

DISTRICT: DHUBRI

IN THE COURT OF THE SPECIAL JUDGE AT DHUBRI

PRESENT: Shri A. Chakravarty, M.A., LL.M., AJS

Special Case No. 26 of 2015

U/S 22 (b) of NDPS Act, corresponding to
G.R. (GKJ) Case No. 2013/2015

State of AssamComplainant

Versus

1. ShriNaba Barman
2. ShriManikAcharjee and
3. ShriJayantaKar ... Accused

Charge framed on : 12-10-2015

Evidence recorded on : 08-02-2016,15-03-2016, 18-06-2016, 02-07-2016,
16-08-2016, 06-02-2017, 18-02-2017, 27-03-2017
and 27-03-2017

Statement recorded on : 01-04-2017

Arguments heard on : 10-04-2017

Judgment delivered on : 28-04-2017

Advocates who appeared in this case are:

ShriManiruzZaman, P.P. for the Prosecution

ShriR.K. Jain, Advocate for the Defence

J U D G M E N T

1.In this case, the accused ShriNaba Barman, 2. ShriManikAcharjeeand 3. ShriJayantaKarhave been tried for commission of an offence punishable under Section 22 (b) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as "the NDPS Act").

2. The case of the prosecution in brief is that on 11-05-2015, at about 01:30 p.m., the Golakganj Police received secret information that in the ASTC bus bearing registration No.AS-21/6770, narcotic drugs were illegally carried from Coochbehar towards Goalpara side. The Officer-in-Charge of the Golakganj Police Station entered the said information in the General Diary Book vide entry No.234, dated 11-05-2015 and informed his superior officer about the matter.

3. Thereafter, accompanied by some police personnel, the informant went to Nandinipar and intercepted the bus bearing registration No.AS-21/6770 and recovered, (1) Nitrosun® Plus [Nitrazepam tablet IP] (20 tab [1 strip] X 300 strips =6000 Tablets) (2) SpasmoProxyvon® Plus [Dicyclomine Hydrochloride Tramadol Hydrochloride &Actaminophen Capsule] (24 cap [1 strips} X 360 strips = 8640 caps and (3) Eskuf [Codeine Phosphate &ChlorpheniramineMaleats Syrup] =200 bottles. The informant seized, sealed and packed the said articles, including the sample packets, at the place of occurrence and arrested the driver ManikAcharjee, conductor JayantaKar and handyman Naba Barman of the bus. Thereafter, he took the accused persons and the seized articles to the Golakganj Police Station and informed his superior officer about the matter. In the course of preliminary investigation, the informant came to know that the above named accused persons were involved in the commission of the said crime. Hence, he he lodged an FIR of the incident with the Golakganj Police Station.

4.Based on the FIR, the Officer In charge of the Golakganj Police Station registered the case No 289 of 2015, for an offence under Section 22 (c) of the NDPS Actagainst the accused Naba Barman, ManikAcharjee and JayantaKarand entrusted the Inspector of Police Jatin Ch. Das to investigate the case. Accordingly, he investigated the case. During the course of investigation, several

statements of witnesses were recorded and the samples of the seized narcotics drugs were sent to the Forensic Science Laboratory, Assam for examination. After examining the sample, Shri G. N. Deka, Deputy Director, Drugs and Narcotics Division, DFS, Assam issued a report stating that some of the samples gave positive tests for Nitrazepam and Codeine. Therefore, the police submitted charge sheet for an offence under Section 27 (c) of the NDPS Act against accused Naba Barman, ManikAcharjeeand JayantaKar.

5. During trial, my learned predecessor framed a charge under Section 22 (b) of the NDPS Act against accused Naba Barman, ManikAcharjeeand JayantaKar. When the contents of the charge was read over and explained to the accused persons, they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. The prosecution, in order to prove its case, examined ten witnesses. The accused did not examine any witness.

7. In their examination under Section 313 Cr.P.C., the accused have denied the prosecution case and have stated that the allegations levelled against them are false and baseless.

8. The point for determination in this case is:-

Whether that on 11-05-2015, at around 01:00 p.m., at Nandinipar, on the National Highway 31, under Golakganj Police Station, the accused Naba Barman, ManikAcharjee and JayantaKar were found possessing 6000 Nitrosun Plus Tablets, each tablet containing 9.10 mg Nitrozepam, 200 bottles of Eskuf cough syrup, each bottle containing 144.1 mg of Codeine as Codeine phosphate, in contravention of the provisions of the NDPS Act?

If so, what punishment do they deserve?

DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF

9. I have carefully examined the evidence on record, gone through the relevant documents on record and after hearing the arguments advanced by the learned counsels for both the sides, give my decision on the above point as follows:-

Special Case No. 26 of 2015

10. PW-1 Pradip Kr. Roy, PW-2 Ganesh Ch. Roy, PW-6 Krishna Prashad and PW-9 Rezaul Ahmed did not support the prosecution case. They have deposed that they know nothing about the alleged occurrence.

11. PW-4 Biswajit Ray also did not support the prosecution case and he was declared hostile and the prosecution was allowed to cross-examine him. In the cross-examination by the prosecution, he has denied the suggestion that the police recorded his statement and he told the Investigating Officer that on 11-05-2015, at around 02:30 p.m., in the ASTC bus bearing No.AS-21/6770, the driver, conductor and the handyman were carrying intoxicating substances.

12. PW-5 MizanurRahmanSarkar has deposed that he does not know the accused persons. On 15-05-2015, while he was waiting for bus on the side of the National Highway No. 31, a bus arrived and some police personnel entered into the bus and after a few minutes, they got down from the bus along with two persons with some bags. When the police opened the bag, he saw some narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances inside the bag.

13. In the cross-examination, he has stated that the police took away the persons and the seized articles to the police station and he boarded the bus. The driver, conductor and handyman of the bus remained inside the bus and the police allowed the bus to go away. He has further stated that nothing was recovered from the possession of the driver, conductor and handyman of the bus. Therefore, the PW-5 also has not supported the prosecution case.

14. PW-7 Pritam Das has deposed that on 11-05-2015, he was posted at the Golakganj Police Station as a Sub-Inspector. On that day, at about 01:00 p.m., they received secret information that a truck loaded with narcotic drugs was coming from Chagolia side towards Gauripur side. Then he obtained an authorization letter from the Circle Inspector, Golakganj to intercept the said truck and thereafter, proceeded to intercept the truck. At Nandinipar, he intercepted the truck bearing registration No.AS-21/6770, searched the truck and recovered Nitrosun Plus, SpasmoProxyvon Plus and Eskuf from four bags kept on the back side of the driver's seat. He then seized the bags and the

Special Case No. 26 of 2015

articles in presence of witnesses and sealed and packed the same. Ext-3 is the said seizure list and ext-3 (1) is his signature therein. He also prepared a site plan and recorded the statements of some of the witnesses. Ext-6 is the said site plan and ext-6 (1) is his signature therein. Ext-4 is the extract copy of the GD Entry No.234, dated 11-05-2015 and ext-4 (1) is the signature of the certifying officer. Thereafter, he took the seized articles, accused persons and the bus to the Golakganj Police Station and lodged the ext-5 FIR of the case. The ext-5 (1) is his signature therein. He has deposited the seized articles in the Malkhana of the Golakganj Police Station.

15. In the cross-examination, he has denied the suggestion that in the ext-3 seizure list, the date and time of seizure is mentioned as 12-05-2015 at 02-30 p.m. The accused are not the driver, handyman or conductor of the truck. The secret information was received by the Officer In charge of the Golakganj Police Station. He does not know whether the Officer In charge of the Golakganj Police Station informed the higher authority in writing about the secret information. In the ext-5 FIR, he has not mentioned about the secret information received by the Officer In charge. In the ext-5, he has stated that on the basis of secret information, along with police team, he proceeded to Nandinipar. He has not mentioned in the ext-5 that after receiving authorization, he proceeded to Nandinipar. The said authorization letter is not available in the case diary or in the case record.

16. He has further stated that there were about twenty/twenty five passengers in the bus. At the time of checking, he directed the passengers standing in the bus to get down from the bus. The women passengers were sitting in the bus. He asked the passengers of the bus whether the bags belonged to them. Abdul Hai and Rezaul Ahmed did not tell him that they were travelling as passengers in the said bus. He did not record the names and addresses of the passengers travelling by the bus. He did not ask the passengers who were sitting on the back side of the driver. He has mentioned about the seized articles in the ext-3 seizure list but did not make separate inventory. He also did not make video or photograph the seizure procedure. He has not shown

the bus in the ext-6 site plan. The Investigating Officer did not record his statement. He did not contact the ASTC Officer where from the said bus had originated to ascertain whether anybody had booked the seized bags for carrying in the bus.

17. He has denied the suggestion that he did not show the seized articles to any of the seizure witnesses and obtained their signatures in the ext-3 and filled up the same subsequently. At the relevant time, ShriBijitDadhara was the Officer-in-Charge of the Golakganj Police Station. He has denied the suggestion that he has falsely implicated the accused with the recovery of the alleged narcotic drugs to save the passengers who were carrying the same in the said bus. He has denied the suggestion that the accused had no connection with the seized articles. He has denied the suggestion that in collusion with the Officer In charge and the Circle Inspector, he has lodged a false FIR against the accused. He has denied the suggestion that the did not comply with the relevant provisions of the NDPS Act in the making seizure of the alleged narcotic drugs and arresting the accused persons.

18. PW-8 Md. Abdul Hai has deposed that he was the Secretary of the Village Defence Party of the village Berbhangi, Part-II. On the day of the alleged incident, the police seized some articles from a bus in his presence and he signed in the seizure list as a witness. Ext-3 is the said seizure list and ext-3 (2) is his signature therein.

19. In the cross-examination, he has stated that he has put the ext-3 (2) signature in the Golakganj Police Station. The Officer-in-Charge of the Golakganj Police Station, namely ShriRustom Raj Brahma took his signature in the seizure list. On that day, he had been to the Golakganj Police Station to attend a Village Defence Party meeting. The seized articles were lying inside the police station. The police recovered the seized articles from a bus and asked him to sign in the seizure list as a witness. He does not know the persons who were removing the seized articles from the bus. He does not know the distance between the Golakganj Police Station and Nandinipar village. He was not travelling as a passenger in the said bus.

Special Case No. 26 of 2015

20. PW-10 Jatin Ch. Das has deposed that on 11-05-2015, he was posted at the Golakganj Police Station as Circle Inspector. On that day, the Officer-in-Charge of the Golakganj Police Station entrusted him to investigate the instant case and accordingly, he investigated the case. During the course of investigation, he forwarded the accused ManikAcharjee, JayantaKar and Naba Barman to the Court. Thereafter, he sent the sample of the seized articles to the Forensic Science Laboratory, Assam, Guwahati for examination. After receiving the examination report, he submitted the Ext-7 charge sheet for offence under section 22 (c) of the NDPS Act against the accused persons. Ext-7 (1) is his signature therein.

21. In the cross-examination he stated that he did not examine any witness. He also did not send the sample of the seized drugs to the Forensic Science Laboratory in presence of any Magistrate. According to the ext-3 seizure list, the articles were seized on 12-05-2015, at 02:30 p.m. He did not seize any article in connection with this case. The investigation was done by the informant himself. He did not visit the place of occurrence. The vehicle involved in this case was a vehicle operating under the Assam State Transport Corporation. He did not inquire from the booking counter of the Assam State Transport Corporation at Coochbehar to find out who booked the seized articles or to whom the seized articles were sent. He did not examine any passenger of the vehicle. He has denied the suggestion that without proper investigation, he has submitted charge sheet against the accused persons.

22. PW-3 ShriGajendraNathDeka, Deputy Director, Drugs & Narcotic Division, Directorate of Forensic Science Laboratory, Assam has deposed that on 15-05-2015, he had received a packet through the Director, Forensic Science Laboratory, Assam, in connection with Golakganj P.S. Case No.289/2015, u/s 22 (c) of NDPS Act, for examination. The parcel, comprising of two exhibits, was enclosed in a sealed carton with cloth cover. The facsimile of the seal was found to be of "SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, DHUBRI."

Description of Articles:-One sealed carton box with cloth cover, marked as "A, B and C" containing three sealed envelopes:

[1] One sealed envelope containing one strip of twenty tablets branded as "Nitrosun-10". The sample was again marked by him as DN-136/2015 (a) [2] One sealed envelope containing one strip of twenty four blue coloured capsule branded as "SPASMO-PROXYVON PLUS" and the sample was again marked by him as DN-136/2015 (b). [3] One sealed envelope containing two sealed plastic bottles with 100 ml liquid substances each branded as "ESKUF". The sample was marked by him as DN-136/2015 (c₁) to DN-136/2015 (c₂), respectively.

Result of examination :- [1] the exhibit DN-136/2015 (a) gave positive test for Nitrazepam and amount of Nitrazepam in each tablets was found to be 9.10 mg.

[2] The exhibit DN-136/2015 (b) gave negative tests for Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. However, the exhibit gave positive tests for Paracetamol, Dicyclomine and Tramadol.

[3] The exhibits DN-136/2015 (c₁) and DN-136/2015 (c₂) gave positive tests for Codeine (present as Codeine phosphate) and the amount of Codeine in each exhibit was found to be 144.1 mg respectively.

The Director, Forensic Science Laboratory, Assam, namely Shri K.C. Sharma forwarded the examination report to the Superintendent of Police, Dhubri. Ext-1 is the report prepared by him and Ext-1 (1) is his signature therein. Ext-2 is the forwarding letter of the Director, Forensic Science Laboratory, Assam and the Ext-2 (1) is his signature therein, which he can identify.

23. In the cross-examination, he stated that he did not see the letter that had accompanied the exhibits in the Court. He does not have an independent office. He was directed by the Director to examine the sample, but he has not mentioned the same in his report. There are two experts working in the Drugs and Narcotic Division, DFS, Assam. He cannot recollect how many experts were involved in the examination of the exhibits. Ext-1 is addressed to SP, Dhubri. There is no endorsement of the Director of the Forensic Science Laboratory in the report. The ext-1 was sent by the then Director to the S.P, Dhubri. He has not mentioned the name of the examiner in the report. He has not mentioned that he has examined those exhibits. The procedure adopted for examination of exhibits

has not been reflected in the report. The date of examination is not reflected in his report. One or two days are sufficient for examination of the exhibits. From 15-05-2015 to 28-05-2015 all the exhibits were in his custody. He has denied the suggestion that he is not competent to examine the exhibits as an expert and he has issued the report without examining the exhibits. He had received three envelopes. The parcel comprised of four exhibits. He has denied the suggestion that the Ext-1 is a fake report.

24. It is crystal clear from the testimony of the prosecution witnesses that though the informant has deposed that he had intercepted the bus bearing registration No.AS-21/6770 and recovered the seized narcotic drugs from the backside of the driver's seat, none of the prosecution witnesses have supported the same. The PW-1, PW-2, PW-4, PW-5 and PW-6 have deposed that they know nothing about the alleged incident. Further, though the PW-5 has deposed that he saw the police personnel entering into the bus and coming out with two persons and some bags of narcotic drugs & psychotropic substances, as he has stated in the cross examination that the driver, conductor and handyman of the bus remained inside the bus and after the police personnel got down from the bus, the bus went away, he also has not supported the prosecution case. Because, according to the prosecution, the driver, conductor and handyman were apprehended with the narcotic drugs and along with the bus and narcotic drugs, they were taken to the Golakganj Police Station, whereas, according to PW-5, the driver, conductor and handyman of the bus remained inside the bus and after the police personnel got down from the bus, they went away.

25. Further, though the informant has deposed that he seized, sealed and packed the alleged narcotic drugs in presence of witnesses, none of the prosecution witnesses has supported the same. PW-8 Abdul Hai, a seizure witness has deposed that he saw the police personnel removing the seized articles from a bus in the police station and the police asked him to sign as a witness in the seizure list. Therefore, the PW-8 did not depose that the narcotic drugs were recovered from the bus or from the possession of the accused persons at Nandinipar. PW-10 Jatin Ch. Das, the Investigating Officer is merely a

formal witness of the case. He did nothing except receiving the examination report of the seized articles from the FSL and submitting the charge sheet. The entire investigation was done by the informant himself. The independent witnesses have not supported the status of recovery and it is crystal clear from the above testimony of the prosecution witnesses that the entire action had taken place inside the police station. The sealing of the seized material sample was not proper and there is no evidence to prove that the sample was sealed as per the law. The independent witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution at all.

26. Thus there is no evidence to hold that on 11-05-2015, at around 01:00 p.m., on the National Highway 31 at Nandinipar, under Golakganj Police Station, 6000 Nitrosun Plus Tablets, each tablet containing 9.10 mg Nitrozepam, 200 bottles of Eskuf cough syrup, each bottle containing 144.1 mg of Codeine as Codeine phosphate, were recovered from the possession of the accused Naba Barman, ManikAcharjee and JayantaKar to hold them guilty of committing an offence punishable under Section 22 (b) of the NDPS Act.

27. In **STATE OF RAJASTHAN Vs. JAG RAJ SINGH @ HANSA, reported in (2016) AIR (SC) 3041, (2016) CriLJ 3336, (2016) 6 SCALE 32**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as follows:

"9. The NDPS Act was enacted to consolidate and amend the law relating to narcotic Drugs, to make stringent provisions for the control and regulation of operations relating to narcotic Drugs and psychotropic substances. This Court had occasion to consider the provisions of NDPS Act in large number of cases. This Court has noted that the object of NDPS Act is to make stringent provisions for control and regulation of operations relating to those Drugs and substances. At the same time, to avoid harm to the innocent persons and to avoid abuse of the provisions by the officers, certain safeguards are provided which in the context have to be observed strictly. This Court in State Of Punjab v. Balbir Singh, 1994 (3) SCC 299, in paragraph 15 has made the following observations:

"15. The object of NDPS Act is to make stringent provisions for control and regulation of operations relating to those Drugs and substances. At the same

time, to avoid harm to the innocent persons and to avoid abuse of the provisions by the officers, certain safeguards are provided which in the context have to be observed strictly. Therefore these provisions make it obligatory that such of those officers mentioned therein, on receiving an information, should reduce the same to writing and also record reasons for the belief while carrying out arrest or search as provided under the proviso to Section 42(1). To that extent they are mandatory. Consequently the failure to comply with these requirements thus affects the prosecution case and therefore vitiates the trial."

10. To the similar effect are the observations of this Court in SaiyadMohd. Saiyad Umar Saiyed and others v.The State Of Gujarat, (1995) 3 SCC 610. Following was stated in paragraph 6 of the said judgment:

"6. It is to be noted that under the NDPS Act punishment for contravention of its provisions can extend to rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than IO years but which May extend to 20 years and also to fine which shall not be less than Rupees one lakh but which may extend to Rupees two lakhs, and the court is empowered to impose a fine exceeding Rupees two lakhs for reasons to be recorded in its judgment. Section 54 of the NDPS Act shifts the onus of proving his innocence upon the accused; it states that in trials under the NDPS Act it may be presumed, unless and until the contrary is Proved, that an accused has committed an offence under it in respect of the articles covered by it "for the possession of which he fails to account satisfactorily". Having regard to the grave consequences that may entail the possession of illicit ar- ticles under the NDPS Act, namely, the shifting of the onus to the accused and the severe punishment to which he becomes liable, the legislature has enacted the safeguard contained in Section 50. To obviate any doubt as to the possession by the accused of illicit articles under the NDPS Act, the accused is authorised to require the search for such possession to be conducted in the presence of a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate."

11. In the present case, Section 42 is relevant which is extracted as below:

"42. Power of entry, search, Seizure and arrest without warrant or authorisation.-
(l) Any such officer (being an officer superior in rank to a peon, sepoy or constable) of the departments of central excise, Narcotics, customs, revenue intelligence or any other department of the Central Government including para-military forces or armed forces as is empowered in this behalf by general or special order by the Central Government, or any such officer (being an officer superior in rank to a peon, sepoy or constable) of the revenue, Drugs control, excise, police or any other department of a State Government as is empowered in this behalf by general or special order of the State Government, if he has reason to believe from persons knowledge or information given by any person and taken down in writing that any narcotic drug, or psychotropic substance, or controlled substance in respect of which an offence punishable under this Act has been committed or any document or other article which may furnish evidence of the commission of such offence or any illegally acquired property or any document or other article which may furnish evidence of holding any illegally acquired property which is liable for Seizure or freezing or forfeiture under Chapter V A of this Act is kept or concealed in any building, conveyance or enclosed place, may between sunrise and sunset,

(a) enter into and search any such building, conveyance or place;

(b) in case of resistance, break open any door and remove any obstacle to such entry;

(c) seize such drug or substance and all materials used in the manufacture thereof and any other article and any animal or conveyance which he has reason to believe to be liable to confiscation under this Act and any document or other article which he has reason to believe may furnish evidence of the commission of any offence punishable under this Act or furnish evidence of holding any illegally acquired property which is liable for Seizure or freezing or forfeiture under Chapter V A of this Act; and

(d) detain and search, and, if he thinks proper, arrest any person whom he has reason to believe to have committed any offence punishable under this Act:

Provided that if such officer has reason to believe that a search warrant or authorisation cannot be obtained without affording opportunity for the concealment of evidence or facility for the escape of an offender, he may enter and search such building, conveyance or enclosed place at any time between sunset and sunrise after recording the grounds of his belief.

(2) Where an officer takes down any information in writing under subsection (1) or records grounds for his belief under the proviso thereto, he shall within seventy-two hours send a copy thereof to his immediate official superior."

28. Therefore, what Section 42(2) of the NDPS Act requires is that where an officer takes down information in writing under sub-Section (1) like the case in our hand, he shall have to send a copy thereof to his immediate officer superior. In the instant case, the prosecution did not prove that copy of the General Diary Book entry No.234, dated 11-05-2015 of the Golakganj Police Station was sent to any superior officer. As the secret information based on which the criminal law was set in motion was reduced into writing, the same should have been sent by the informant to his immediate official superior within seventy two hours, or thereafter with explanation. But, he did not do so. Therefore, the prosecution case is vitiated due to the total non-compliance of the provisions of the Section 42 of the NDPS Act and the same has vitiated the prosecution case as to that extent, the said provision is mandatory.

29. The police also did not comply with the provisions of the Section 52-A of the NDPS Act and hence, there is no primary evidence of the seized narcotic drugs like inventory, photographs and list of samples drawn under sub-Section 2 and certificate issued by the Magistrate and as can be seen from the discussion made above, the prosecution could not prove its case by adducing other evidence, like by examining the independent witnesses.

30. In **Karnail Singh v. State of Haryana, reported in 2009 (8) SCC 539**, A Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that non-compliance of the requirement of Sections 42 and 50 is impermissible whereas

delayed compliance with satisfactory explanation will be acceptable compliance of Section 42 of the NDPS Act.

31. In view of the above, though the PW-3 has proved that the sample of the seized articles contained narcotic drugs, in view of the discussion made above, it cannot be held that the same were recovered and seized on 11-05-2015, at around 01:00 p.m., on the National Highway 31 at Nandinipar, under Golakganj Police Station, from the possession of the accused Naba Barman, ManikAcharjee and JayantaKarto hold them guilty of committing an offence punishable under Section 22 (b) of the NDPS Act. The point is decided in the negative, accordingly.

ORDER

32. In the result, considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, I hold that the prosecution has failed to bring home the charge under section 22 (b) of the NDPS Act against the accused Naba Barman, ManikAcharjee and JayantaKar. Hence, they are acquitted. They are set at liberty forthwith.

32. Destroy the seized narcotics drugs in due course of time.

33. Signed, sealed and delivered in the open Court on this the 28th day of April, 2017, at Dhubri.

(A. Chakravarty)

Special Judge, Dhubri

Dictated & corrected by me.

(A. Chakravarty)

Special Judge, Dhubri

APPENDIX

PROSECUTION WITNESSES:

PW-1 Prodip Kr. Roy
PW-2 Ganesh Ch. Roy
PW-3 G.N. Deka
PW-4 Biswajit Ray
PW-5 MizanurRahmanSarkar
PW-6 Krishna Prasad
PW-7 Pritam Das

PW-8 Abdul Hai
PW-9 Rezaul Ahmed
PW-10 Jatin Ch. Das

2. PROSECUTION EXHIBITS:

Exhibit- 1 FSL report.
Exhibit- 2 Forwarding of FSL report.
Exhibit-3 Seizure list
Exhibit-4 Extract copy of GD Entry No.234
Exhibit-5 FIR
Exhibit-6 Site Plan
Exhibit-7 Charge sheet.

(A. Chakravarty)

Special Judge, Dhubri