Karnataka High Court

```
Prabhakar Kumar vs State Of Karnataka By Chikpet ... on 19 November, 2008
Author: S.R.Bannurmath & K.Ramanna
      IN THE HIGH COURT OF I-{ARXATAKA AT BANGALORE
      Dated : This the 19"! of November, 2%
      PREEENT
      THE HOIVPBLE MR. JUSTICE 8.8. BAKNURMATH
      THE I-ION'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. .. 3 A
      CRIMINAL APPEAL No. 3.0: «:Q12.. oos *. "' V V
      BE'l"WEEN:
      1. Prabhakar Kumar,
      S/o Abid Singh,
      Aged abcmt 24 yeazs,
      R/atBabanvillage, \_ . \_
      Lalckisaradistxict,
      2. Mohan Kumar, V
      S] 0 Rs:-zjendra Si'a'g11,"
      Aged about 24 yca.:*'::5_' '
      R/a Hindupu.r.vil}agc,'
      Thana Pcast, " ¢ V
        I A. .....
      La1(kisaJ*ay'i.,di:2!;t1Qt, -- < ' V. V
      Bihar. " V , .. APPELLANTS.
       P-1. Padiilavafli1;vz;iciv.)
        Felice Station. RESPONDENT.
      Sxfj Hhlawaz, Max SPF)
      This Criminal Appeal is flied under Section 374(2)
      {3r.P.C:., by the advocaie far tlm appellants against the §udgme z 1 t
      dated 8.4.2005 passed by the ?residillg oat-car, Fast
      C-o'ul't~IX, Bangalore City, in SI}-.No. 517/2002
```

appellants/accused Nos. 2 and 3 for thtif',.Qfi'fi1'1Cf:Sh:31f£#iLfi'J¥éh1E:,

' the judgment of conviction: and substantive <, se.'niience of imprisonment imposed on the accused by the judgment dated 8th April 2005 passed by the Fast Tract Court 6:4"

No.IX, Bangalore, in S.C.No. 51'?/2002.

- 2. It is to be noted here itself that even though 'have been tried for the oଢnees punishable untiéer :20-B and 392 1130., since Saketkumar (aceu:<;ed~ 'No'}'}.) if to be juvenile, his case has been appellants [accused Nos. 2 3] hasfei m'<%:'d~ said sessions case.
- 3. The to :__t13e"'pfesent case as per the prosecution .fcg1lows; .. 7 One \$2, 'miss having a shop by name 'Sha Vastimal who was dealing in home ap'pl.Li}an.ce'g~ et%...,BaIi'g;a}ore.« Vvccording to him, the deceased and iipthe p'3'resei1t. by name Nsvaram was Working as a .T"NianagerA the for the past 35 years. According to him, ~ Nacksli Kumax', P.W.19 -- Srinivas, accused No. 1 -- and accced No.3 Mohan Kumar were all h in his shop. According to the prosecution, the shop on the gonad floor and in the 3"' and 491 to the kieeeased and other employees were resicing. According to him, about one year prior to the incident, he along with his son had 6,1/(W left for Rajasthan in respect of the marriage of his daughter and during that time, the deceased Manager -- Navaram was charge of the same. It is not much in dispute that Kanthilai a nephew of the deceased is also !'CSi(§Z'l'eI1:f. M Bangaiore having a business of his ow1:1'."" 1~'.r:co§a:di1_3vgf prosecuclon, P.W. 8 Naresh _ accountant in the said shop and on' he over the cash of Rs. 1,34,000*1§z 1'!.1OI;t.iy] to the éeeeased Manager Navarent the owner P.W.7 -- Bavarlal Rajasthan.

to*Mohan 19 ~-- Srinivas came to his house aed ~ .t.tig3tfo ☐hed thaLt_N"avaram has been munlered in the mom he was visiting the spot, he saw the dead body of h bearing injuries on his gerson and as such, he goes to 4' jurisdictional police at Chickpet and gives a written complaint as per Ex.P.7 at about 9.45 3.111. On receipt of the same, P'.W.5 --- the S.H.O. and 19.8.1. registers a case in Czrfgme "I" found in the 3rd Dor of the premises No.1S4/155 belonging to P.W.7 who had a shop on ground \square for at AS. Char Bangalore. The evidence of the autopsy doctor cleaxflf j" that the deceased Navaram had received a_s._z..n1any and stab injuries on his entire body' asjjsetr ijf doctor and his repoit, these i11juIieS'--._V}n7er'eA'~.etnte' nature, which could be caused by ectge like M.Os. 16 and 17 and the to sahoek and $\}$:1eme:rrhage as a result. {if mjxl \square De. by the deceased. Hence, the said Navamm met K Veetablished beyond any doubt. us is ~ whether the pm-secutioti reasonable doubt that it is these; "Nos. 2 and 3} with juvenile 1;)'. and have caused the death crf It is also to be seen Whether the . ""pVmsecutio.; 1V hae.esjtat) shed that the object of this murder was "'reb».the suiuie-f Rs. 134,000] - said to be in passession of the 4: ~-tieee"@e_ed_bet'A_the relevant point of time. Ga peruse} of the entire gmsecu □ □ □ □ ease 311:1 the evidence led, it is to be nested that them are no eye Witnesses; to the actual -assault and as such, the entrixe case of the \Box e, 'ex E1 prosecutti-mi is baseci on evidence of circumstantial in nature. These CiI'C11}33.SU;'3I1C€S are as follows:

3) bi

61) Motive;

Robbery of large sum ef Rs.1,34,(}o{)/--~' homicidal death of Navaramg Accused Nos} and 3 were empieyeee.

with the deceased, P.W:-3.8' P.W.7 - Bavar1a1@ 'DeepchaIi $\{i; \sim ... '$ Accuses $\}$ Nos. 3 and floor of the businevssj 'premises' 'tc:l;e1eeeV_ \square egdeceased was si:ayfing_ l'J,;11 .'_ ' O11 tlie, eirenieg 'bf 25.5.2002 large cash of Rs. $\{34, (SOO, L\{--'ieas Y: \S;\})\}$ e custody of the deceased and

- _ had 'kept "" Sam ' e in a cup board in the mom relevant time of the incident.

V 4{§a\$_1.staying;

A the .ae,- sed Imew about the deceased having in cu9;te@?;y such a large amount;

. _'I'he accused were near the scene of offence during the Infaet it is accused No₅.

I and 3 who have inforaeed about the Inding of the dead body to P.W.6;

K54, E2

h) Recovery of the cash, blood stained az ties Weapons at the instamres of and the 'statements made by the accused;

- i) Fimiing of a shirt button «~ M.(),; »14__oz1 one of the shirts I\e"i.O. 18 seized E311 iriflf accused No.2, was found oi'v-a'b11ttcr»:s'Aé:1_1a<§ button found at the spot mafC:l1ecY.._»_wit.li the Inissing button on M.C).18. V
- 7. At the £ov%b.e é1ts"'i;7e have already helei that the e'ec§;aé.¢d Navaram is not much in dissufe by the pmseeution thmugh \$he e degeiice of [inciuding mahazar witnesses] -the poiice officials as well as the e delieiee bf autapsy deetar,
- 8. A .__'IV'he 'eircumstance mo to is aiieged to be for ~ .T.Ti§?.b}:\$i:1g the dveeeased of large sum in his possession. It is the VY:l_:ze"'Aprosec.13tio11 that accused Nos. 1 and 3 as Well as the H V'V:éeeVesseq:1 were working in the shop of P.W.'? siong with P.W.8
- 19. In this regard, the a;rgume11t of the learned .VCi<)unse1 fer the accused is that there is absalutely no documentazy evidence produced to show such employment of the accused by P.W.'?. On peruse} of the entire evidence, itis □he that no documentary evidence in respect employment of accused Noe. 1 a:t:t{i 3 by P.W.7:" regarding their stay in the premises is prc>_d.;.1eed. :.<L5weg;¢: should not deter us from accepting the ;ee--.:.§:1énc¢-» ef if witnesses in this regard, if thee'j_sa;x11e 'is. acrceptable. In this regard, the the employer himself. He has tesmts that Saketh Kama}: 3"'uvenile._ (acettseri No.3 Mohan Kumar aloug and P.W.19 -

Srinivas were wori;i;.1gi:_"t1i; stated that the premises coneiste the ground ☐wr was the shop W h e r e a s t i i e t i t i e e e a s e d w a s s t a y i n g a n t i o 3:1 t h e 4 & 1 o'E4.;I'é)..Vt':J.€*:V'|AiA!£V7V()1;kII1.t-iI3L'.t'!...1011g with accuseé Nos. 3. and 3 a sugges ☐n to this witness that the ' " u.f1et:'...~working and he is falseiy deposizag, 44iéib'so1uteIy,t1Vo material is elicited from this Wimess. It ~ --té.jV»-net-»as if it Witness alone who speaks about tile said 'jg;;.ep1e§%;ag;§t;_« lnfact, P.W.6 the brother-ix3,--1aW of 1=.w.7 and h i?'.Ws.8 and 3.9 the Ccwemployees of accused 'E%Q_s_;f1 and 3 have éeposed to this e☐ect. Their evidence is net cormborated to each other but in the absence of any cross- exazninatien as to why they are faieely imp☐a☐ng these f empleyer. No doubt, he was not pzeeent. on 25.5.2002 but had gone to Rajasthan one month eariier but his evidence had learnt this amount from Naresh Kumar --- P.W.8, j" found fault with. Admittedly and undisputedly, employer and he would be a1:1x:ious:':a.boi_i1A. it 1" mandatory transactions of his shopV__vth;t)u§hv.

Manager and employees ae t_ the consideration of the dd 19 that on 25.5.2002 P.W.8 gave aeash ttie deceased which he kept in the Vt \(\to \) or. it is also established he was handing were present infact seen the deceased keeping the meneét' There is nothing strange Gt the 'accused as they were also co~ employeee in the eame building on the 4&3 _1f\(\to \)-or.

'ti t"'If_1:1e presence of accused Nos. 1 and 3 while Navaram V. and also just immediately after his dead body was ~V.gj1;i;ee:overed, they are spoken to by P.W.8 eonnbomted by the evidence of P.W.6. Apart from them, there is umlmpeachable evidence of P.W.17 the Security Guard who had just taken \(\subseteq \grace{2}{9}\).

circumstances against them as faise. But they have not trieezi to explain or Show that they were not employed by ?.W.7 or th;i£.»j they were staying somewhere eise falsifying the case .. prosecution that they were residing on the 431 premises and the murder did take place the ~3*'fi 'ifI~§rVe11'} on re-appreciation. of the evidence in Wé. V the prosecution has established the tjreeettee ef _e.ee31é§e(i*V::Vot only at the time of P.W.8. of Rs.1,34,000/~ to the deeeasedttébettt. Veve't1t':t1te£?eatter' till the eiead body of the ciecea5ed__.

```
1 1. as to the guilt of
the accused to the hxvesfigafing
officer, of accused Nos. 1 and 3 on
```

}C'tT12.e;t.r wjere "tt1te'i1:'cV>gated and they gave voiuntary state't1te1;t_ to accused No.2, had two shirt as "elader Shirt' at Sudhamanagar.

accused No.2 - Prabhakar stating that they had 'V.'jh_2;jt1tIed';over the cash of Rs.1,34~,O{}€}/- to him for safe keeping. VV"~--..C)iiVj1tteIIogat:ion of said accused No.2, it is stated that he took tithe police and the mahazar Witnesses to the place where he was residing in the same premises and from the plastic bag which fee.

contained rice, the cash of Rs. l,34~,()Oo]- was recovered. £1; is also alleged that the accused also produced two blood clothes said to have been used in the crime and e1;:1~ea::.\$_';_\$'.;* " wimesses to the 4th. cross of Lz-Jlbaghl _ja'7g=.:di<:'I,V' _ plastic bag is pointed out. On Iecovely of Vlih.e:'saB3e, pants axe recovered. it is sigI1i\[\textsicatore\] actove«..£0'.uote shirt ~ M.o.1s had one buttoi:x..V_;'z3is\\$:iiisg;'.._evideiice"of the 1.0. has been corroborated ",v mahazar witnesses P.Ws. 9, cross examination, evidence in this respect has been In this mgajnd, it is mainly conteilededbgf diet the gpmsecution has not esmb\[\] he\[\] he\[\] lleccused Nos. 1 and 3 and more importantly it is alleged thai involvement of accused No.2 and his ialleged Volpeltazryledflltement leading to discovery is of false. The ~ for the accused pointing out to Ex.D.1 - the 4'V'l.I3.'l'__\]\{\}E'.Ii\\$1tiO11 given to the accused, vehemently contended 'iflhel\[\] arrest in Ex.D. 1, the arrest of all the accused is shown 'at, em. However, it is argued that the recovery mahazar, tehich is drawzu at about 5.45 p.m. sta\[\] hg that it is only after accused Nos. 1 and 3 who gave voluntary statement and led the gem police and pamzhas to the spot, they founci Pmbhakar -- accused No.2 Working at the factory premises. it is contended, per Ex.[\}. 1 when accused No.2 was in custody of the could not have been present at the V-fa'c'tory Vttati.

Sudhaxnanagar so as to lead the 3 recovery of cash, the weapons and st"-aigged ...I:i this negard, on perusal of the, Station...:cti'ouse..LADieiy;t~ isiseen that the mentiolzjng of 'emf along wétil accused Nos. 1 and 3 inistggieeoestéitement given.

by the 1.0 and S.H.D., of the relevant dates arrested around 7 13.111. it appears -.as a] routine, while giving the arrest i.3:1timatioi1V._toVs1f1d 3, have also mentioned the nsme"of aecoseel as such there is possible ioteteoceé was also arrested along with aeeutsetit 4.30 pm. But we are satis dater of,t11ev_S~. that at the relevant point of time the fact ,_t:No éoubt the police have not produced any the alleged friendship or link between Nos. 1 and 3 on one hand and accused No.2 on

the But that fact has been practically established through the evidence of P.Ws. 8 and 19. These co-employees of accused Nos. 1 and 3 have as alreaeiy noted categorically stated that We

- 12. The \Box al Court has infant considered ail these; aspects at length and in our view, has arrived at a }'£.1\$.'>'£".~' £.€.="1:..<_.Zi'< ". proper conclusion.
- 13. In the resuit and for the □hd that the appeal □ed by acc11set1V__I\$Eo\$3. 2: merits and is liable to be rejcgcted tl:1.e':' of conviction and setntcnce passéé§..i'brAt.i";c for the o□ences punishable under Sec□ens V;
- 14. though we have referred thé accused No.1 in the crime in q11e\$.tAi£j3:;,4"six1Ce,_.i«i:a§. i:L§:_éi--#§:i:§;v.éi1i1e: and to be tried and he is not on ease, any observations made for iii; i§13{f}1V£¥V]fI'J;(vi'f!I'iEH"t'viS incidental and should not be 5.3 against him since ht: has to be tried in compaajtént ':i;e., by the Juvenile Court. 4' sd/-' Iudge Sd/-~ Judge I N311!»