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

1



2025:KER:66503

"CR"

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.G.ARUN

WEDNESDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF AUGUST 2025 / 22ND SRAVANA, 1947

CRL.MC NO. 5765 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED 24.04.2025 IN CRMP
NO.1537 OF 2025 OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT & SESSIONS
COURT - VII/RENT CONTROL APPELLATE AUTHORITY, ERNAKULAM /
III ADDITIONAL MACT, ERNAKULAM.

PETITIONER:

SHONE GEORGE,
AGED 41 YEARS
S/O P.C. GEORGE, RESIDING AT PLATHOTTAM,
ARUVITHARA P.O, ERATTUPETTA, KOTTAYAM,
PIN - 686122

BY ADVS.
SMT.MARIYA RAJAN
SRI.SHINU J.PILLAI
SMT.S.SUJA
SMT.ANN MARIYA JOHN
SHRI.FELIX SAMSON VARGHESE

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

2



2025:KER:66503

RESPONDENTS :

- 1 UNION OF INDIA,
REPRESENTED THROUGH SENIOR ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,
SERIOUS FRAUD INVESTIGATION OFFICE (SFIO) ,
MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS, GOVT OF INDIA,
REGIONAL OFFICE, CORPORATE BHAWAN, NO: 29, RAJAJI
SALAI, CHENNAI, PIN - 600001

- 2 COCHIN MINERALS AND RUTILE LTD.
P.B.NO.73, VIII/224, MARKET ROAD, ALWAYS, COCHIN,
KERALA, REPRESENTED BY ITS CGM-FINANCE AND
COMPANY SECRETARY AND ALSO THE AUTHORISED
SIGNATORY, MR.SURESH KUMAR.P (IMPLEADED)

BY ADVS.
O.M.SHALINA, DEPUTY SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA
SRI.V.JOHN SEBASTIAN RALPH

OTHER PRESENT:

SMT. O.M. SHALINA FOR DSGI.
SRI. ARSHDEEP SINGH KHURANA FOR R2.

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING BEEN FINALLY ON
05.08.2025, THE COURT ON 13.08.2025 ALONG WITH CONNECTED
CASES AND PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

3



2025:KER:66503

"CR"

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.G.ARUN

WEDNESDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF AUGUST 2025 / 22ND SRAVANA, 1947

CRL.MC NO. 6537 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED IN CRMP NO.1803 OF
2025 OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT & SESSIONS COURT -
VII/RENT CONTROL APPELLATE AUTHORITY, ERNAKULAM / III
ADDITIONAL MACT, ERNAKULAM

PETITIONER:

COCHIN MINERALS AND RUTILE LTD. (CMRL)
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT P.B.NO. 73.
VIII/224, MARKET ROAD, ALWAYS, COCHIN, KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CGM - FINANCE AND COMPANY
SECRETARY AND ALSO THE AUTHORISED SIGNATORY, MR.
SURESH KUMAR P., PIN - 683101

BY ADVS.

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

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

4



2025:KER:66503

RESPONDENTS :

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

- 2 SHONE GEORGE
S/O. P.C GEORGE, RESIDING AT PLATHOTTAM,
ARUVITHURA P.O., ERATTUPETTA, KOTTAYAM, KERALA,
PIN - 686121

- 3 UNION OF INDIA
REPRESENTED THROUGH SHRI. PRABHU K., SENIOR
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, SERIOUS FRAUD INVESTIGATION
OFFICER (SFIO), MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS,
GOVT. OF INDIA, REGIONAL OFFICE, CORPORATE BHAWAN,
NO. 29, RAJAJI SALAI, CHENNAI, PIN - 688881

BY ADVS.
SMT.MARIYA RAJAN
O.M.SHALINA, DEPUTY SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA
SRI.SHINU J.PILLAI
SMT.S.SUJA
SMT.ANN MARIYA JOHN
SHRI.FELIX SAMSON VARGHESE

OTHER PRESENT:

SRI. ARSHDEEP SINGH KHURANA FOR THE PETITIONER.
SMT. O.M. SHALINA, FOR DSGI. SRI. AJITH MURALI,
PP.

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING BEEN FINALLY ON
05.08.2025, THE COURT ON 13.08.2025 ALONG WITH CONNECTED
CASES AND PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

5



2025:KER:66503

“CR”

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.G.ARUN

WEDNESDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF AUGUST 2025 / 22ND SRAVANA, 1947

CRL.MC NO. 6409 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT DATED IN CRMP NO.1851 OF
2025 OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT & SESSIONS COURT -
VII/RENT CONTROL APPELLATE AUTHORITY, ERNAKULAM / III
ADDITIONAL MACT, ERNAKULAM

PETITIONER:

COCHIN MINERALS AND RUTILE LTD. (CMRL)
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT P.B.NO. 73.
VIII/224, MARKET ROAD, ALWAYE, COCHIN, KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CGM - FINANCE AND COMPANY
SECRETARY AND ALSO THE AUTHORISED SIGNATORY, MR.
SURESH KUMAR P, PIN - 683101

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

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

6



2025:KER:66503

RESPONDENTS :

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF
KERALA, PIN - 682031
- 2 SHONE GEORGE
S/O. P.C GEORGE, RESIDING AT PLATHOTTAM,
ARUVITHURA P.O.,
ERATTUPETTA, KOTTAYAM, KERALA, PIN - 686121
- 3 UNION OF INDIA
REPRESENTED THROUGH SHRI. PRABHU K., SENIOR
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, SERIOUS FRAUD INVESTIGATION
OFFICER (SFIO), MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS,
GOVT. OF INDIA, REGIONAL OFFICE,
CORPORATE BHAWAN, NO. 29, RAJAJI SALAI,
CHENNAI, PIN - 688881

BY ADVS.

SMT.MARIYA RAJAN
O.M.SHALINA, DEPUTY SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA
SRI.SHINU J.PILLAI
SMT.S.SUJA
SMT.ANN MARIYA JOHN
SHRI.FELIX SAMSON VARGHESE

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING BEEN FINALLY ON
05.08.2025, THE COURT ON 13.08.2025 ALONG WITH CONNECTED
CASES AND PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases



2025:KER:66503

“CR”

V.G.ARUN, J

=====

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765,6537 and 6409 of 2025

=====

Dated this the 13th day of August, 2025

ORDER

The petitioner in Crl.M.C.No.5765 of 2025 claims to be the whistleblower at whose instance the Central Government assigned the investigation into the affairs of three companies namely Exalogic Solutions Private Limited, Cochin Minerals And Rutile Limited ('CMRL' for short) and Kerala State Industrial Development Corporation Limited, with the Serious Fraud Investigation Office ('SFIO' for short). After investigation, the SFIO filed a complaint (Crl.M.P.No.1537 of 2025) before the Additional Sessions Court-VII (Special Court under the Companies Act), Ernakulam. Later, the petitioner submitted Annexure A5 application before the Special Court, seeking issuance of certified copies of the complaint filed by



SFIO along with the accompanying documents. By Annexure A6 order dated 24.04.2025, the Special Judge directed to issue certified copy of the complaint on usual terms, as there is no facility for giving copies of voluminous documents. The petitioner also preferred Annexure A8 application seeking issuance of certified copies of the investigation report filed by the SFIO along with its annexures. By Annexure A9 order dated 29.04.2025, the Special Judge ordered to issue the certified copies on usual terms. Accordingly, a copy of the investigation report was furnished to the petitioner. The prayer in Crl.M.C. No.5765 of 2025 is to set aside Annexures A6 and A9 orders and direct the Special Court to issue certified copies of all documents forming part of the complaint filed by the SFIO.

2. When Crl.M.C.No.5765 of 2025 came up for consideration, this Court directed the Registry to call for a report from the Special Court as to why copies of the documents cannot be issued, if the petitioner is prepared to



bear the expenses. At that stage, the CMRL, one of the respondents in the complaint filed by the SFIO, moved Crl.M.C.Nos.6537 of 2025 and 6409 of 2025, seeking to quash Annexure A6 and A9 orders by which the Special Court had directed to issue certified copies of the complaint and other documents.

3. Heard, Adv.Shinu J Pillai for the petitioner in Crl.M.C.No.5765 of 2025, Senior Advocate Arshdeep Singh Khurana for the petitioner in Crl.M.C.Nos.6537 and 6409 of 2025, Advocate Ajith Murali, the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and Advocate O.M.Shalina, the learned Deputy Solicitor General of India for the Central Government. For the sake of convenience, Shone George, the petitioner in Crl.M.C.No.5765 of 2025 is referred to as the petitioner in this order and the Cochin Minerals and Rutile Ltd., the petitioner in Crl.M.C.Nos.6537 and 6409 of 2025, as the respondent. The documents and orders referred to are described as in Crl.M.C.No.5765 of 2025.



4. Assailing the order of the Special Court, directing to issue certified copies of the documents sought by the petitioner, the learned Senior Counsel made the following submissions;

The petitioner is a total stranger to the proceedings pending before the Special Court and his claim of being the whistleblower and de facto complainant is without basis. There is no mention about the petitioner either in the order directing investigation by the SFIO or in the complaint. The attempt of the petitioner is only to make political mileage by tarnishing the image of the respondent and others. The proceedings in Crl.M.P.No.1537 of 2025 is stayed by the High Court of Delhi as per order dated 28.05.2025 in W.P.(Crl) No.1188 of 2024 filed by the respondent. Further, in the suit for damages (O.S.No.104 of 2025) filed by the respondent, the Subordinate Judge's Court, Ernakulam had granted an *ex parte* interim injunction, restraining the petitioner, his agents or associates



2025:KER:66503

from distributing, transmitting/re-publishing or releasing the defamatory contents of the statements made by the petitioner. The interim injunction order was later made absolute, after hearing the petitioner. The attempt of the petitioner is to obtain certified copies from the Special Court and to use them for tarnishing the image and reputation of the respondent, *de hors* the injunction order passed by the civil court. In fact, the petitioner himself had told the media about his intention. In his applications, the petitioner has stated that the certified copies are sought for taking measures for disgorgement of the assets of the companies under Section 212(14A) of the Companies Act. The said reasoning is erroneous since the power to take action for disgorgement under Section 212(14A) is vested only with the Central Government.

5. According to the Senior Counsel, the impugned orders are bad for non application of mind and absence of reasons also. This Court's decision in **Ismail P.M. v. Muhammad Ameer-ul-Islam and Another** [2022 (2) KHC 660] and that of



the Madras High Court in **Karthik Dasari v. State** [2022 SCC OnLine Mad 1412] are pressed into service to contend that the court directing to issue copies of documents should be satisfied about the purpose for which the copies are applied for and such satisfaction should be discernible from the order.

6. In order to refute the allegation that the petitioner is a stranger to the proceedings, learned counsel for the petitioner referred to Annexure A1 interim order, in the writ petition filed by the petitioner, directing the Central Government Counsel to get instructions as to whether an investigation by the SFIO has been ordered or found warranted based on petitioner's complaint. Drawing attention to Annexure A11, copy of the writ petition filed by the respondent before the High Court of Delhi, it is pointed out that the specific averment therein is that the petitioner is behind the order directing SFIO investigation into the affairs of the company.

7. The learned counsel contended that, being an interested person, the petitioner is entitled to get copies of the



2025:KER:66503

documents under Section 212(13) of the Companies Act, since the complaint is pending before the Special Court for Companies Act cases. To buttress the argument that being the Special Court, provisions of the Companies Act will prevail over the Criminal Rules of Practice, Kerala, the legal maxim *Generalia Specialibus Non Derogant* (general things do not derogate from special things) and the decision of the High Court of Delhi in **Ashish Bhalla v. State and Another** [2023 SCC OnLine Del 5818] are pressed into service.

8. Indisputably, the orders under challenge are issued in purported exercise of the power under Rule 226 of the Criminal Rules of Practice, Kerala ('the Rules' for short), formulated by the High Court for the guidance of all criminal courts in the State. Chapter XXV of the Rules deals with issuance of certified copies and Rule 222 therein provides for application of copies by parties, while Rule 226 permits submission of application for copies by strangers. As per Rule 226, the applicant has to file a duly verified petition, setting forth the



purpose for which the copy is required, and the court is bound to pass an order on that petition, except when the application is for certified copy of a judgment. Here, it is essential to note that Section 363(6) of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides for grant of copies of any judgment or order of a criminal court to any person on payment, subject to such conditions as the High Court may, by rules, provide. Going by sub-section 5 of Section 363, a person affected by a judgment or order of a criminal court is also entitled for a copy of such judgment or order or deposition or other part of the record, on payment or otherwise. From a conjoint reading of sub-sections 5 and 6 of Section 363, along with Rules 222 and 226, it is clear that a stranger to the proceedings is not entitled for certified copies of the records as of right. Rule 226 only allows the stranger to apply for the copies and it is the duty of the court concerned to consider the purpose set forth in the verified petition and decide whether to issue the copies. Being vested with such a duty, the reason for allowing or rejecting the prayer for



issuance of certified copies should be discernible from the order passed by the court. The law on the point is expounded in the Division Bench decision in **Ismail P.M.** (supra). Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the judgment being contextually relevant, are extracted hereunder;

“4. R.226 of the Criminal Rules of Practice, Kerala, 1982 is also extracted hereunder:

"226. Application for copies by strangers. -Except in the case of judgments, applications for the grant of copies of any proceedings or documents by a stranger to the proceeding shall be allowed only by order of the Court obtained on a petition duly verified setting forth the purpose for which the copy is required."

(underlined for emphasis)

5. It is clear from the Rules extracted above that, insofar as strangers are concerned, their entitlement for copies of records, except judgments, is subject to an enabling order by the Court, on a verified petition setting forth the purpose for which the copy is required. The word "only" occurring in R.129 of the High Court of Kerala and R.226 of the Criminal Rules of Practice, Kerala extracted above underscores the rigour in the matter of issuing certified copies to strangers. Besides, both the rules speak of the requirement to set forth the purpose for which copy is required,



which implies that the Court which makes an order directing issuance of copy should be satisfied of the purpose for which certified copy is sought for.”

9. The Madras High Court in **Karthik Dasari** (supra) also dealt with this aspect elaborately and held as under;

“Just because the affidavit discloses the purpose for which the copy is required, it does not mean that the third party would be automatically entitled to the certified copy of the document sought by him. The expression "shall be allowed only by an order of the Court" qualifies the subsequent requirement, viz., obtained on a petition supported by an affidavit setting for the purpose for which the copy is required. A fortiori, if a person makes a third party copy application, he is required to file an affidavit setting forth the purpose for which the copy is required. On that affidavit and petition, the judicial officer is required to pass a judicial order whether to grant or refuse to grant the certified copy. In a given case, the judicial officer can refuse to grant the certified copy, bearing in mind, the privacy rights of the victim and the accused and other factors. Sometimes, the bona fides of the third party may also be in a cloud. Therefore, the judicial officer is not required to mechanically grant certified copy of documents available in his Court to a third party, but is expected to adopt a judicious approach on a case-to-case basis and pass a judicial order. ”



10. As far as the cases under consideration are concerned, the prayers for issuance of certified copies were allowed in the following manner;

Crl.M.P.No.1803/2025
in
Crl.M.P.No.1537/2025

"There is no facility for giving copies of document which is voluminous.

Issue CC of complaint on usual terms."

"Crl.M.P.No.1851/2025
in
Crl.M.P.No.1537/2025

"Issue CC on usual terms."

It is thus evident that the certified copies were directed to be issued without considering the purpose stated in the applications. The cryptic manner in which the orders are passed has also rendered them unsustainable.

11. That leaves only the contention that, as per Section



212(13) of the Companies Act, any person concerned is entitled to obtain a copy of the investigation report by making an application in that regard to the court and the Companies Act being a special enactment, its provisions will prevail over the Criminal Rules of Practice. The above contention calls for a careful scrutiny of Section 212(13) of the Companies Act, extracted below for easy reference;

“Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or in any other law for the time being in force, a copy of the investigation report may be obtained by any person concerned by making an application in this regard to the court.”

(underlined for emphasis)

Going by the above provision, the person concerned is entitled only for a copy of the investigation report. As the petitioner is issued with a copy of Annexure A10 investigation report pursuant to Annexure A9 order of the Special Court, the requirement of sub-section 13 of Section 212 of the Companies Act stands satisfied. Therefore, it is not necessary to decide



2025:KER:66503

whether the petitioner is an interested person and whether Section 212(13) of the Companies Act will prevail over Rule 226 of the Criminal Rules of Practice. Suffice it to observe that, even accepting that an interested person can apply and obtain a copy of the investigation report by resorting to Section 212(13), insofar as the other documents are concerned, the submission of applications, their processing and the decision of the court can only be in accordance with Rule 226.

12. While on the subject, it will be appropriate to note that the Apex Court in **Saurav Das v. Union of India and Others** [(2023) 11 SCC 154] has declared that the copy of charge sheet along with the documents do not fall within the definition of public document in Section 74 of the Indian Evidence Act. Insofar as the documents, the certified copies of which are applied for, are not public documents, the question whether issuance of copies will infringe the privacy of the respondent/ accused cannot also be overlooked. Therefore, in cases where the court finds a possibility of the privacy of the

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

20



2025:KER:66503

parties being infringed, they are bound to be put on notice about the application. I request the Rules Committee to consider this aspect and decide whether to amend Rule 226 of the Rules by empowering the court to call for objections from the affected persons in appropriate cases.

For the aforementioned reasons, Crl.M.C.Nos.6537 and 6409 of 2025 are allowed and the orders passed in Crl.M.P.Nos.1803/2025 and 1851/2025 in Crl.M.P.No.1537 of 2025, are quashed. Consequently, Crl.M.C.No.5765 of 2025 is dismissed and the court below is directed to pass fresh reasoned orders on Crl.M.P.Nos.1803/2025 and 1851/2025 in Crl.M.P.No.1537 of 2025.

sd/-
V.G.ARUN, JUDGE

sj



APPENDIX OF CRL.MC 5765/2025

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

- Annexure A1 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER IN WRIT PETITION NO: 42092 OF 2023 DATED 15.01.2024
- Annexure A2 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 31.01.2024 ISSUED BY THE OFFICE OF DIRECTOR GENERAL CORPORATE AFFAIRS
- Annexure A3 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. SFIO/INV/AOI/2023-24 DATED 31.01.2024 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT
- Annexure A4 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P (C) NO: 42092 OF 2023 DATED 30.05.2024
- Annexure A5 TRUE COPY OF THE CRL MP NO: 1803 OF 2025 FILED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 21.04.2025
- Annexure A6 CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 24.04.2025 IN CRL MP NO: 1803 OF 2025
- Annexure A7 TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT AS ISSUED BY THE HON'BLE SPECIAL COURT AS PER THE ORDERS IN CRL MP NO: 1803 OF 2025
- Annexure A8 TRUE COPY OF THE CRL M P NO: 1851 OF 2025 FILED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 26.04.2025
- Annexure A9 CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER IN CRL M P NO: 1851 OF 2025 DATED 29.04.2025
- Annexure A10 TRUE COPY OF THE INVESTIGATION REPORT OF THE SERIOUS FRAUD INVESTIGATION OFFICE AS ISSUED BY THE HON'BLE SPECIAL COURT ERNAKULAM
- Annexure A11 True copy of the Writ Petition (Crl) No: 1188 of 2024 pending before the High Court of Delhi without its annexures



APPENDIX OF CRL.MC 6409/2025

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

- Annexure 1 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 29/4/25 IN CRL MP NO. 1851/25 IN CRL MP 1537/2025 ISSUED BY THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT VII ERNAKULAM
- Annexure 2 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM INJUNCTION ORDER DATED 23.05.2025 IN IA.NO5/2025 IN OS NO.104/2025 ISSUED BY THE HON'BLE SUBORDINATE JUDGE'S COURT, ERNAKULAM
- Annexure 3 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 25.06.2025 IN IA NO 5/2025 IN O.S. NO. 104/2025 ISSUED BY THE HON'BLE SUBORDINATE JUDGE'S COURT, ERNAKULAM
- Annexure 4 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 16.04.2025 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA IN CRL. REV. PET 442/2025
- Annexure 5 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 23.05.2025 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA IN CRL. REV. PET 442/2025
- Annexure 6 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28.05.2025, PASSED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF DELHI IN WP(CRL) 1188/2024
- Annexure 7 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 24/4/25 IN CRL MP 1803/25 IN CRL MP 1537/25 OF THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT - VII ERNAKULAM



APPENDIX OF CRL.MC 6537/2025

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

- Annexure 1 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 24/4/25 IN CRL MP NO. 1803/25 IN CRL MP 1537/2025 ISSUED BY THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT VII ERNAKULAM
- Annexure 2 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM INJUNCTION ORDER DATED 23.05.2025 IN IA.NO5/2025 IN OS NO.104/2025 ISSUED BY THE HON'BLE SUBORDINATE JUDGE'S COURT, ERNAKULAM
- Annexure 3 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 25.06.2025 IN IA NO 5/2025 IN O.S. NO. 104/2025 ISSUED BY THE HON'BLE SUBORDINATE JUDGE'S COURT, ERNAKULAM
- Annexure 4 TRUE COPY OF THE PLAINT FILED BY THE PETITIONER HEREIN IN IA NO 5/2025 IN O.S. NO. 104/2025
- Annexure 5 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FOR INTERIM INJUNCTION FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEING I.A. NO. 5/2025 IN O.S. NO. 104/2025
- Annexure 6 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 16.04.2025 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA IN CRL. REV. PET 442/2025
- Annexure 7 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 23.05.2025 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA IN CRL. REV. PET 442/2025
- Annexure 8 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28.05.2025, PASSED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF DELHI IN WP(CRL) 1188/2024
- Annexure 9 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 29.04.2025 ON CRL. M.P. NO. 1851/2025 IN CRL.M.P 1537/2025 ISSUED BY THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT & SESSIONS COURT-VII

Crl.M.C.Nos.5765/25
& con.cases

24



2025:KER:66503

Annexure 10

TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FILED BY
THE 2ND RESPONDENT HEREIN IN
CRL.MP.NO.1803/2025 IN CRL.M.P
1537/2025 BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL
DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT VII
ERNAKULAM

Annexure 11

TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FILED BY
THE 2ND RESPONDENT HEREIN IN
CRL.MP.NO.1851/2025 IN CRL.M.P
1537/2025 BEFORE THE THE ADDITIONAL
DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT VII
ERNAKULAM