
**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE :::: BILASIPARA
:::: DHUBRI**

Present:- Shri J. Borah, AJS
Additional Sessions Judge,
Bilasipara.

Session Case No- 63 of 2018

u/s 302 Indian Penal Code

State of Assam

-Vs-

Chakradhar Singha

..... **accused person**

Date of framing charge	:-	12-10-2018
Date of recording evidence	:-	06-04-2019
		10-06-2019
		05-07-2019
		05-08-2019
		26-08-2019
		24-09-2019
		24-10-2019
		10-01-2020
Date of Argument	:-	06-11-2020
Date of Judgment	:-	21-11-2020

Advocates Appeared in the case:

For the State of Assam :- Mr. T. Kr. Bhattacharya, Ld. Addl. P.P
for the State of Assam.

For the defence :- Smti Syeda Afroza Akhtar,
Ld. Advocate for the defence.

Contd. to page no. 2

J U D G M E N T

1. The prosecution case, in brief, is that Sushama Sarkar, the informant, lodged an ezahar with the Chapar police station on 09-07-2018 informing that on 09-07-2018 at about 11.00 A.M, the accused Chakradhar Singha went to the house of the informant Sushama Sarkar and took her husband Ganesh Namadas away from her house. The accused Chakradhar Singha took Ganesh Namadas to his house. One Dipak Namadas heard hue and cry towards the house of the accused Chakradhar Singha. Dipak Namadas went to the house of the accused Chakradhar Singha and saw Ganesh Namadas in the court yard of the accused Chakradhar Singha wetted with blood. One Ajoy Singha, the relative of the accused Chakradhar Singha, went there and took Ganesh Namadas to Chapar Hospital. Ganesh Namadas informed many people at the Hospital that the accused Chakradhar Singha assaulted him with sharp weapon. Ganesh Namadas, later on, shifted to Bongaigaon where he embraced the death at about 04.30 P.M.

So, the informant prayed for taking necessary action against the accused.

2. The Chapar police station received the ezahar and registered as Chapar police station case no. 263/2018 under section 302 Indian Penal Code. The case was investigated and having found prima facie under section 302 Indian Penal Code against the accused Chakradhar Singha, laid the charge sheet before the court for trial.

3. The accused Chakradhar Singha appeared in the court of the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Bilasipara and he was furnished copy. Learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class having found the case under section 302 Indian Penal Code, which is triable exclusively by the court of Sessions, committed to this court for trial.

4. The accused Chakradhar Singha, hereinafter called the accused, appeared in this case. Charge was framed u/s 302 Indian Penal Code, I.P.C in short, against the accused. The charge was read over and explained to the accused to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5. The prosecution, in order to prove the charge against the accused, examined 15 (fifteen) witnesses namely-

1. Arup Kr. Roy P.W-1

2. Sushama Sarkar	P.W-2
3. Riju Das @ Raju	P.W-3
4. Dr. Puspendra Das	P.W-4
5. Deepjyoti Ray	P.W-5
6. Khajendra Namadas	P.W-6
7. Mokbul Hussain	P.W-7
8. Janata Namadas	P.W-8
9. Hemanta Das	P.W-9
10. Smti Dipali Singha	P.W-10
11. Sitendra Singha	P.W-11
12. Nabajit Pathak	P.W-12
13. Dipak Namadas	P.W-13
14. S.I Suresh Sarma	P.W-14
15. Banashree Deka	P.W-15

6. The accused was examined u/s 313 Code of Criminal Procedure and his statement was recorded where he denied all allegations levelled against him in the evidence adduced by the prosecution witnesses and also declined to adduce evidence in defence.

7. Heard argument for both sides.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor Mr. T. Kr. Bhattacharya has submitted that the prosecution has proved it's case beyond all reasonable doubt. At the same time learned defence advocate Syeda Afroza Akhtar has submitted that the occurrence took place during day light and in the populous area, but the prosecution has failed to examine a single eye witness to prove it's case. The witnesses examined by the prosecution are mere hearsay witnesses. The said witnesses have lack of authenticity. So, she has earnestly submitted to acquit the accused.

8. **POINTS FOR DETERMINATION**

- i. Whether accused on 09-07-2018 at about 11.00 A.M at Khorida Gossaigaon under Chapar police station committed murder by intentionally causing the death of Ganesh Namadas and thereby committed offence u/s 302 Indian Penal Code?

DECISION AND REASONS THERE OF

9. Let see the evidence available on record.

Since P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar is the informant and wife of the deceased Ganesh Namadas, so, she is the vital witness in this prosecution case. Let see the evidence of this witness at first.

P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar has stated in her evidence that she is the informant in this case. Ganesh Namadas was her husband. She knows the accused. On 09-07-2018 at about 11.00 A.M to 11.30 A.M she with her husband were at their house. At that time, the accused went to their house and called her husband. She resisted her husband not to go with the accused, but her husband did not listen to her and he went with the accused. After a while, one neighbour went to their house and informed her that the accused committed murder of her husband. She doesn't know the name of the said neighbour. She immediately informed her '*bhasoor*', the elder brother of her husband. One Ajoy, a police person and one Siten, a military person took Ganesh Namadas in a tempo. She saw the injuries on chest and right ear on her husband. She took her husband to Chapar Hospital. She then took her husband to Bongaigaon. Ganesh Namadas was taken to Bongaigaon in a vehicle provided by the police. On way to Bongaigaon, in the vehicle, her husband told her that the accused caused him injury with a knife and stabbed on his chest. Her husband died at Bongaigaon Civil Hospital in the evening. She, thereafter, lodged the ezahar. As she was busy with the treatment of her husband, so, it took time to lodge the ezahar. Ext-2 is the ezahar, Ext-2(1) is her signature.

In her cross P.W-2 has denied that the accused did not go to her husband and call her husband. One Niso Namadas informed her about the murder of her husband. When Niso Namadas informed her about the occurrence, her (P.W-2) daughter Gitumoni Namadas was present. There are many houses nearby their house. She did not go to the house of the accused. P.W-2 denied that Ganesh Namadas went to the house of the accused and attempted to commit rape on the wife of the accused. She did not state before the police that her husband told her that the accused caused him injury with a knife and stabbed in his chest. P.W-2 has also denied that she has adduced false evidence. P.W-2 has also stated that she

wrote in the ezahar that one Dipak Namadas informed her about the occurrence.

10. Thus, minute scrutiny of evidence of P.W-2 shows that the occurrence took place at about 11.00 A.M to 11.30 A.M i.e day light. It is also clear in the evidence of P.W-2 that there are several houses nearby the house of the informant. If that is so, one might have seen the accused and the deceased when they went from the house of the informant to the house of the accused. This is to be established with the evidence of other prosecution witnesses.

Secondly, when and how the informant got to know about the occurrence.

P.W-2 has scribed in her ezahar that one Dipak Namadas informed her about the occurrence. In her cross examination too P.W-2 has stated that she wrote in the ezahar that Dipak Namadas informed her about the occurrence. But in her evidence in chief, P.W-2 has stated that one neighbour whose name is not known her told her about the occurrence. At the same time P.W-2 has stated in her cross that one Niso Namadas informed her about the occurrence. Thus, P.W-2 is not specific from whom she got to know about the occurrence. There is contradiction in this respect between her statement in the ezahar and the evidence adduced before this court.

Thirdly, according to P.W-2 one Ajoy, a police man and Siten, a military man brought Ganesh Namadas in a tempo in injured condition. This aspect will be established with the help of evidence of Ajoy and Siten.

Fourthly, P.W-2 has stated that Ganesh Namadas was taken Chapar Hospital to Bongaigaon Hospital in a vehicle provided by the police. On their journey her husband Ganesh Namadas told her that the accused caused him injury with knife and he was stabbed on his chest. But P.W-2 has stated in her cross that she did not state before the police that her husband told her that Ganesh Namadas told her that the accused caused her injury and stabbed on his chest. So, there is omission between her evidence in chief and her earlier statement given before her investigating officer. This contradiction of omission is a vital one as P.W-2 developed her evidence while adduced before this court.

11. Now let see the evidence of other witnesses.

P.W-1 Arup Kr. Roy is an independent witness. In his evidence P.W-1 has stated that he knows the informant, the accused and deceased Ganesh Namadas. Ganesh Namadas died 3/4 months ago (from the date of adducing evidence on 06-04-2019). He heard that there was a quarrel between the accused and Ganesh Namadas. He also heard that the accused committed murder of Ganesh Namadas. He rushed to the place of occurrence. When he reached there he saw the police. The police seized one 20/- (twenty) rupee note and a pair of 'hawai chappal'. He signed the seizure list, Ext-1 is the seizure list and Ext-1(1) is his signature.

In his cross P.W-1 has stated that his house is 2 (two) kilometer away from the house of the deceased and 500/700 meter away from the house of accused. The police did not ask him about the occurrence. When he reached the place of occurrence he did not see the accused or the deceased.

12. P.W-3 Riju Das @ Raju has stated in his evidence that he knows the informant, the accused and the deceased. He heard that quarrel took place between the accused and Ganesh Namadas and Ganesh Namadas died. He denied that he gave the statement before the police stating that the accused went to the house of the deceased and took him to his house.

In his cross P.W-3 has stated that the police did not ask anything about the occurrence. He did not see how the occurrence took place.

13. P.W-5 Deepjyoti Ray has stated in his evidence that he does not know the informant. He knows the accused. The occurrence took place 1 (one) year ago (from the date of adducing his evidence on 10-06-2019). He with some others were working in a place of their house. They heard that there was a murder near the house of the accused. He did not see who committed murder of whom. Later on, he heard that the accused committed murder of Ganesh Namadas. He went to the place of occurrence, but he saw none. The police seized one 20 (twenty) rupee note and a 'hawai chappal'. Ext-1 is the seizure list.

In his cross P.W-5 has stated that his house is 3 k.m away from the house of Ganesh Namadas. He cannot say the name of the person from whom he heard about the occurrence. The police took his signature on a blank paper.

14. P.W-6 Khajendra Namadas has stated in his evidence that he knows the informant, the deceased Ganesh Namadas and the accused. The

occurrence took place 1 (one) year ago (from the date of adducing his evidence on 05-07-2019). He got to know from one tempo driver that the accused committed murder of Ganesh Namadas. The occurrence took place at the house of the accused. He went to the Chapar Hospital and Ganesh Namadas told him that the accused caused him injury. Ganesh Namadas was shifted from Chapar Hospital to Bongaigaon Hospital where he died.

In his cross P.W-6 has stated that he did not see the occurrence. Ganesh Namadas is the son of his uncle. He denied that he has adduced false evidence supporting Ganesh Namadas.

15. P.W-7 Mokbul Hussain has stated in his evidence that he knows the informant, the accused and the deceased. The occurrence took place more than 1 (one) year ago (from the day of adducing his evidence on 05-08-2019). The occurrence took place in the afternoon. On the day of occurrence he was at Chapar Hospital. He got to know that someone committed murder of Ganesh Namadas. He saw injuries on the ear, stomach and other parts of Ganesh Namadas. On being asked, Ganesh Namadas told him in front of police that the accused committed murder of him. Later on, Ganesh Namadas was shifted to Bongaigaon Hospital where he died.

In his cross P.W-7 has stated that there was none with him when he went to Chapar Hospital. In the auto by which injured Ganesh Namadas was taken to Chapar Hospital were Khajen Namadas, the elder brother of Ganesh Namadas and two others. He denied that Ganesh Namadas did not tell him that the accused did not commit murder of Ganesh Namadas.

16. P.W-8 Janata Namadas has stated in his evidence that he knows the informant, the accused and the deceased. The occurrence took place on 09-07-2018 towards morning. On the day of occurrence he was at Bongaigaon. He got to know through mobile that Ganesh Namadas was murdered. He met Ganesh Namadas at Bongaigaon Civil Hospital. On being asked Ganesh Namadas told him that the accused hacked him with a sharp weapon from his backside. There were two other persons, but Ganesh Namadas did not know them. Ganesh Namadas was later on shifted to a private Hospital where he died.

In his cross P.W-8 has stated that Ganesh Namadas was his brother. P.W-8 has denied that Ganesh Namadas did not tell him that accused assault

him with a sharp weapon. He did not state before the police that Ganesh Namadas told him that the accused assaulted him with a sharp weapon.

17. P.W-9 Hemanta Das has stated in his evidence that he knows the informant, the accused and the deceased. The occurrence took place 1 (one) year ago (from the date of adducing his evidence on 05-08-2019). He went to the house of the accused with police. The accused showed a 'dao' to the police and the police seized the 'dao'. Ext-3 is the seizure list and Ext-3(1) is his signature.

In his cross P.W-9 has stated that they went to the house of the accused at about 1 -1½ A.M. They did not call the neighbour. There was no other person except the police when 'dao' was seized. The seizure list was not read over to him.

18. P.W-10 Smti Dipali Singha has stated in her evidence that she knows the informant and the deceased. The accused is her husband. The occurrence took place one year ago (from the date of adducing her evidence on 26-08-2019). The deceased went to their house and told her obscene words. Her husband asked Ganesh Namadas not to say obscene words to her. On the day of occurrence Ganesh Namadas went to their house. She was cooking food at that time. Ganesh Namadas made her nude and got into her. At that moment, her husband i.e the accused arrived there. She did not know the rest. She did not tell before the police that her husband hacked Ganesh Namadas with a 'dao'. She denied to know that the accused committed murder of Ganesh Namadas.

In her cross P.W-10 has stated that Ganesh Namadas used to visit their house often and he misbehaved her. She did not know how Ganesh Namadas died.

19. P.W-11 Sitendra Singha has stated in his evidence that he knows the informant, the accused and the deceased. He forgot the date of occurrence. On the day of occurrence he went to the Chapar market. He heard that an occurrence took place at the house of the accused. He rushed to the house of the accused and saw Ganesh Namadas falling there in an injured state. He took Ganesh Namadas to Chapar Hospital. Ganesh Namadas was shifted to Bongaigaon Hospital. But he did not go to Bongaigaon.

In his cross P.W-11 has stated that one Dipak and Ajoy Singha were with him. When Ganesh Namadas was at Chapar Hospital he had no sense.

20. P.W-12 Nabajit Pathak has stated in his evidence that he went to the house of the accused with S.I Suresh Sarma. S.I Suresh Sarma seized a 'dao' from the house of the accused. He signed the seizure list, Ext-4 is the said seizure list and Ext-4(2) is his signature.

In his cross P.W-12 has stated that they reached the place of occurrence at about 03.00/03.30 A.M. Two or three persons came there but he did not know their name.

21. P.W-13 Dipak Namadas has stated in his evidence that he knows the informant, the accused and the deceased. The occurrence took place at the house of the accused. He went there and saw to get Ganesh Namadas into a tempo by some persons. Ganesh Namadas was in the state of injury. He got to know from the crowd that the accused committed murder of Ganesh Namadas.

In his cross P.W-13 has stated that when he reached the place of occurrence there were 30/35 persons there. Ganesh Namadas was facing between the road and the house of the accused. He did not know where Ganesh Namadas sustained injury.

22. Thus, care scrutiny of evidence of P.W-1, P.W-3, P.W-5, P.W-6, P.W-7, P.W-8, P.W-9, P.W-10, P.W-11, P.W-12 and P.W-13 shows that the occurrence took place at about 11.00 A.M to 02.00 P.M i.e in the day light. According to the evidence available on record and the Ext-5, the sketch map shows that the place of occurrence is surrounded by many houses, i.e the house of Baltu Singha, Sukreswar Singha, Jiten Singha and many others. But the prosecution has not examined not a single witness who saw the occurrence. P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar has stated that the accused went to their house and took Ganesh Namadas to his house. The distance between the house of the informant and the accused is 1 (one) kilometer away. If that is so, there were many people on the road who saw both the accused and Ganesh Namadas together. But the prosecution has failed to examine no witness who saw them together. The evidence of P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar that the accused took away Ganesh Namadas from their house is not supported by any witness examined by the prosecution. In such a situation the evidence of P.W-2 that the accused took Ganesh Namadas away from their house cannot be accepted to be authenticated.

The witness P.W-1 Arup Kr. Roy did not see the occurrence, rather

he heard that the accused committed murder of Ganesh Namadas. But P.W-1 is not specific in his evidence from whom he heard. So, the evidence of P.W-1 is mere hearsay evidence. Hearsay evidence has not value in the eye of law.

Same is the position of P.W-3 Riju Das @ Raju. He heard to commit murder of Ganesh Namadas by the accused. But he has not made clear from whom he heard of it. So, the evidence of P.W-3 is also hearsay.

The evidence of P.W-5 Deepjyoti Ray is also mere hearsay. He also heard to commit murder of Ganesh Namadas. But he is not specific from whom he heard.

Same is the evidence of P.W-11 Sitendra Singha. He heard that an occurrence took place at the house of the accused. He went to the place of occurrence and saw Ganesh Namadas falling there in the state of injury.

Thus, the evidences of P.W-1, P.W-3, P.W-5 and P.W-11 are mere hearsay evidence. Such evidence has little strength for consideration.

23. The evidence of P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar, P.W-6 Khajendra Namadas, P.W-7 Mokbul Hussain, P.W-8 Janata Namadas are different from the evidence of P.W-1, P.W-3, P.W-5 and P.W-11. P.W-2, P.W-6, P.W-7 and P.W-8 have categorically stated in their respective evidence that Ganesh Namadas told them that the accused assaulted him with a sharp weapon and thereby caused him injury.

Now question arises whether the evidence of P.W-2, P.W-6, P.W-7 and P.W-8 can be accepted to be authentic.

P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar has stated in her evidence that when she took Ganesh Namadas to Bongaigaon by a vehicle, in the said vehicle Ganesh Namadas told her that the accused caused him injury. So, P.W-2 heard from Ganesh Namadas to assault him by the accused only on way to Bongaigaon from Chapar. She accompanied Ganesh Namadas to Chapar Hospital. She was with Ganesh Namadas at Chapar Hospital. But P.W-2 has stated nowhere that Ganesh Namadas told her at Chapar Hospital to assault him by the accused.

P.W-6 Khajendra Namadas has stated in his evidence that when he met Ganesh Namadas at Chapar Hospital, on being asked Ganesh Namadas told him that the accused assaulted him on his stomach with dao.

P.W-7 Mokbul Hussain has also stated in his evidence that when the

police inquired Ganesh Namadas at Chapar Hospital, he told that the accused assaulted him causing injuries.

Thus, both P.W-6 and P.W-7 have stated categorically in their respective evidence that Ganesh Namadas told them to assault him with dao.

Now question arises whether Ganesh Namadas was in a position to talk when he was at Chapar Hospital.

P.W-11 Sitendra Singha took Ganesh Namadas to Chapar Hospital by an auto rickshaw. He was with Ganesh Namadas at Chapar Hospital. In his cross P.W-11 has stated that when Ganesh Namadas was at Chapar Hospital he had no sense. He was not in a position to talk.

P.W-11 is an independent witness. He took Ganesh Namadas to Chapar Hospital. He was with Ganesh Namadas. So, he cannot be disbelieved. If Ganesh Namadas would have told. P.W-2 and P.W-11 would have also heard of it. But they did not hear such thing told by Ganesh Namadas. Another thing is that P.W-7 has adduced in his evidence that Ganesh Namadas stated to the police when the police inquired. But the prosecution has not examined any police personal except the investigating officer to authenticate this evidence. P.W-14 S.I Suresh Sarma has stated nothing in his evidence in this regard. So, the evidence of P.W-6 and P.W-7 is not trustworthy.

24. P.W-8 Janata Namadas has stated in his evidence that when he met Ganesh Namadas at Bongaigaon Civil Hospital, he told him that the accused assaulted him with sharp weapon.

When Ganesh Namadas was at Bongaigaon Civil Hospital, there were other persons also such as P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar and P.W-7 Mokbul Hussain. But P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar and P.W-7 Mokbul Hussain have not stated in their evidence that Ganesh Namadas told Janata Namadas that he was assaulted by the accused. P.W-8 is the brother of Ganesh Namadas. So, evidence of P.W-8 is subject to minute scrutiny. His evidence must be supported by other independent witness. But the prosecution has failed to examine any witness who supports the evidence of P.W-8.

25. Being the said position of evidence of P.W-2, P.W-6, P.W-7 and P.W-8, their evidence that Ganesh Namadas told them to assault him by the accused cannot be accepted.

26. Another aspect is that the investigating officer P.W-14 S.I Suresh Sarma seized a 'dao' and a 'hawai chappal' from the house of the accused, Ext-1 and Ext-4 are seizure list.

P.W-14 has stated nowhere in his evidence that the seized 'dao' was stained with blood stain. If the assault was done by the 'dao', the dao must have tainted with blood. But P.W-14 has stated nothing about it. Even P.W-14 has clearly stated in his cross that he did not send the 'dao' for examination by Forensic laboratory.

Mere seizing a 'dao' from the house of the accused does not imply that the accused used that 'dao' to assault injured.

27. Another aspect is that place of occurrence where the injured Ganesh Namadas was found.

To satisfy this quarry, the evidence of P.W-13 Dipak Namadas is the best one. According to P.W-13, he went to the house of the accused and found Ganesh Namadas falling there. He took the injured and with the help of an auto, he took him to Chapar Hospital. He saw the injured falling by the side of the road near the house of the accused.

P.W-13 Deepak Namadas saw the injured and found him falling by the side of the road near the house of the accused. The evidence of Deepak Namadas is quite natural and there is no help to disbelieve his evidence. So, the injured, was falling not inside the household compound of the accused rather by the side of the road near the house of the accused.

28. Now let me have a cursory on the evidence of P.W-4 Dr. Puspendra Das, the Medical & Health Officer who performed post mortem of the dead body of Ganesh Namadas.

P.W-4 has stated in his evidence that on 10-07-2018, he was at Bongaigaon Civil Hospital and found as follows:

A male body of 45 years; medium built; black haired; not emaciated; not decomposed; rigor mortis seen on whole body.

Cut injuries over right side of face toward posterior, downwards to scalp cutting the lower part of ear (size- 6 X 1 X ½ inch);

Cutting the under neck of vessels of neck, cut injuries left parital region of scalp (size- 2 X 1 X 1 inch);

Cut injuries over middle and upper portion of abdomen (size- 2 X 1 X 1 inch exposing intestine).

Tear in upper portion intra peritoneal haemorrhage seen; Small intestine intact exposing to the abdominal cut; Fracture of left parital bone; membrane ruptured in parital region; Sub dural haemorrhage is seen in the left parital region, congestion of brain.

All injuries were anti-mortem in nature. Cause of death was due to shock and haemorrhage resulting from injuries described above caused by heavy sharp cutting weapon which is ante-mortem in nature.

Ext-3 is post mortem report. Ext-3(1) is his signature.

Cross examination of P.W-4 was declined by the defence.

The evidence of P.W-4 shows that the injuries sustained by Ganesh Namadas were ante-mortem in nature. Shock and haemorrhage resulted the death of the injured. But the vital thing is that the prosecution has failed to establish who caused the said injuries to Ganesh Namadas.

29. P.W-12 Nabajit Pathak is an Executive Magistrate who went to the house of accused and he signed in the seizure list of 'dao' and 'hawai chappal'. Ext-4 is the said seizure list and Ext-4(2) is his signature.

It has also been stated that the investigating officer seized the 'dao' as part of investigation. But the said seizure does not meliorate the prosecution case in any manner.

Thus, the evidence of P.W-12 has no effective value.

30. P.W-15 Banashree Deka is an Executive Magistrate who prepared inquest report Ext-7. The evidence of P.W-15 does not reflect where she found the deceased. The evidence of P.W-15 has not developed the prosecution case.

31. P.W-14 S.I Suresh Sarma is investigating officer. He investigated the case. He went to the place of occurrence and drew a sketch map Ext-5. He seized a dao and a pair of chappal. Ext-1 and Ext-4 are seizure list. He examined the witnesses and arrested the accused.

So, the evidence of P.W-14 is mere formal. It does not develop the prosecution case.

32. Considering above all aspects, it leads to, conclusion that the prosecution evidence is not sufficient and reliable to establish that the accused committed murder of Ganesh Namadas. The prosecution has left many lacunaes to prove the case against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt.

33. Thus, the prosecution has failed to prove it's case under section 302 I.P.C against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt.

34. Held, the accused is not guilty u/s 302 I.P.C

35. The accused is, accordingly acquitted and set at liberty.

The bail bond of accused stands cancelled and the bailor is discharged from all liabilities.

The case is disposed of.

Given under my hand and seal by this court on this 21st day of November, 2020 at Bilasipara, Dist- Dhubri.

(Shri J. Borah)

Addl. Sessions Judge, Bilasipara

Transcribed & typed by,

S. Brahma, Stenographer Gr. III.

APPENDIX

PROSECUTION WITNESSES :-

P.W-1 Arup Kr. Roy

P.W-2 Sushama Sarkar

P.W-3 Riju Das @ Raju

P.W-4 Dr. Puspendra Das

P.W-5 Deepjyoti Ray

P.W-6 Khajendra Namadas

P.W-7 Mokbul Hussain

P.W-8 Janata Namadas

P.W-9 Hemanta Das

P.W-10 Smti Dipali Singha

P.W-11 Sitendra Singha

P.W-12 Nabajit Pathak

P.W-13 Dipak Namadas

P.W-14 S.I Suresh Sarma

P.W-15 Banashree Deka

PROSECUTION EXHIBITS :-

Ext-1 Seizure list

Ext-2 Ezahar,

Ext-3 Post Mortem report,

Ext-4 Seizure list,

Ext-5 Sketch Map,

Ext-6 Charge sheet and

Ext-7 Inquest report

DEFENCE WITNESS :- NIL

DEFENCE EXHIBITS :- NIL

COURT WITNESS :- NIL

COURT EXHIBITS :- NIL

(Shri J. Borah)

Addl. Sessions Judge, Bilasipara