

FORM-A

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-VI, JAMUI	
Present: Manoranjan Kumar Jha, A.S.J.-VI	
Date of Judgement : 16.07.2026	
SESSIONS TRIAL No. 476/2010	
Khaira P.S. Case No.- 208/2008	
U/ss- 399, 402 of IPC & (1-b)a25, 26 of Arms Act	
Complainant/Informant	S.H.O. Punam Sinha
Represented by	Sri Benu Mandal, Ld. Addl. P.P.
Accused	Dhano Ray
Represented by	Ld. Advocate, Sri Chandra Mohan Prasad

FORM-B

Date of offence	23-24.11.2008
Date of FIR	24.11.2008
Date of Charge Sheet	23.09.2009
Date of framing of charges	24.05.2018
Date of commencement of evidence	14.06.2018
Date of Judgement	16.07.2026
Date of the sentencing order, if any	N.A.

ACCUSED DETAILS

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences Charged with u/s	Whether Acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of section 428, Cr.P.C.

01.	Dhano Ray			399, 402 of IPC & (1- b)a25, 26 of Arms Act	Acquitted	N.A.	N.A.
-----	-----------	--	--	--	-----------	------	------

FORM-C

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT WITNESSES

A- Prosecution - Nil

B- Defence Witness - Nil

C- Court Witness - Nil

LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS

A- Prosecution Exhibit - Nil

B- Defence Exhibit - Nil

J U D G E M E N T

1. The accused person, namely, **Dhano Ray** is facing trial for the offence punishable under sections **399, 402 of IPC & (1-b)a25, 26 of Arms Act**. The charges have been read over and explained to the accused person in Hindi to which he did not plead guilty and claimed to be tried.
2. The prosecution case, in brevity, is that on 23.11.2008 at about 22:30 p.m., the police upon receiving secret information as to commission of offence conducted search in the house of Paulura Kharwar and found one country-made two barrel gun and one country-made musket and ammunition.
3. On the basis of written report, a case being Khaira P.S. Case No.- 208/2008, dated 24.11.2008 was registered under Sections **399, 402 of IPC & 25(1-b)A, 26, 35 of Arms Act** against the accused. After completion of investigation police submitted charge-sheet u/ss- **399, 402 of IPC & 25(1-b)A, 26, 35 of Arms Act** against the accused person namely **Dhano Ray** thereupon the Ld. Court below has taken cognizance u/ss- **399, 402 of IPC & 25(1-b)a, 26/36 of Arms Act** on dated 24.09.2009.
4. Charges under Sections **399, 402 of IPC & 25(1-b)A, 26, 35 of Arms Act** were framed on 23.09.2009 against the accused to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial by the Court.
5. Defence is denial of allegation and of false implication at the instigation of the informant party.
6. Now, the only question for determination is whether prosecution has been able to establish the charges levelled against the accused person beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubt?

FINDINGS

7. In the instant Case, in support of its case, the prosecution has failed to examined even a single witness in support of its case. It reflects from the order sheet that the Court had issued all the processes including summons, bailable warrants and non-bailable warrants against the witnesses but the prosecution did not bring any evidence before the Court so as to corroborate the case in hand. It further reflects that the Court had even issued dasti to the Ld. P.P. but the prosecution even failed to bring evidence on record in support of its case. In this case charges have been framed on 24.05.2018 but in spite of ample opportunities the prosecution did not take any pain to produce evidence to establish the case and at last the prosecution evidence was closed and record was posted for statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. in which the accused pleaded not guilty.
8. Considering the aforesaid facts and the fact that the prosecution failed to adduce any evidence in support of its case and as such and in absent of any evidence, the court is of the opinion that the prosecution has miserably failed to establish the case beyond shadow of any doubt.
9. Consequently, the prosecution has, therefore, failed to prove the charges against accused person namely, **Dhano Ray** beyond reasonable doubt.

ORDER

10. In view of the above, this Court is of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to establish the offences u/ss **399, 402 of IPC & (1-b)a25, 26 of Arms Act** against the accused person namely, **Dhano Ray**. Accordingly, the accused person is acquitted from the charges levelled against him and set at liberty forthwith.

A copy of this judgment be sent to District Magistrate, Jamui.

A free copy of the judgment be furnished.

Given under the hand and seal of this Court.

This judgment has been corrected, signed and pronounced by me on 16th of July, 2026 in Open Court.

Dictated

(Sri Manoranjan Kumar Jha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-VIth
Jamui
Dated- 16th July, 2026

(Sri Manoranjan Kumar Jha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-VIth
Jamui
Dated- 16th July, 2026