

# State By vs Ramakatak @ Rama on 9 June, 2020

S.C.No.466/2011

1

IN THE COURT OF LXVII ADDL CITY CIVIL AND  
SESSIONS JUDGE; BENGALURU CITY (CCH.No.68)

PRESENT

SRI.K.SUBRAMANYA, B.Com., LL.M.  
LXVII ADDL CITY CIVIL & SESSIONS JUDGE ,  
BENGALURU.

Dated this the 9 th day of June 2020.

S.C.No.466/2011

COMPLAINANT: State by  
J.P.Nagar Police,  
(Puttenahalli Police)  
Bengaluru.  
  
(By learned Public Prosecutor)

.Vs.

ACCUSED : 1. Ramakatak @ Rama,  
S/o.Makan Katak,  
22 years,  
R/at.C/o.165/17,  
Joseph Layout,  
Doresanipalya,  
J.P.Nagara,  
Bengaluru.  
  
(By Sri.K.M.C., Advocate)  
  
2. Krishna Prasad @ Krisha Kevat,  
S/o.Ramlal Kevat,  
24 years,  
R/at.C/o.165/17,

S.C.No.466/2011

2

Joseph Layout,  
Doresanipalya,  
J.P.Nagara,  
Bengaluru.

3. Ramesh Katak @ Rama,  
S/o.Rajan Katak,  
21 years,

R/at.C/o.165/17,  
Joseph Layout,  
Doresanipalya,  
J.P.Nagara,  
Bengaluru.

(Accused Nos.2 & 3 by Sri.M.C.P.,  
Advocate)

J U D G M E N T

The P.S.I., of J.P.Nagar Police Station, Bengaluru has laid the charge sheet against the accused for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 r/w. Section 34 of IPC.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are as under:

On 29.08.2010 between 0-00 hours and 7-00 a.m., while deceased Krishna Prasad Gol was sleeping in the house situated in a vatara at Joseph Layout, Doresanipalya, within the limits of J.P.Nagar Police Station, Bengaluru, the accused have common intention to commit the murder of said Krishna Prasad Gol, the accused Nos.2 and 3 have caught hold the legs of the deceased and the  
S.C.No.466/2011

3

accused No.1 assaulted with wooden re-piece and caused bleeding head injury and in furtherance of the criminal act, the accused No.1 has held the mouth tightly by hands and due to suffocation, the said Krishna Prasad Gol was died. Further, the accused Nos.1 to 3 in order to cause screening the evidence and disappearance of evidence and to screen the offender, have washed the blood stains fallen on the floor and thrown the dead body behind the toilet. Hence, this charge sheet.

3. The accused appeared and charges framed and pleads not guilty. The prosecution in proof of its case examined P.Ws.1 to 14 and got marked the documents Exs.P.1 to 29 and M.O.s.11. After closure of the evidence of prosecution witnesses, the statement of accused under Section 313 of Cr.P.C., was recorded. The accused have denied the incriminating evidence stated against them. The accused have not chosen to adduce any defense evidence.

4. After hearing the arguments, the points raised for my determination are as under:

1.

Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on 29.08.2010 between 0-00 hours and 7-00 a.m., while deceased Krishna Prasad Gol was sleeping in the house S.C.No.466/2011 situated in a vatara at Joseph Layout, Doresanipalya, within the limits of J.P.Nagar Police Station, Bengaluru, the accused have common intention to commit the murder of said Krishna Prasad Gol, the accused Nos.2 and 3 have caught hold the legs of the deceased and the accused No.1 assaulted with wooden re-piece and caused bleeding head injury and in furtherance of the criminal act, the accused No.1 has held the mouth tightly by hands and due to suffocation, the said Krishna Prasad Gol was died and thereby, committed an offence punishable under Section 302 r/w. Section 34 of IPC ?

2. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond reasonable doubt that on the alleged in order to cause screening the evidence and disappearance of evidence and to screen the offender, have washed the blood stains fallen on the floor and thrown the dead body behind the toilet and thereby, committed an offence punishable under Section 201 of IPC ?

3. What Order ?

5. My findings on the above points are as under :

POINT No.1 - In the Negative, POINT No.2 - In the Negative, POINT No.3 - As per final order, for the following :

#### R E A S O N S

6. POINT Nos.1 & 2 : Since both these points are S.C.No.466/2011 interconnected to each other, they have been taken up together for discussion in order to avoid the repetition of facts and evidence.

P.W.1 has deposed that he know the accused Nos.1 to 3, as they are tenants under him. Late Krishnaprasad was also tenant under him since two years prior to the date of alleged incident. On 29.08.2018 at about 7-00 a.m., when came out of his house to attend the nature call towards his toilet situated on road at a distance of 50 feet away from his house, the accused Nos.1 to 3 were carrying something in the bed sheet. On enquiry, the accused have not answered and thrown away the said bed sheet along with something in it and ran away. He has noticed the dead body of Krishna Prasad in the bed sheet and he has sustained blood injury at his head. He has informed the said fact to J.P.Nagar. The police came to the spot. At that time, the accused Nos.1 to 3 were in their room. The police have taken the accused Nos.1 to 3 to the Police Station and the dead body was sent to hospital for conducting P.M.Examination. He has lodged the complaint the complaint as per Ex.P.1. He has further deposed that when he gone inside the room of the accused, he has noticed the blood was fallen on the floor of the room. He do not know why the accused have murdered Krishna Prasad. Later, he learnt through his wife that the accused have taken the S.C.No.466/2011 mobile of the deceased and they are not ready to return it back to him. Due to that, the quarrel was taken place

between the deceased and accused, which was ended in murder of Krishnaprasad.

In the cross examination, P.W.1 has stated that the tenants were residing in the house at which the incident was occurred. C.W.16 has taken the premises on contract basis for rent and he was running security agency. He has kept the security boys working under him in the tenanted premises, but he do not know the names of the persons, who were resided in the tenanted premises. He do not know in which room, the accused were residing. He has identified the photographs of his house in front of the tenants house as per Ex.P.1. It is also admitted that there is a toilet in the tenanted premises and it is not visible from his house. It is also stated that he used to attend the nature call in the toilet situated in his house only and not outside. He has gathered information through tenants, who told that the body was lying at bathroom. He immediately called Ramachandra, who is Security Feed Officer. He came to the spot and enquired him. He told that he do not know who has committed murder and he has no idea. The said Ramachandra called me to call the police and thereupon, he has informed the police. At about 6-30 to 7-00 a.m., the police came to the spot. The police S.C.No.466/2011 themselves written the complaint and he has signed the same as per Ex.P.1. He do not know the condition of the door bolt, where the deceased was residing. It is also admitted that the matter written in the complaint was written by the police and he has evidenced the same. Therefore, the evidence of P.W.1 is to be scrutinized with proper care and caution. The premises was let to the tenants, who were working under Security Officer P.W.7 and P.W.7 is the better person to state the affairs of the accused and the nature of work carried by the deceased. P.W.1 do not remember the date of incident. He has not identified the persons resided in the premises. He has relied upon P.W.7-Ramachandra so as to identify the persons kept by him as tenants, who were working under him.

Further, he has deposed in the cross examination that he do not know who has thrown the dead body in the spot, but he went along with Ramachandra and saw the deadbody. He has not discussed the fact of death of Krishna Prasad Gol with his wife. But, in the cross examination, it is stated that the accused Nos.1 to 3 were carrying something in the bed sheet and on enquiry, they have thrown away the bed sheet and ran away to their room. It is also stated in the chief examination that he has noticed the dead body of Krishna Prasad Gol in the bed S.C.No.466/2011 sheet, who has sustained head injury and informed to J.P.Nagar Police, Bengaluru. Therefore, the evidence of P.W.1 is to be scrutinized with proper care and caution.

7. P.W.2-Wife of P.W.1 has deposed that the accused Nos.1 to 3 and the deceased were working as Security Guards. On the previous night to the date of alleged incident, the deceased Krishna Prasad had came to her provision store for purchase of eggs and told that the accused No.1 has taken away his mobile and not returning the same. On the next day morning, her husband/P.W.1 told that the accused Nos.1 to 3 have through the dead body of Krishnaprasad while her husband/P.W.1 had gone near the toilet situated about 50 feet away from our house. Immediately, she had been near the toilet and noticed the dead body of Krishna Prasad, who was sustained blood injuries at his head. Her husband informed to the police about the said fact. The accused No.1 has assaulted the deceased with iron rod, but she do not know the cause for the said assault.

In the cross examination, she has stated that she do not know the deceased and the persons, who are residing in their tenanted premises. She do not know how the deceased Krishna Prasad Gol died and the cause for his S.C.No.466/2011 death. She has denied the statement given to the police. This aspect is clear that P.W.1 has not discussed the incident of death and carrying something by the accused Nos.1 to 3 in the bed sheet. Therefore, the defense counsel has elicited that she do not know the deceased and the assailants, who have committed the murder. Hence, the evidence of P.W.2 is not corroborative to the chief examination or to the evidence of her husband P.W.1. She has further deposed that her husband P.W.1 has informed the death of Krishna Prasad Gol to the police and the accused No.1 has assaulted Krishna Prasad Gol with iron rod, but she do not know the cause for the said assault. But, the case of prosecution is that the assault is made by wooden re-piece M.O.2 and the alleged iron rod, as stated by P.W.2 is not forthcoming as material object on behalf of the prosecution. Therefore, the evidence of P.Ws.1 and 2 is not consistent or corroborative to the prosecution case.

8. Here in this case, the evidence of eye witnesses is not forthcoming, but the prosecution based its case on circumstantial evidence as to carrying the dead body by the accused Nos.1 to 3 and thrown the same near the toilet. P.W.1 has stated that the toilet is not visible from his house and he has attending the nature call in his own toilet, then how he has seen carrying of bed sheet by the accused is S.C.No.466/2011 also not clear in the prosecution case.

9. P.W.3 has turned hostile to the prosecution case. He is residing at a shed belonging to Narayana Das since 15 years and working as security and looking after the plantation belongs to the said Narayana Das, situated behind the Joseph Vataru, Doresanipalya, Bengaluru. The accused Nos.1 to 3 were residing in the room belonging to P.W.1. He do not know the other persons, who were residing along with accused. About 4-5 years back, J.P.Nagar Police have obtained his signature. The police have not disclosed the contents of the document to which he has signed. Therefore, his evidence is quite contradictory to the prosecution case. P.W.3 has not stated that the deceased was resided along with the accused Nos.1 to 3 in the same room.

In the cross examination of prosecution, he has denied the suggestion that the police have called him to the spot near toilet situated by the side of Joseph Layout Vataru, wherein the dead body of Krishna Prasad Gol was lying. It is also denied that the police have recorded his statement in the spot at the time of inquest. It is also denied that during the life time of deceased, he has disclosed that the mobile was stolen by the accused No.1. It is also denied that he has advised the accused No.1 to return the mobile S.C.No.466/2011 to the deceased. Therefore, the stolen of mobile leading to quarrel and the accused No.1 assaulted on the deceased in the spur of moment, which causes the death is not forthcoming from the testimony of this witness. The fact of quarrel regarding the mobile and it is revealed by the deceased soon before the incident to P.W.3 is not forthcoming from the testimony of this reliable witness. Even though P.W.2 has stated that the deceased Krishna Prasad Gol has informed her regarding the accused No.1 taking away his mobile while the deceased had been to her shop for purchasing eggs, but that is not forthcoming from this witness P.W.3. Further more, the fact of taking away the mobile by itself created the intention to commit murder in the mind of accused No.1 is not established with reliable testimony, as there is absence of eye witnesses. The neighbouring residents of the room, who have heard the commotion of quarrel and shouting of

deceased at the time of assault is not forthcoming. There is a doubtful circumstance revealed by P.W.1 as to carrying the dead body by accused Nos.1 to 3. It is forthcoming in the prosecution case with the material contradictions and inconsistencies in their cross examination.

10. P.W.4-The then Medical Officer/HOD of Forensic Medicine at KIMS, Bengaluru has deposed that on S.C.No.466/2011 30.08.2010, while he was in the hospital, he has received a requisition from J.P.Nagar Police so as to examine the dead body of Krishna Prasad. Accordingly, he has conducted P.M.Examination on the dead body of Krishnaprasad and noticed the following injuries.

1. Laceration over the right parietal region in the middle on the lateral side, oblique 3.5 X 1 cm. X bone deep;
2. Abrasion over the front of lower part of right side chest measuring 11 X 4 cm. ;
3. Linear abrasion over the front of the lower part of the left side chest measuring 7 X 0.5 cm. ;
4. Abrasion over the front of lower part of right leg measuring 1 X 1 cm. ;
5. Laceration over the back of right foot measuring 8 X 2 cm. Skin deep ;
6. Contusion over the front of neck on the left side measuring 6 X 5 cm.

On dissection of neck, the blood effused in the right side muscle of the neck measuring 2 X 1 cm. The blood effused in the right side of laryngeal cartilage.

On dissection of the body, he has noticed the following injuries.

Scalp : Contused over both frontal and parietal region all over the body.

Skull : Fissured fracture over the base of the skull in S.C.No.466/2011 the right side of middle cranial fossa extending on to right temporal and parietal bone measuring 10 cms in length.

Brain : Covered with subdural and sub arachnoids hemorrhage all over the body.

Thorax : Blood was effused around right side of laryngeal cartilage.

All the injuries are fresh in nature and anti mortem at the time of death. The death was occurred within 24 to 48 hours earlier to conducting P.M.Examination. He has opined that the death was due to COMA as a result of head injury sustained. Accordingly, he has issued the P.M.Report as per Ex.P.4.

He has further deposed that on 3.11.2010, he has received a requisition from the Investigating Officer to examine the material objects, which were sealed. On opening the said packet, he has noticed a wooden piece measuring 49 X 4 X 3 cm. He has opined that the said material object may

cause the external and internal injuries as mentioned in Ex.P.4 and resulting in the death of a person. Accordingly, he has issued his opinion as per Ex.P.5.

In the cross examination, he has admitted that he has S.C.No.466/2011 not mentioned whether the assault was made when a person was sleeping or standing. He has not mentioned the weapon pertaining to the case. But, he has given a separate report on its examination. It is stated that on user of similar type of weapon or object, the injury or death may occur. In case of suspicion as to drugs and alcohol, he may collect the blood. He has not mentioned whether there was blood stains on M.O.2. It is admitted that if M.O.2 is used for assault and causing injury, there is a possibility of blood stains on M.Os., but there was no blood stains found on M.O.2 at the time of examination. Therefore, the severe assault made by the assailants by using M.O.2 is also leading to doubt. The wooden piece allegedly used is not corroboratively stated by P.W.2, who has in fact stated that the iron rod was used for assault and the said iron rod is not seized in this case. The Doctor's evidence does not correlate to the prosecution case as to whether the wooden re-piece likely to cause such grievous injury so as to cause or likely to cause death of a person. The absence of blood stains on M.O.2 is also leading to doubt the prosecution case. The repeated blows with the same object would have caused blood stains on the material object M.O.2., that possibility cannot be ruled out in the evidence of P.W.4, who has clearly stated that there was no blood stains on it. It is suggested that if a person falls on the hard object, S.C.No.466/2011 such injury might be caused to the head, but not on the neck. Therefore, the tussle between two persons may lead to fell down or otherwise the deceased felling down and sustaining such injury cannot be ruled out as suggested by the defense counsel.

11. P.W.5-The then Head Constable of J.P.Nagar Police Station, Bengaluru has deposed that on 29.08.2010, C.W.32 has directed him to carry the FIR pertaining to their Police Station Crime No.691/2010 under Sections 302 and 201 of IPC and accordingly, it has been transmitted to the concerned jurisdictional court. This procedural aspect is only as to compliance of the process of transmission of FIR, that is not disputed by the defense.

12. P.Ws.6 and 11-Official witnesses have deposed that on 29.08.2010, C.W.32 has directed themselves and C.W.27 for tracing out the accused pertaining to Crime No.691/2010. Accordingly, they made rounds at Doresanipalya and when they came near the bus stop, they received a credible information that the accused Nos.1 to 3 were standing near the bus-stop. Immediately, they apprehended the accused Nos.1 to 3 at the bus-stop and brought them to the Police Station and produced before S.C.No.466/2011 C.W.32 along with report.

This evidence is quite contradictory to the evidence of P.W.1, who has stated that the accused Nos.1 to 3 were carrying something in the bed sheet and he has noticed the dead body of Krishna Prasad Gol near the toilet. If at all they were there in the room itself, the police who have arrived to the spot would have arrested the accused then and there itself on the complaint of P.W.1, but that circumstances is not forthcoming in this case. Further more, the accused have not chosen to flee away from the spot, if at all actually they are involved in the crime, they would have attempt to fled away. It is quite unnatural that they are available in the spot itself and they have not fled away in order conceal or screen themselves under the apprehension of their arrest. The subsequent conduct of the accused is also leading to doubt the prosecution case as they are not fled away from the scene

or absconded after the incident.

Further, P.W.6 has deposed that on 13.09.2010, C.W.32 was deputed to bring the articles from KIMS. Accordingly, he had been to KIMS and collected the sealed article and produced the same before C.W.32 along with his report as per Ex.P.8. The witness has identified M.O.1 and sealed ten articles.

S.C.No.466/2011

13. P.W.7 has deposed that he is working as Security Feed Officer in Network Detective Pvt. Ltd. The accused Nos.1 to 3 joined as Security Guards in his office in the year 2010. They were residing in a room situated at Doresanipalya, J.P.Nagar, Bannerghatta Road, Bengaluru. The accused No.1 was deputed in KOGI Apartments and the accused Nos.2 and 3 were deputed as Security Guards in Esteem Heritage Apartments. It is stated that the deceased Krishnaprasad Gol was also working in his security agency and he was also residing with the accused Nos.1 to 3 in the same room. On 29.08.2010, he has received a call from the owner of the room and came to know that Krishnaprasad Gol was dead. He went and saw his body rolled in a rug. He has not seen what had happened to the body. He has informed the police and the police came and drawn the mahazar. He has identified the rug-M.O.1.

14. In fact, P.W.1 has stated that he has intimated the police regarding the incident and carrying of something in a bed sheet by the accused. Therefore, there is quite contradiction as to the information either given by P.W.1 or by P.W.7. Whether after arrival of P.W.7, P.W.1 has S.C.No.466/2011 intimated the police or not is also not clear. Therefore, there is due deliberation between P.Ws.1 and 2 and the concerned police, who have arrived to the spot is very clear in this case. P.W.1 has stated that the complaint was written by the police and he has signed the same as admitted in the cross examination. The Rental Agreement is not produced to show the residence of accused Nos.1 to 3 in the same room along with deceased Krishnaprasad Gol in the tenanted premises of P.W.1. P.W.7 has not stated the boundary and the number of the room in which the accused were resided. The name of the persons, who are residing in the adjacent room is also not forthcoming from his evidence. Except the phone call, P.W.1 has not informed about the death.

15. Here in this case, the mobile seized and its data as to any quarrel between the accused No.1 and the deceased and causing assault, which resulted in the death of deceased Krishnaprasad Gol is not specifically elicited in the evidence. The last seen theory if considered, it is on the basis of the evidence of P.W.1. But, P.W.1 has not deposed the manner of assault and the circumstances under which the fatal injury has been caused and who is actually assaulted on the deceased inside the room. His evidence is S.C.No.466/2011 only circumscribed to the effect that the accused have been carrying something in a bed sheet and he has noticed the dead body of the deceased near toilet. Therefore, it is difficult to hold that the accused have committed the murder. On the basis of the evidence of P.W.1, one cannot infer that the accused have committed the murder. The access of other person to the room soon before the death cannot be ruled out. The evidence of neighbouring witnesses or the person, who has last seen the accused and deceased together entering the room is not forthcoming. Even P.W.1 is not consistent as to the inmates of the room in which the alleged



incident of murder was took place. The belongings and clothes of the accused seized in their room is not evidenced to show their residence. The cloth of the accused stained with blood is not seized to show that they were wearing the same clothes while incident and the blood stains of the deceased spread over their clothes.

16. P.W.8-General Manager of Network Detective Agency Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru has deposed that during 2010, the accused Nos.1 to 3 and deceased Krishnaprasad Gol were working as security guards in his agency. He has produced the Election I.D.Card, Marks Card and Panchayat Card on the request of the police. He has also given the copies of S.C.No.466/2011 Bio-data of the accused Nos.1 to 3 to the police. Even though the Bio-data is produced as secondary evidence along with the rental agreement as per Section 65 of Indian Evidence Act, it does not reveal in the evidence that the accused were having any criminal antecedents or such impeachable character. On 29.08.2010, he has received intimation from P.W.7 about the incident and immediately he went to the spot and saw the police and he came to know that the security boy Krishnaprasad Gol was dead. The body was covered with blanket and found back side of the room near toilet. He came to know the assault by rod, but this is not forthcoming in the prosecution case as the material object used for the assault is wooden re-piece M.O.2.

In the cross examination, this witness has stated that on information given by P.W.7 to the police, he came to know the incident. Apart from that, he do not know any other fact. Therefore, the quarrel regarding mobile taken away by accused No.1 is not testified by this witness. Any grievance put forth before P.W.7 or P.W.8 regarding mobile dispute is not forthcoming from their testimony, even though, they are employers of the accused Nos.1 to 3 and the deceased.

S.C.No.466/2011

17. P.W.9 has turned hostile to the prosecution case. He know the accused and they were working in different place and this witness is working in different place. According to this witness, the deceased Krishnaprasad Gol was residing in his room at J.P.Nagar. Therefore, the evidence of this witness is totally contradictory as to the residence of the deceased with the accused Nos.1 to 3. 7-8 years back, he went to night duty and after finishing his work, came in the morning and came to know that the police have taken te accused to the Police Station as Krishnaprasad Gol was dead. He do not know how Krishnaprasad Gol was died and who has assaulted on him and caused the death.

The prosecution treated this witness as hostile and suggested that the accused were quarreled with the deceased and he has pacified the said quarrel, but the same has been denied. He has also denied that prior to one week i.e., on 28/29.08.2010, the mobile of Krishnaprasad Gol was stolen and he was asking for it. It is also denied that due to the quarrel as to taking away the mobile, the accused have assaulted and murdered the deceased.

18. P.W.10-The then P.S.I., of J.P.Nagar Police Station, Bengaluru has deposed that on 29.08.2010, when he was in the Police Station, P.W.1 has given the complaint and on S.C.No.466/2011 the basis of it, he has registered the case in Crime No.691/2010 for the offence under Sections 302 and 201 of IPC and forwarded the FIR to his superior officers. Thereafter, he had been to the place of incident

and identified the dead body of deceased and conducted inquest proceedings in the presence of C.Ws.18 to 20 as per Ex.P.13. He has visited the place of occurrence and conducted mahazar in the presence of panchas C.Ws.21 and 22 as per Ex.P.2. He has recovered the blood stained bed sheet and sample blood in a preservative container as per M.Os.1 and 3 and the said material objects were seized and sealed and set in P.F.No.213/2010. He has sent the dead body to KIMS, Bengaluru for post mortem. He has recorded the statements of P.Ws.2 and 3 and C.Ws.4 to 14 and 16. The Constable-P.W.5 has given a report as per Ex.P.5. C.Ws.27 to 29 have produced the accused Nos.1 to 3 and he has followed the arrest procedure by recording the voluntary statements of accused Nos.1 to 3 as per Exs.P.15 to 17. The accused No.1 took them to the spot i.e., Narayana Das Sapota Farm and identified one white bag in the bush and in the presence of C.Ws.23 and 24, he has seized the said bag by conducting mahazar. The said bag was containing blood stained clothes, one cement colour shirt. The accused No.1 has produced the blood stained wooden piece and the accused No.2 has produced S.C.No.466/2011 one cement cream colour shirt. He has seized the said articles by drawing mahazar Ex.P.18 and set the same in P.F.No.214/2019 as per Ex.P.19. He has identified M.O.10, which is a plastic cover.

19. The evidence of this official witness/ Investigating Officer is quite contradictory to the evidence of the Doctor- P.W.4, who has examined the wooden repiece and has not stated about the blood stains found on the wooden piece. On the other hand, P.W.11 has stated that the wooden piece is stained with blood. Therefore, the official witnesses perse contradictory to their testimony. Hence, the user of M.O.2 in the crime by the accused leading to murder the deceased is not evident.

P.W.10 has further deposed that C.W.26 has took the seizure mahazar photographs depicting the dead body, which is marked as Exs.P.20 to 24. He has recorded the statements of C.Ws.23 and 24 and also recorded the statements of C.Ws.11, 12 and 15. On 30.08.2010, he has given a requisition to the Doctor to conduct post mortem and after P.M.Examination, he has handed over the body to the relatives through his staff. Further, the accused were produced before the jurisdictional court along with remand application. All these procedural aspects is deserves to be considered on the part of Investigating Officer, but that S.C.No.466/2011 itself is not sufficient to connect the accused in this crime unless cogent corroborative evidence is forthcoming.

The presence of the accused in the room and their overt act of assault and the clothes worn by them also stained with blood correlating to the blood of the deceased is not forthcoming.

In the cross examination, P.W.11 has stated that he has received the complaint in the Police Station. But, according to P.W.1, he has given the complaint in th spot itself. Therefore, it can be inferred that there is due deliberation between P.Ws.1 and 7 and the Investigating Officer and the police, who have visited the spot on receiving the phone call and later on, the complaint has been lodged. Therefore, the facts of the complaint is to be scrutinized with proper care and caution and it needs sufficient cogent and reliable corroboration. According to P.W.11, in the cross examination, the accused were residing in the same room, but he has not traced them and arrested them earlier to the time of mahazar. It is apparent that the accused were available in the room and they have been seen by P.Ws.1 and 2 at the relevant point of time while carrying the dead body near toilet. But, the prosecution and the concerned police have not explained why the accused were not arrested in the

spot even though S.C.No.466/2011 they are available and present in the room. Therefore, the testimony of prosecution witnesses is not appreciable or reliable in nature. On the other hand, P.Ws.6 and 11 have stated that the accused were arrested near bus-stop. Therefore, the place of arrest of the accused is also quite contradictory to their availability at the time of the alleged transmission of the dead body.

In the cross examination, P.W.10 has denied that the accused No.1 was resided separately in other room and not resided with the accused Nos.2 and 3. On the other hand, the evidence of P.W.7 is quite contradictory and according to him, the accused No.1 was working at KOGI Apartments and the accused Nos.2 and 3 were deputed as Security Guards at Esteem Heritage Apartment. P.W.8 do not know the room number and the schedule of the place of incident and the premises in which the accused and deceased were resided. P.W.9-Security Personnel has deposed that he know the deceased Krishna Prasad Gol, who was residing in a room at J.P.Nagar. This is quite contradictory to the prosecution case so as to prove that the accused Nos.1 to 3 were resided together along with deceased Krishna Prasad Gol. Therefore, the interse contradictory evidence of the independent witnesses, it is difficult to hold the guilt of the accused and to fix the place of occurrence of murder.

S.C.No.466/2011

20. In the evidence of P.W.1, the circumstance only indexing carrying of dead body rather than the culpable act of murder committed by the accused. Even the participation of the accused Nos.2 and 3 is also not established in this case. The conspiracy, intention, motive and preparation so as to commit the murder of the deceased is not established by the prosecution with relevant testimony of the circumstantial evidence. Even though, the sketch is prepared by the police, it does not specifically shown the place of toilet in the sketch. Even the residential house of C.W.1 is not shown in the rough sketch. Therefore, the visibility from the house of P.W.1 so as to see carrying of the dead body near toilet is also doubtful and the evidence is so feeble and bleak.

21. The defense has also suggested that the accused have not given any voluntary statements nor accompanied to the spot while drawing mahazar Ex.P.18. Therefore, the prosecution has to comply the provision under Section 100(4) of Cr.P.C., so as to prove the seizure and other mahazar procedures conducted in the presence of the respectable citizens of the locality or any other neighbouring residents. Unless such relevant evidence is S.C.No.466/2011 forthcoming, the procedure adopted by the Investigating Officer does not in any way help the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt.

22. P.W.12 has turned hostile to the prosecution case. He do not know the owner of the house in which he was resided. His employer is one Mr.Deepak Sharma. He came along with C.W.12-Gunjan Sharma and C.W.4-Pankaj Kumar from Bihar and resided together. He do not know the deceased Krishna Prasad Gol. He do not know who was murdered him and whether the deceased was residing with the accused. He has not identified the accused. According to this witness, the deceased was died near Bilekahalli. The said Krishna Prasad Gol was quarreling with his friends on the previous night, but he do not know who has committed the murder. Therefore, the identification of the accused and the circumstances under which the deceased was died is not forthcoming. Hence, the

hostile testimony of this witness is not in any aid the prosecution to connect the accused in the crime.

In the cross examination, the prosecution has suggested that the accused Nos.1 to 3 were resided with the deceased and they have started quarrel regarding snatching of mobile and the accused No.1 assaulted on him, the same has been denied. Further, he has admitted that on S.C.No.466/2011 29.08.2010 at about 7-00 p.m., he heard the quarrel sound and the accused voice. But, he has denied the suggestion that his house owner went to the place of murder and saw the dead body near the toilet and the accused went away from that place. Therefore, the statement given as per Ex.P.28 is denied by this relevant witness. Hence, the prosecution has not placed sufficient material to corroborate the evidence of P.W.1 as to carrying of the dead body by the accused as well as they have indulged in committing the murder.

23. P.W.13 has also turned hostile to the prosecution case. He has signed the mahazar Ex.P.18, but he do not know its contents. He do not know who was murdered and he has not seen the accused. The police have not seized any cloth or repiece and blood stained shirts in the presence of accused. Therefore, the prosecution treated this witness as hostile and suggested that on 30.08.2010 at Sapota garden, the mahazar was done and the police have seized the wooden piece and clothes in his presence, but the same is denied. Therefore, the prosecution has failed to place cogent testimony of the mahazar witness as to the seizure of cloth and repiece, which is connected to this case.

S.C.No.466/2011

24. P.W.14 has also turned hostile to the prosecution case. He is doing Carpentering work and resided at Building No.165/17, Joseph Layout, Doresanipalya, Bannerghatta Road, Bengaluru. He has not identified the accused. But, he has deposed that the residence of the accused is in front of his working place. He do not know the deceased Krishna Prasad Gol and he do not know whether the deceased was resided with the accused. He do not know the manner in which he was murdered and who are involved in the commission of murder. He has seen the dead body of deceased when the police visited the spot. The dead body was traced in a garden, back side of toilet room. This is also quite contradictory as the body is traced in sapota garden. He do not know whether there was any injury or bleeding present on the body. Therefore, his evidence is totally contradicting to prove the presence of this witness and seeing the body and the nature of injuries found on the body. The injuries whether antemortem or whether it is the cause for the death is not forthcoming. In the improved version, this witness has stated that the deceased was quarreling regarding the cleaning of clothes and mobile phone. This aspect is not stated by other witnesses. He do not know to whom the mobile phone belongs to and whether there was any quarrel regarding that. Therefore, the stealing of mobile phone by accused S.C.No.466/2011 No.1 led to enmity and causing the murder is not established in the prosecution case with authenticated trustworthy evidence of the prosecution witnesses. The prosecution suggestion as to the quarrel between the accused and the deceased and in furtherance of the said quarrel, the accused committed the murder is denied. The hearing of commotion and quarrel and shouting are not testified and the suggestion as to hearing the shouting at 2- 30 a.m., is denied. The statement given as per Ex.P.29 is also denied by P.W.14. Hence, the prosecution has failed to place consistent corroborative positive evidnece of this witness.

In the cross examination of defense, this witness has admitted that he do not know the house in which the quarrel was occurred. There are many houses in the building. Therefore, the specific overt act and the spot of murder is not clearly brought out from the testimony of this witness. Hence, the prosecution has miserably failed to place reliable authenticated testimony of the independent witnesses to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. The arrest of the accused from the locality and seizure of the articles from their room either belonging to the accused or to the deceased is not brought out in the evidence. Therefore, the benefit of doubt is to be conferred in favour of the accused.

S.C.No.466/2011

25. The info of mobile, footage conversation and SMS message are not collected to prove the ill-will or quarrel between the accused No.1 and deceased as per Section 65(A) and (b) of Indian Evidence Act. P.W.1 has seen the carrying of bed sheet with something, but their presence in the premises prior to that circumstance and they are coming out from the room with something holding bed sheet is not testified by any of the witness. The co-accused Nos.2 and 3 conspired with accused No.1 and participated in the crime is also not evident. They have not been cited as accomplice to the crime under Section 133 of Indian Evidence Act. Section 133 of Indian Evidence Act reads thus :

"An accomplice shall be a competent witness against an accused person; and a conviction is not illegal merely because it proceeds upon the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice".

If such evidence is forthcoming, the truth or otherwise of the incident would have been revealed by the co- accused/accomplice, because they are having personal knowledge under Section 106 of Indian Evidence Act. If they were arrested in the same room as per the prosecution case, all these aspects would have been revealed to the S.C.No.466/2011 police.

26. The learned counsel for accused has relied upon the following dictums reported in :

(1) 2007 Criminal Law Journal 1890 (Abdul Sayeed .Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh) , wherein Their Lordships pleased to observe as under :

(A) Penal Code (45 of 1860), Section 300

- Evidence Act (1 of 1872), Section 3 -

Appreciation of evidence - Circumstantial evidence - Murder case -

Entire case resting upon circumstantial evidence only - in such a situation, case of prosecution has to be subjected to tests as laid down in AIR 1990 SC 79.

(B) Penal Code (45 of 1860), Section 302

- Medical Jurisprudence - Murder case -

Case of throttling - Medical Officer is expected to remove piece of skin around neck for preservation as an exhibit in a later criminal proceedings for purpose of ascertaining opinion of expert - Failure in this regard is lacuna in the case.

(C) Evidence Act (1 of 1872), Section 3 -

Appreciation of evidence - Murder case - When two views are possible, view that is favourable to accused shall be adopted so as to arrive at conclusion.

Here in this case, the chain of circumstance to connect the accused in the crime has not been established. The S.C.No.466/2011 mobile is not seized, which is the root for the quarrel. The info of messages and conversation footage are not produced. The evidence of P.W.1 is not completing the chain of links so as to rely upon his testimony. There is doubtful circumstance expressed by the witness and there is due deliberation by the police before taking the complaint, which cast cloud on the credibility of the witness.

(2) 2007 Criminal Law Journal 1972 (Gopal Singh .Vs. State of Uttaranchal) , wherein Their Lordships pleased to observe as under :

(A) Penal Code (45 of 1860), Section 302

- Evidence Act (1 of 1872), Section 3 -

Murder - Circumstantial evidence -

Chain of circumstances - Last seen evidence - Time gap theory - Accused and deceased went together on 16 th April 1987 and dead body was found on 18 th April 1987 - There was thus long gap between two and last seen theory would not come into play - Deceased did not come back on 16 th , but no complaint of missing was lodged with police.

(B) Evidence Act (1 of 1872), Section 8 -

Penal Code (45 of 1860), Section 300 -

Murder - Circumstantial evidence -

Subsequent conduct of accused -

S.C.No.466/2011 Deceased alleged to be went out with accused and did not return back and his body recovered after two days -

Accused stated to have come to house of deceased on very next day - He had also gone to see dead body of deceased when it was recovered - He was all the time present in village - If he had committed murder, it would be natural conduct to abscond from there and not to go there - It reveals that appellant was not guilty of offence alleged against him - Moreover he had good relations with deceased - Facts and circumstances not consistent with hypothesis of his guilt.

(D) Penal Code (45 of 1860), Section 302/34 - Murder - Conviction of appellant No.2 along with appellant No.1 - Trial Court observed that appellant No.1 who took out deceased with him had a fractured hand and could not inflict injuries as sustained by deceased - Deceased had allegedly stolen wood of appellant No.2 -

Therefore it was inferred that appellant No.2 had assisted appellant No.1 in committing murder - Finding of trial court bases on surmises and conjectures - No legal evidence on record against him - None of witnesses had stated about his participation and there was no direct or circumstantial evidence against him - Finding of guilt perverse - His conviction liable to be set S.C.No.466/2011 aside.

Here in this case, the evidence of P.W.1 is not parting with the accused and the deceased went to the room at a particular point of time and the quarrel in the night and screaming of deceased and shouting of the accused has not been heard by the neighbours. The testimony of neighbouring residents is not positively and consistently revealing all these vital aspects. Due to lack of relevant evidence, it is difficult to hold the guilt of the accused.

(3) AIR 2002 SC 3206 (Ashish Batham .Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh) , wherein Their Lordships pleased to observe as under :

(A) Evidence Act (1 of 1872), Section 3 -

Circumstantial Evidence - Conviction on basis of - Principles which should guide and weigh with court - Reiterated.

(B) Evidence Act (1 of 1872), Sections 3, 100 - Criminal case - Proof - Suspicion however strong - Not substitute for legal proof - Graver the charge greater has to be the standard of proof - Courts to keep in mind that there lies long mental distance between 'may be true' and 'must be true'.

Here in this case also, the proof is not sufficient and it is suspicious - Graver the charge greater has to be standard of proof. The court has to keep in mind that there S.C.No.466/2011 lies long mental distance between 'may be true' and 'must be true'. Therefore, the realities or truth apart fundamental basic presumption in the administration of criminal law and jurisdiction delivery system is innocence of the alleged accused and till charge are proved beyond all reasonable doubt. On the basis of clear, cogent, credible and unimpeachable evidence, the question of indicting or punishing the accused does not arise merely carried away by heinous nature of the crime.

(C) Penal Code (45 of 1860) Section 300

- Murder, Circumstantial evidence -

Failure in love affair alleged to be the motive - Circumstances of presence of accused at scene, false plea of alibi, recovery of chain of deceased from and knife and blood stained clothes at instance of accused relied upon by prosecution - Prosecution however suppressing results of finger print and lie detector examination and report of independent investigation made by CID

- Held, it casts shadow of doubt on credibility of prosecution case -

Evidence adduced to prove incriminating circumstances also lacking in legal credibility - Accused held was somehow roped in - Liable to be acquitted.

Here in this case also, the finger prints available in the spot and finger prints on M.O.2-Wooden repiece is not S.C.No.466/2011 proved so as to correlate with the finger prints of the accused No.1, who has allegedly used the same for assault. The FSL Report is also not obtained so as to prove the blood sample of the deceased, which is correlating with the blood stains found on the floor or on the clothes of the deceased and the stains found on the clothes of the accused or found on any other object in the spot inside the room. Therefore, the observations in the above said dictum is aptly applicable to the case on hand. It is observed that the prosecution however suppressing results of finger prints and lie detector examination and report of independent investigation will hamper the proof and cast shadow of doubt on the credibility of the prosecution case.

(E) Penal Code (45 of 1860), Section 300

- Murder - Motive - Proof - Accused alleged to have murdered deceased because of failure in love affair - Mere proof that accused and deceased were in love - Not sufficient to presume that accused was cause for murder -

Breakdown of love affair beyond redemption ought to be proved by credible evidence.

Here in this case, the murder committed by the accused with specific motive, preparation and intention is not forthcoming. The trivial aspect of taking mobile phone by itself leading to cause such heinous offence by the S.C.No.466/2011 accused, who were living together is leading to doubt the prosecution case. There must be a strong and sufficient cause so as to commit the murder so as to satisfy the ingredients of the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC. The prosecution has to prove the case by credible evidence that the accused have committing the murder for the sole cause of taking mobile by the accused and the deceased resorted to quarrel. In the absence of such course of events prior to the alleged act of murder, it is difficult to hold that the accused had conspired, planned and intended to murder the deceased.

(4) AIR 2008 Criminal Law Journal 1775 (Leela Ram and Ashok & Another .Vs. State of Rajasthan) , wherein Their Lordships pleased to observe as under :



"Penal Code (45 of 1860), Section 300 - Murder - Circumstantial evidence - Accused were in police custody where they allegedly gave disclosure statements about their involvement in crime - Their foot prints matched with foot impressions taken on spot - Stolen articles recovered from their houses - However, foot impression moulds were not taken before or under orders of Magistrate - Cannot be accepted in evidence - Stolen articles not recovered during 1 st search of house, but recovered during 2 nd search - Evidence of witnesses to recovery not found S.C.No.466/2011 truthful - Moreover these articles were of such little value that no accused would carry them home after commission of murder - Evidence adduced not sufficient to connect accused with crime - Doctrine of confirmation by subsequent fact "not applicable" - Conviction liable to be set aside.

Here in this case also, the mahazar was conducted and the material objects were seized while the accused was in custody. Therefore, the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the case with reliable testimony of the mahazar witnesses, as they have been turned hostile.

(5) 1992 SCC (Cri) 329 (State of Karnataka .Vs. Venkatesh & Others) , wherein Their Lordships have pleased to observe as under:

"Criminal Trial - Appreciation of evidence - Ace prosecution witness not disclosing relevant information to anyone at the earliest opportunity till November 10 though alleged murder took place on the night of November 8 - Held, this created serious doubts about the genuineness of the prosecution case".

"Criminal Trial - Abscondence - Murder taking place on November 8 but police not visiting house of any of the accused on November 9 to arrest them -

Prosecution                      witness                      disclosing  
S.C.No.466/2011

information about the murder on

November 10 - Held, failure of accused to appear before police cannot give rise to any inference of their guilt and therefore, the alleged circumstance of abscondence cannot be used against the accused".

Here in this case, the accused have neither absconded nor escaped from the scene as contended by the defense. Therefore, there is strong suspicion as to the commission of offence by the accused.

Hence, the circumstantial evidence is also not established with complete chain of events and course of criminal act and nexus of the accused in culpable act.

27. Here in this case also, the neighbours claiming to have seen the accused near the house of the deceased, but the accused are not arrested at that relevant point of time even though, knowing that the police had come and public have gathered at the house of deceased. It is disclosing that P.W.1 has seen the accused after the arrival of police. Their evidence is too artificial to be believed. It is also the evidence of P.W.1 that the accused disposed the bed sheet having something and went to their room. There must be identification of the accused and conducting of the Test S.C.No.466/2011 Identification Parade as provided under Section 9 of Indian Evidence Act is very essential. But, here in this case, the Investigating Officer/prosecution has not conducted the Test Identification Parade, which is fatal to the prosecution case.

28. Further, even though hearing sound of the quarrel, none of the witnesses went inside the room at the time of quarrel in order to pacify the quarrel. The room is situated in a vatara, which consists of several rooms and houses. P.W.1 or P.W.2 have not went to see the quarrel in the midnight.

29. So far as the offence under Section 201 of IPC is concerned, Their Lordships of Hon'ble Apex Court have pleased to observe in Appeal (Cri) No.1203/2006 (Sukhram .Vs. State of Maharashtra ) as under :

Section 201 of IPC, the ingredients to be established are:

(i) committal of an offence;

(ii) must have the knowledge or reason to believe that an offence has been committed;

(iii) person charged with the said offence should have caused disappearance of evidence; and S.C.No.466/2011

(iv) the act should have been done with the intention of screening the offender from legal punishment or with that intention he should have given information respecting the offence, which he knew or believed to be false.

It is plain that the intent to screen the offender committing an offence must be the primary and sole aim of the accused. It hardly needs any emphasis that in order to bring home an offence under Section 201 of IPC, a mere suspicion is not sufficient. There must be on record cogent evidence to prove that the accused knew or had information sufficient to lead him to believe that the offence had been committed and that the accused has caused the evidence to disappear in order to screen the offender, known or unknown.

30. On considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the prosecution has failed to establish that the conduct of accused, both at the time of occurrence or immediately thereafter, is consistent with hypothesis of his guilt. The prosecution has failed to prove the case with cogent, credible testimony of reliable prosecution witnesses. The evidence of circumstantial witnesses P.Ws.1 and 2 does not inspire confidence, as their credibility is tested in the cross

examination and the S.C.No.466/2011 unimpeachable incriminating evidence is not forthcoming to connect the accused in the direct act of committing murder and also screening of evidence and knowingly that they have committed the offence. The varied version of the witnesses and vital and material inconsistencies and omissions in evidence is materially affecting the prosecution case. Therefore, the evidence is not cogent or sufficient to come to unerring conclusion as to the guilt of the accused. Hence, the appreciation of comprehensive evidence is leading to doubt the prosecution case and the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. The benefit of doubt is to be conferred in favour of the accused. Accordingly, I answer the Point Nos.1 and 2 in the Negative.

31. POINT No.3 : My finding on this point is as per the following :

O R D E R Acting under Section 235(1) of Cr.P.C., accused Nos.1 to 3 are acquitted for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 r/w. Section 34 of IPC.

The accused No.1 is set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required in any other case.

The bail bonds and surety bonds of the accused Nos.2 S.C.No.466/2011 and 3 stand cancelled, subject to appeal/appeal period.

M.O.4-Watch is ordered to be confiscated to the State and M.Os.1 to 3 and 5 to 11 being worthless, are ordered to be destroyed, otherwise confiscated to the State as per Criminal Rules of Practice, after the appeal period is over.

(Dictated to the Judgment-writer, transcript thereof is corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court on this the 9th day of June 2020) ( K.SUBRAMANYA ) LXVII Addl.City Civil and Sessions Judge, BENGALURU.

#### A N N E X U R E

##### 1. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR PROSECUTION :

P.W.1	Theres Raju
P.W.2	Sujatha
P.W.3	Ramesh
P.W.4	Dr.Ananda K.
P.W.5	Narayanaswamy
P.W.6	Sundar Rao
P.W.7	Ramachandra
P.W.8	M.N.Srinivasa Reddy
P.W.9	Prabhu Katik
P.W.10	S.K.Umesh
P.W.11	Imroz Pasha
P.W.12	Ramesh Sharma
P.W.13	Raju
P.W.14	Gunjan Sharma

S . C . No . 466/2011

## 2. LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR PROSECUTION:

Ex.P.1	Complaint
Ex.P.1(a)	Signature of P.W.1
Ex.P.1(a)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.2	Mahazar
Ex.P.2(a)	Signature of P.W.1
Ex.P.2(b)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.3	Inquest Mahazar
Ex.P.3(a)	Signature of P.W.3

Exs.P.3(b) & (c) Signatures of P.W.10 Ex.P.4 P.M.Report Ex.P.4(a) Signature of P.W.4 Ex.P.4(b) Signature of P.W.10 Ex.P.5 Opinion of P.W.4 Ex.P.5(a) Signature of P.W.4 Ex.P.5(b) Signature of P.W.10 Ex.P.6 F.I.R.

Ex.P.6(a)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.7	Report of P.W.5
Ex.P.7(a)	Signature of P.W.5
Ex.P.7(b)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.8	Report of P.W.6
Ex.P.8(a)	Signature of P.W.6
Ex.P.8(b)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.9	Acknowledgment issued by FSL
Ex.P.10	Report of P.W.6
Ex.P.10(a)	Signature of P.W.6
Ex.P.11	Letter of P.W.8
Ex.P.11(a)	Signature of P.W.8
Ex.P.12	Xerox Copy of Rental Agreement
Ex.P.13	Statement of P.W.9
Ex.P.14	Property Form
Ex.P.14(a)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.15	Voluntary Statement of accused No.1
Ex.P.15(a)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.16	Voluntary Statement of accused No.2

S.C.No.466/2011

Ex.P.16(a)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.17	Voluntary Statement of accused No.3
Ex.P.17(a)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.18	Seizure Mahazar
Ex.P.18(a)	Signature of P.W.10
Ex.P.18(b)	Signature of P.W.13
Ex.P.19	Property Form
Ex.P.19(a)	Signature of P.W.10

Exs.P.20 to 24 Seizure Mahazar Photographs Exs.P.20(a) to Signature of P.W.10 24(b) Ex.P.25 Report of C.W.26 Ex.P.25(a) Signature of P.W.10 Ex.P.25(b) Signature

of C.W.26 Ex.P.26 Property Form Ex.P.26(a) Signature of P.W.10 Ex.P.27 Report of C.W.27 Ex.P.28 Statement of P.W.12 Ex.P.29 Statement of P.W.13

**3. LIST OF MATERIAL OBJECTS PRODUCED AND GOT MARKED FOR PROSECUTION :**

M.0.1	Woolen Blanket
M.0.2	Wooden re-piece
M.0.2(a)	Signature of P.W.4
M.0.3	Blood Sample
M.0.4	Watch
M.0.4(a)	Signature of P.W.4
M.0.5	Black Banian
M.0.5(a)	Signature of P.W.4
M.0.6	Underwear
M.0.6(a)	Signature of P.W.4
M.0.7	Shirt
M.0.7(a)	Signature of P.W.4
M.0.8	Pant
M.0.8(a)	Signature of P.W.4

S.C.No.466/2011

M.0.9	Shirt
M.0.10	Plastic Cover
M.0.11	Shirt

**4. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED & DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR ACCUSED :**

- NIL -

( K.SUBRAMANYA ) LXVII Addl.City Civil and Sessions Judge, BENGALURU.