IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL JUDGE, SONITPUR AT TEZPUR

SPECIAL (POCSO) CASE NO. :- 14 OF 2015

(Under Section 8 of the POCSO Act, arising out of G.R. Case No. 1301 of

2015)

Present :- Sri Ashok Kumar Borah, AJS

Special Judge, Sonitpur

Tezpur

Prosecutor :- State of Assam

-vs-

Accused :- Sri Ranjit Mech,

Son of Sri Sukleswar Mech, Resident of New Ghaghra Police Station – Tezpur Dist:- Sonitpur, Assam

Date of framing Charge :- 09/09/2015

Date of Recording Evidence :- 09/10/2015 & 01/07/2016

Date of examination of accused u/s

313 Cr.P.C

:- 27/07/2016.

Date of Argument :- 02/09/2016.

Date of Judgment :- 08/09/2016.

Counsel for the Prosecution :- Mr. Hari Prasad Sedai

Public prosecutor

Sonitpur.

Counsel for Accused :- Mr. A. Mahanta and Mr. R. Phukan,

Advocates.

JUDGMENT

1. In this case accused Ranjit Mech is put for trial for allegation of charge under Section 8 of the POCSO Act, 2012.

2. The factual matrix of the case in brief is that on or about 3.15 p.m. of 02-06-2015 at village No. 2 Natur Ghagra under Tezpur Police Station the

<u>Spl POCSO Case No. 14 of 2015</u>
Page 1

accused wrongfully trespassed into the house of the informant Dinesh Kurmi, grabbed his 12 years minor daughter from backside and attempted to commit rape on her. As his minor daughter raised alarm, so the accused fled away. Hence, this prosecution case. The ejahar was filed by complainant Sri Dinesh Kurmi before the I/C of Salonibari police Out Post under Tezpur Police station on 04-06-2015.

- Out Post by giving the GD Entry No. 110 dated 04-06-2015 forwarded the same to Officer-In-Charge of Tezpur Police Station for registering a case and SI Omar Faruk was entrusted to investigate the case. On receipt of the ejahar, O/C of Tezpur Police station registered a case being Tezpur P.S. Case No. 613/15 u/s 376(f)/511 of IPC read with section 8 of the POCSO Act, 2012 by giving the GD Entry No. 168 dated 04-06-2015. After completion of usual investigation, the I.O. sent up the accused for trial by filing charge sheet u/s 376(f)/511 of IPC read with section 8 of the POCSO Act, 2012 against the accused Ranjit Mech.
- **4.** On being appeared the accused before this Court, my learned predecessor-in-Court, after hearing both parties, framed charge under section 8 of POCSO Act, 2012 against the accused and particulars of the charge was read over, explained to the accused to which he pleads not guilty and claims to be tried.
- **5.** To substantiate the case prosecution examined as many as five numbers of witnesses which includes the informant, victim, other material witnesses and the Investigating Officer.
- **6.** After completion of prosecution evidence accused is examined u/s 313 Cr.P.C. All the allegations made against the accused and evidence appears against the accused are put before him for explanation where he denied the allegations and declined to adduce defence evidence.
- **7.** I have heard the argument put forward by the learned counsels of both sides.

8. The point for decision in this case is that -

(1) "Whether on or about 5.30 p.m. of 02/06/2015, at No.2 New Ghaghra, under Tezpur Police station the accused committed sexual assault on "Miss X (aged about 12 years) and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 8 of the Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act?

Reasons, Decisions and reason for decision.

- **9.** To arrive at the judicial decision, let me appreciate the evidence on record.
- **10.** PW 1 Dr. Bhibha Nani Keot, has deposed that 05-06-2016 while she was posted as a Sr. M & H.O at Kanaklata Civil Hospital, Tezpur, she examined Miss Momi Kurmi in reference to Tezpur PS Case No. 613/15, on being escorted and identified by women HG Runumi Borah of Tezpur PS and in presence of GNM Khaneswari Narzary vide Hospital emergency OPD No. 13705/15 dt. 05-06-2015. Consent not given to examine her private parts by her guardian Dinesh Kurmi and found that the victim has not attended menarche. No history of sexual exposure. Identification mark no prominent identification mark seen.

Height – 139 cm., Weight – 29 Kg, Teeth – 6 in all four quadrants.

At the time of examination, she was well dressed, neat and tidy and normal gait. No injury marks seen on the exposed part of her body. Private parts are not examined as consent is not given.

Investigation advised and report-

1. X-ray for age determination (hand, wrist joint, elbow joint and iliac crest) Done at Assam X-ray Clinic & Laboratory by Radiologist Dr. P.K. Barman dt. 08-06-2015.

Report -

Epiphysis of the base of the first metacarpal is not united with its shafts.

Epiphysis of lower ends of the radius and ulna are opened.

Epiphysis of the medial and lateral epicondyles of humerus are not united.

Epiphysis of iliac crest has not appeared.

Impression: Age of the person under investigation appears to be below 14 years.

OPINION:

- 1. No injury marks on exposed parts of her body.
- 2. Age of the victim is below 14 years.

Ext. 1 is the Medical Report and Ext. 1(1) is her signature. Ext. 2 is the X-ray report with plates and Ext. 2 (1) is the signature of Dr. P.K. Barman, Radiologist, which is known to her. Ext. 3 is the advice slip and Ext. 3(1) is her signature.

In cross-examination PW 1 admitted that the assessment of age may vary two years of age.

11. PW 2 Sri Dinesh Kurmi, father of the victim girl and informant of this case, has stated that on the day of occurrence his wife told him about the incident. His wife stated that her daughter told her that the accused groped his daughter from behind her breast. When he asked his daughter she also told him crying that the accused groped her daughter from behind on her breast. Accordingly he filed the ejahar Ext. 4 and Ext. 4(1) is his signature.

Though PW 2 he has been exposed to long cross-examination except giving many suggestion, the evidence as to he was reported about the matter by his wife that accused Ranjit Mech groped his daughter from behind on her breast and when he asked his daughter she told him by crying that at the relevant time the accused groped her breast from behind, has remained unchallenged.

12. PW 3, Smti Lakheswari Kurmi, the mother of the victim girl, stated that the occurrence took place at about 4 months ago in the evening. She also stated that the age of her daughter was 12 years at the time of occurrence. When she was coming from hotel, she met her daughter on the way. They came back to their house. Her daughter i.e. the victim told her that the accused came to their house and asked for tobacco when her daughter told that there is no tobacco, the accused went back. Lateron, the accused again came to their house and groped her daughter's breast. Lateron she informed this incident to

her husband. Her daughter also informed about the incident to her husband. Later on, on 4th her husband lodged an FIR.

Though she has been exposed to long cross-examination, except giving many suggestion the evidence as to victim daughter told her that the accused came to their house and asked for tobacco when her daughter told that there is no tobacco, the accused went back, lateron, the accused again came to their house and groped her daughter's breast has remained unchallenged.

13. PW 4 "Miss X" (victim) has stated that the incident took place on 02-06-2015 at 6 p.m. when she was in her house with her sister who went out to play. Her mother and father were at Hotel. She was alone in her house. The accused came to their house and asked for tobacco. She told the accused that tobacco is not there. Thereafter, the accused caught hold of her breast from backside. Then she shouted and the accused left the place. She was very afraid and went out to inform her mother. Accordingly, she narrated the whole incident to her mother. She also stated about the incident to her mother and father at night. In the next day there was a village meeting and then her father lodged the FIR. Thereafter, she was taken for medical examination and she was also brought to the court and there she narrated the incident to the Magistrate. She also put signatures in her statement. Ext. 5 is her statement and Ext. 5(1) and 5(2) are her signatures.

Though she has been exposed to long cross-examination, the evidence as to at the relevant time accused came to their house, asked her tobacco, then accused caught hold her breast from backside has remained unchallenged.

14. PW 5 Omar Faruk, the I.O. of this case, has stated before the court that on 04-06-2015 he was posted at Salonibari Police Out Post as Incharge. On that day, one IPS Officer was named Bhawal Lal Mina was the I/C of the Out Post. The matter was entered into the GD Entry as GD Entry No. 110 dt. 04-06-2015. On that day one Dinesh Kurmi filed an ejahar alleging that on 02-06-2015 at about 5.30 p.m. while he was not present in his house, the accused Ranjit Mech had entered into his house and caught hold of his 12 years daughter and tried to sexually assault her. He also stated in the ejahar that his

daughter had raised alarm over the incident and the accused fled. Ext. 4(2) is the signature of I/C Bhawal Lal Mina. The ejahar was sent to Tezpur Police station for registering a case and accordingly O/C Tezpur PS registered a case being No. 613/15 u/s 376(F)/511 of IPC r/w section 4 of the POSCO Act and endorsed him for investigation of this case. Ext. 4(3) is the signature of O/C Rafiqul Haque of Tezpur PS which he knew.

On the same day, at about 9.30 p.m., he had visited the place of occurrence and also recorded the statements of informant, victim and other witnesses available at the place of occurrence. He had also prepared the sketch map of the place of occurrence. Ext. 6 is the sketch map and Ext. 6(1) is his signature.

Next day the victim was sent to Medical examination and to the Court for recording her statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C. After completion of the investigation, he had collected the medical certificate, arrested the accused Ranjit Mech and forwarded him to the Court. Thereafter, he had filed the charge sheet on 30-06-2015 against the accused u/s 376(F)/511 of IPC r/w section 4 of the POSCO Act. Ext. 7 is the charge sheet and Ext. 7(1) is his signature.

During cross-examination, the PW 5 has admitted that while receiving the ejahar Bhawal Lal Mina, I/C of the Out post, has not mentioned in his note about the time of receiving the ejahar. In the case diary he has not mentioned who accompanied the informant to the Out post. On 04-06-2015, at 9.15 a.m. he had started his investigation. He had recorded the statement of the informant at about 10.30 a.m. in the Police Out Post who went to the place of occurrence on his own will without being led by anyone. At the time of filing or after filing of the ejahar, members of Tea Tribes Students Association did not come to the Police Out Post. The accused in this case belongs to Bodo community. The informant belongs to Ex-Tea Tribe Community. During the period of investigation he never found that the case was filed on pressure made by Tea Tribes Students Association.

15. These much is the evidence of the prosecution case.

- 16. Learned counsel for the accused submitted that the case was filed by the complainant on a baseless, concocted story against the accused. Victim called the accused as "Mama" and so he used to visit the house of the victim. Learned counsel for the accused has also submitted that other than parents of the victim, no independent witness was examined by the prosecution, even there was a village "mel" held for the allegation of the incident. That apart the victim was not examined medically, as such the accused is required to be acquitted.
- **17.** On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor, Sonitpur, Tezpur submitted that the prosecution has ably proved the case beyond all shadow of doubt, as such required to be convicted under the said section of law. Learned PP also submitted that in fact there is no enmity in between the accused and the complainant. Even if there is any strange relation between the parties, it would not be expected from the complainant to involve his own minor daughter in such a hatred cases.

Learned PP again submitted that PWs 1 and 2, the father and mother of the victim, therefore, they are interested witnesses. To rely the interested witnesses in convicting the accused, learned PP submitted the case of **Gali Venkataiah Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh** reported in **2008 Crl.L.J. 690.** In regard to minor discrepancies, learned PP also submitted the case law of **State of UP V. Krishna Master & ors** reported in **2010 Crl.L.J.3889.**

- **18.** Keeping in mind, the rival submissions advanced by the learned counsels of both the parties, I am going to dispose of the case as follows.
- **19.** After going through the evidence of the aforesaid witnesses, it is seen except the victim, there is no eye witness to the incident, but after the incident, the victim came out of her house and informed about the incident to her parents which was corroborated by them.

According to PW 2, the father of the victim stated that he was reported by his wife. His wife stated that her daughter told her that accused groped his daughter from behind on her breast. When he asked his daughter she also told him crying that the accused groped his daughter from backside. Similarly, PW3,

the mother of the victim also stated that when she was coming from hotel she met her daughter on the way, her daughter told her that accused came to their house and asked for tobacco when her daughter told that there is no tobacco, the accused went back. Lateron, the accused again came to their house and groped her daughter's breast. Lateron she informed this incident to her husband.

Similarly, the victim also narrated that at the relevant time, she was alone in their house. Accused came to their house and asked for tobacco. She told the accused that tobacco is not there. Thereafter, the accused caught hold of her breast from backside. Then she shouted and then the accused left the place. She was very afraid and went out to inform her mother. Accordingly, she narrated the whole incident to her mother.

Though all the aforesaid witnesses i.e. PWs 2,3 and 4 were exposed to long cross-examination but the presence of the accused at the house of the victim at the relevant point of time is not challenged by the accused.

- **20.** Learned counsel for the accused argued that the victim is a minor girl and changed her version in different times, before the police, before the Magistrate and even in the Court whose statement cannot be considered to convict the accused.
- **21.** It is true that in the present case there is no documents like Birth certificate or age certificate or any certificate issued by the School authority where the victim last studied etc. available on the record to prove the victim was a children less than 18 years of age on the date of commission of the offence. But the medical report is clear that the age of the victim is below 14 years. Though the Doctor (PW 1) has been cross-examined by the learned counsel for the accused that the assessment of age may vary two years of age, even if admitted the assessment of age as suggested by the learned counsel for the accused, her age would have been 14 + 2 = 16 years but cannot cross the age of 18 years. Besides, none of the witnesses was challenged as to the age of the victim.

- 22. In the case of **K. Muthu Mariappan Vs State**, represented by the Inspector of Police, **Criminal Appeal (MD) No.98 of 2015**, it was held that it is true that primary evidence to prove the date of birth of the individual may be preferably the birth certificate. But, it cannot be said that in absence of birth certificate, the date of birth cannot be proved. When the age of the individual is not disputed, the question of proving the same does not arise at all. It is the settled law that a fact in issue or any relevant fact or any fact relevant to the issue, which is disputed by the adverse party alone, needs proof. If it is not disputed, there is no need to lead any evidence in proof of the said admitted fact.
- 23. In this case, the victim and her parents categorically stated the age of the victim as 12 years from the very beginning of the case, at the time of commission of offence, but during cross-examination, the same has not been disputed at all by the accused side. Thus, the evidence of PWs 2, 3 and 4 (the victim) in respect of age of the victim remains unchallenged.
- 24. In the case in hand, the victim has been consistent on the material particulars with regard to the incident that on the date of incident, she was alone in their house and the accused came to their home, wants some tobacco, as the tobacco was not available in their home, so stated to that, the accused after some time again came, hold her breast from backside. The victim has also said so before the Magistrate when her statement was recorded u/s 164 Cr.P.C and before the police while her statement recorded u/s 161 of Cr.P.C. and even in the time of deposing before this court. Though she has been vigorously cross-examined but the evidence as to the accused groped her breast by coming from backside has remained unchallenged. The evidence of victim is cogent and reliable. There cannot be any doubt to disbelieve the evidence of the victim.
- **25.** Undoubtedly in a criminal trial any such lapse on the part of accused is not leading any defence evidence would not have mattered much as prosecution is supposed to prove its case beyond shadows of all reasonable

doubts. However, in a case under POCSO Act, the situation is not so. In this regard, it will be worthwhile to refer to the provisions of Section 29 and 30 of POCSO Act.

- **26.** U/s. 29 of POCSO Act, a mandatory presumption for certain offence is to be drawn against the accused in a prosecution for certain offences and same reads as under:
- "29. Presumption as to certain offences Where a person is prosecuted for committing or abetting or attempting to commit any offence u/s.3, 5, 7 and Section 9 of this Act, the Special Court shall presume that such person has committed or abetted or attempted to commit the offence, as the case may be, unless the contrary is proved.
- **27.** Similarly, Section 30 of POCSO Act mandates that the Special Court shall draw a presumption of the existence of culpable mental state of the accused where culpable mental state is required on the part of the accused. Section 30 reads as under:
- "30. Presumption of culpable mental state (1) In any prosecution for any offence under this Act which requires a culpable mental state on the part of the accused, the Special Court shall presume that existence of such mental state but it shall be a defence for the accused to prove the fact that he had no such mental state with respect to the act charged as an offence in that prosecution.
- (2) For the purpose of this section, a fact is said to be proved only when the Special Court believes it to exist beyond reasonable doubt and not merely when its existence is established by a preponderance of probabilities.
- 28. The use of expression "shall presume" has been defined in Section 4 of the Indian Evidence Act. As contrasted from the expression "if presume", the expression "shall presume" whenever used connotes "legal presumption" or "compulsory presumption" as contrasted from "factual presumption" or "discretionary presumption" emanating from the expression "may presume". "Legal presumptions" or "compulsory presumption" as are signified by the use of expression "shall presume" are inferences or proposition established by law,

which the law peremptorily requires to be made whenever the facts appear which it assumes as the basis of that inference. The presumptions of law are in reality rules of law, and part of the law itself and the court may draw inference whenever the requisite facts are developed in pleadings.

- 29. Similarly whenever any law prescribes that the Court shall presume the existence of culpable mandatory state or to draw a presumption regarding commission of any offence, unless the contrary is proved, the onus to prove the contrary undoubtedly shifts upon the accused. Certainly, it does not discharge the prosecution of its duty to first establish and prove the facts, the existence of which can only lead to drawing of any such compulsory presumption or legal presumption by the use of the expression "shall presume". Thus, as per Section 29, if a person is prosecuted for committing or abating or attempting to commit any offence u/s.3, 5, 7 and 9 of POCSO Act, the Special Court shall presume that such person has committed or abated or attempted to commit the said offence as the case may be unless the contrary is proved. However, in the present case, the accused has completely failed in discharging his burden even by preponderance of probabilities much less beyond reasonable doubt.
- **30.** Coming now to the fact as to whether conviction can be recorded on the sole testimony of a child witness or not? This issue was dealt by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Virendra Vs State of U.P., (2008) 16 SCC**, which are reproduced as under:

"The Evidence Act does not prescribe any particular age as a determinative factor to treat a witness to be a competent one. On the contrary, Section 118 of the Evidence Act envisages that who may testify – all persons shall be competent to testify unless the Court considers that they are prevented from understanding the questions put to them, or from giving rational answers to those questions, by tender years, extreme old age, disease, whether of body or mind, or any other cause of the same kind."

31. A child of tender age can be allowed to testify if he or she has intellectual capacity to understand questions and give rational answers thereto.

The evidence of a child witness is not required to be rejected per se, but the Court as a rule of prudence considers such evidence with close scrutiny and only on being convinced about the quality thereof and reliability can record conviction, based thereon.

- **32. In Dattu Ramrao Sakhare Vs State of Maharashtra, (1997) 5 SCC 341,** it was held that a child witness if found competent to depose to the facts and reliable one such evidence could be the basis of conviction. In other words, even in the absence of oath the evidence of a child witness can be considered u/s.118 of the Evidence Act provided that such witness is able to understand the questions and able to give rational answer thereof. The evidence of a child witness and credibility thereof would depend upon the circumstances of each case. The only precaution which the Court should bear in mind while assessing the evidence of a child witness is that the witness must be a reliable one and his/her demeanour must be like any other competent witness and there is no likelihood of being tutored.
- **33.** Subsequently, in **Ratansingh Dalsukhbahai Nayak Vs State of Gujarat, (2004) 1 SCC 64**, it was held that the decision on the question whether the child witness has sufficient intelligence primarily rests with the trial Judge who notices his manners, his apparent possessions or lack of intelligence, and the said Judge may resort to any examination which will tend to disclose his capacity and intelligence as well as his understanding of the obligation of an oath.
- **34.** In the present case, at the time of examination of the victim, some questions were put to her and she replied the same without any hesitation and this Court hold that the victim was able to give rational answers and thereafter her statement was recorded without oath. Apart from that, other witnesses i.e. parents of the victim also supported the fact by stating that while they returned to home, PW 3 (mother of the victim) reported the matter to PW 2(father of the victim) that the accused in their absence entered into their home, asked tobacco to her daughter, her daughter told the accused that tobacco is not

there. Again the accused came to their house, groped her daughter's breast from backside. There is nothing in the cross-examination of any of the prosecution witnesses which could suggest that they were deposing falsely in any manner. Various suggestions put to them, but they vehemently denied.

Another point may be discussed in the present case is that the accused submitted that other than the parents of the victim none has stated about the incident. It is true that other than the victim none has stated about the incident. In fact, the incident was taken place inside the house of the informant. According to the prosecution story, there is none other than the victim while the accused entered into their home just before the incident. So, it would be futile to expect others for the prosecution to give evidence as an independent witness. Another point is to be discussed in the present case is that as submitted by learned counsel for the accused that other than the victim, the other witnesses are PW 2 and PW 3, i.e. the father and mother of the victim respectively, so presumption may be there that they give evidence just to succeed their case. In this connection, I may mention a case law i.e. Mangal Singh Vs. State of Madhya Bharat reported in AIR 1957 SC 199, it is held that "the proposition that when the eye witnesses to the occurrence are interested persons there should be corroboration of heir evidence by independent witness, cannot be of an universal application."

35. Here in the present case as discussed above, the victim did not state about the incident to any other person other than her parents i.e. PW 2 and 3. Besides, the allegation against the accused is such a shameful act so it cannot be expected that the parents of the victim reported the matter to other persons. Besides, there is no any evidence that the informant or any of the family members of the victim has any strange relation or quarrel or enmity with the accused or any of the family members of the accused to falsely implicate him in such a shameful act by involving their own minor daughter in the allegation. Under such circumstances, the evidence of the victim as well as the complainant and others are convincing and reliable.

- 36. On an appreciation of the evidence given by the victim and her parents, I find that the victim was sexually assaulted by the accused. Sexual assault is defined u/s.7 of the POCSO Act that whoever, with sexual intent, touches the vagina, penis, anus or breast of a child, or makes a child touch the vagina, penis, anus or breast of such persons, or any other person, or does any other act with sexual intent which involves physical contact, is said to commit sexual assault. Section 8 of POCSO Act prescribes the punishment for the offence defined u/s.7. The offence proved in this case comes under the second part of Section 7 of POCSO Act, constituting any act done with sexual intent involving physical contact. The victim of the present case has given a clear evidence that on the date of incident, the accused came in to the house of the informant, asking for a tobacoo while she stated they do not have such tobacoo then the accused returned but again came to their house and groped her breast from backside. This will very well come u/s.7 of POCSO Act, punishable u/s.8. So, the accused is convicted thereunder.
- **37.** The accused is heard on the point of sentence where he praying for leniency. The accused has submitted that he is a married person, having his wife and children. He is the only bread earner of his family, if he is in Jail for further more period, that will create great trouble in his family and prayed for leniency.
- **38.** I have heard learned counsel for the accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor, Sonitpur.
- **39.** Turning to the question of sentence, it is the settled law that while deciding the quantum of punishment, it is required that the Court should strike a balance between aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances. The aggravating circumstances relate to the crime and mitigating circumstances relate to the criminal. In this case, so far as the aggravating circumstances are concerned, a minor girl was sexually exploited. The wound caused to the girl is not only to the body but also to the mind of not only to the victim but that of entire family members, but considering the mitigating circumstances, the

Page 15 of 16

accused was hardly 31 years of age at the time of the incident. It is not brought

to the notice of this Court that before this incident, the accused had committed

any other offence. There is likelihood of his reformation, but the statute u/s.8

of POCSO Act prescribes minimum punishment for a term of three years with

fine. When the intention of the legislator is to impose stringent punishment for

not less than three years, this court has no option but to impose minimum

punishment of three years.

ORDER

40. I convict the accused Ranjit Mech u/s.8 of POCSO Act and

sentence him to Rigorous Imprisonment for 3 (Three) years and also to pay a

fine of Rs.500/- (Rupees Five Hundred only), in default, Rigorous Imprisonment

for one month. The period, which he detained in custody, shall be set off from

the period of imprisonment, imposed on him.

41. A copy of this judgment be furnished to the accused free of cost

and a copy thereof be sent to the District Magistrate, Sonitpur, Tezpur, as per

provisions of law.

Given under my Hand and Seal of this Court on this the 8th day

of September, 2016.

(Ashok Kumar Borah) SPECIAL JUDGE,

SONITPUR: TEZPUR

Dictated and corrected by me

(Ashok Kumar Borah) SPECIAL JUDGE,

SONITPUR :: TEZPUR

Dictation taken and transcribed by me:

Smt. R. Hazarika, Steno

APPENDIX

Prosecution Witness

1. Prosecution Witness No.1 :- Dr. Bhiba Noni Keot, M.O.

2. Prosecution Witness No.2 :- Sri Dinesh Kurmi, informant

3. Prosecution Witness No.3 :- Smt. Lakheswari Kurmi

4. Prosecution Witness No.4 :- Victim.

5. Prosecution Witness No.5 :- Omar Faruk, I.O.

EXHIBITS.

Exhibit 1, 2 & 3 :- Medical Report,X-ray report and

Advice slip.

Exhibit 4 :- Ejahar

Exhibit 5 :- 164 Cr.P.C statement of the victim.

Exhibit 6 :- Sketch map

Exhibit 7 :- Chargesheet.

(Ashok Kumar Borah)
SPECIAL JUDGE
SONITPUR: TEZPUR

<u>Spl POCSO Case No. 14 of 2015</u>
Page 16