

In the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge-V , Muzaffarpur
District:- Muzaffarpur
Present : Suman Kumar Divakar
Bihar Superior Judicial Service
Date of Judgement : 07-05-2026
Sessions Trial No.448/2025
[Muzaffarpur Rail P.S. Case No. 10/2025]

INDEX

Serial No.	Particulars	Page Number.
1	Form "A" and Form "B" as per C.S. 98 [Addenda and Corrigenda to Criminal Court Rules of the High Court of Judicature at Patna (Volume 1) (Third Edition)].	
2	Introduction	
3	The Facts	
4	Submission (s) made on behalf of the Parties.	
5	The point for determination(s)	
6	The Evidence	
7	Analysis	
8	Findings.	
9	The Sentence.	
10	Form C (List of Prosecution / Defence/ Court Witnesses.	

(Suman Kumar Divakar)
Addl. Sessions Judge-V
Muzaffarpur

FORM A

In the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge-V, Muzaffarpur
District: Muzaffarpur

Present : Suman Kumar Divakar
Bihar Superior Judicial Service

Date of Judgement : 07-05-2026
Sessions Trial No. 448/2025
[Muzaffarpur Rail P.S. Case No. 10/2025]

Complainant	State of Bihar
Represented by	Jagdish Sahani, Addl. PP
Accused	1. Sushil Mandal s/o Kailash Mandal , Village-Gaheli Panchma, P.S.- Kodha, District-Katihar, Bihar. 2. Md. Ekbal Hussain s/o Md. Mansur Hussain , P.S.-Barari, District-Katihar, Bihar. 3. Shiv Dayal Mahto @ Dayal Mahto s/o Kamla Mahto , Village- Jalki Ward No. 11, P.S.- Azamnagar, District-Katihar, Bihar. 4. Md. Rehan Raza s/o Jainuddin, Village-Natuapara, P.S.- Bahadurganj, District-Kishanganj, Bihar.
Accused Represented by	Parminder Singh Khalsa, Md. Arman Ali , Advocates.

FORM B

Date of Offence	15-01-2025
Date of FIR	15-01-2025
Date of Chargesheet	10-03-2025
Date of Framing of Charges	23-06-2025
Date of Commencement of evidence	12-09-2025
Date on which judgement is reserved	15-04-2026/30-04-2026
Date of the Judgement	07-05-2026
Date of Sentencing order , if any .	16-05-2026

ACCUSED DETAILS

Rank of the accused	Name of the accused	Date of arrest	Date of Release on bail	Offences charged with	whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of detention undergone during trial for purpose of Section 428 Cr.P.C
A1	Sushil Mandal	15-01-25	Not Bailed out	Section 143(5) BNS, Section 79 JJ Act, 2015 and Section 3/14 Child Labour Adolescent Act , 1986	Convicted	Please refer to sentencing portion	About 1 year 04 months
A2	Md. Ekbal Hussain	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto
A3	Shiv Dayal Mahto @ Dayal Mahto	Ditto	19-8-25	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	About 08 months
A4	Md. Rehan Raja	Ditto	Not Bailed out	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	About 1 year 04 months

J U D G E M E N T

The Judgement is being divided into the following head(s):-

1. Introduction
2. The Facts
3. Submission(s) made on behalf of the parties
4. The Point(s) for determination
5. The Evidence
6. Analysis
7. Finding(s)

" Human trafficking is an open wound on the body of contemporary society, a scourge upon the body of Christ. It is crime against humanity."-Pope Francis

1. Introduction:

The accused A1 to A4 stand (s) charged and faced trial for committing the offence(s) punishable Under Section 143(5) of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNS' for short) and Section 79 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as 'JJ Act' for short) and further, under Section 3/14 of Child Labour Adolescent Act, 1986 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Child Labour Act' for short) in connection with Muzaffarpur Rail P.S. Case No.10/2025 registered for the offences under Section 143(6) BNS, Section 79 JJ Act and Section 3/14 the Child Labour Act. They pleaded not guilty and claimed for trial. Further, they while responding to the incriminating materials surfaced during the evidence under section 351 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Surakasha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS' for short) have asserted their innocence.

1.1. The Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 16-02-2026 passed in Criminal Misc. No. 9908 of 2026 had been pleased, while dismissing the prayer for bail, to direct the trial court to expedite the trial in view of the judgement

of Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as Pinki versus State of U.P. since reported in 2025 INSC 482. This court has taken its honest effort to comply with direction of the Hon'ble Court to ensure early disposal of the present sessions trial. The present sessions trial was at the stage of argument when the undersigned joined this court on 30-03-2026 pursuant to Annual General Transfer, 2026.

2. The Facts:

The present case relates to human trafficking. In sum and substance, the accused persons are alleged to be trafficking 22 children for the purpose of labouring to the different place in the state of Punjab. The Informant is Gokulesh Pathak, Inspector of Police , RPF, Muzaffarpur. He has alleged that on 15-01-2025, he along with Sub-Inspector of Police Girish Kumar , Head Constable Shivrath, Shambhunath Sah , Constable Ritesh Kumar and Lalbabu Khan and Jay Ballabh Mishra, Assistant Project Officer, Bachpan Bachao Andolan , after having received secret information with regard to human trafficking and other criminal activity, proceeded from Muzaffarpur Junction to Samastipur Junction. After reaching Samastipur Junction, they boarded on ` Karmbhumi Express' (Train No. 12407) and returning to Muzaffarpur Junction then he found some boys in distress condition in Coach No. NF 204577/C. When he made enquiry from the said children, he was replied by them that they were being taken to Ambala, Jalandhar and Amritsar for the purpose of labour work. He was further told by them that they were being taken by Shiv Dayal Mahto, Sushil Mandal , Md. Ekbal Hussain and Rehan Raza. On the instance of the children, the said accused persons along with the children made to board down on Muzaffarpur Junction for the purpose of inquiry. Thereafter, all the four accused

persons along with 22 children handed over for further action resulting into institution of the present FIR followed by arrest of the accused persons facing trial here.

3. Submission(s) made on behalf of the parties:

3.1. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that the prosecution has successfully proved the recovery of the children along with the accused persons from Karmbhumi Express. He further submits that all the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. The recovery of the children along with co-accused persons have not disputed either in cross examination or in the defense evidence. He finally submits that the prosecution has been able to prove its case beyond shadow of all reasonable doubts. In the background of such submissions, he prays for holding the accused persons guilty for the charged offences.

3.2. Learned counsel for the accused persons has multifold argument to pierce the fortress of the prosecution. Those arguments, inter alia, includes (i) The children recovered had enough mental maturity to understand as to what they were intended to do or where were they going, (ii) All the accused persons are related with the children so recovered, (iii) the place of the occurrence has not been proved in the present case . In particular, the prosecution has failed to prove the fact that from where, the so called children recovered. Was it Samastipur Railway Station or Muzaffarpur Railway Station, (iv) Any employee of Bachpan Bacho Andolan is not authorised to make routine checking,(vi) the Children were going with consent of their family as has surfaced in the defence evidence and they were going with valid tickets. Finally, he submits that the police officer had gone to make extortion and when the

money demanded by them was not given by the accused persons, they have been falsely implicated in the present case.

4. The Point(s) for determination:

4.1. As to whether the prosecution has been successful in proving the charges levelled against the accused person A1 to A4 beyond shadow of all reasonable doubts?

5. The Evidence(s):

5.1. In order to bring home the guilty of the accused person, the prosecution has got examined altogether five (05) witnesses. They are **PW1** Manoj Kumar Singh, **PW2** Gokulesh Pathak (the Informant), **PW3** Girish Kumar, **PW4** Birendra Kumar (the Investigation Officer) and **PW5** Jaiballabh Mishra.

5.2. The documentary evidences produced by the Prosecution are not repeated herein for the sake of brevity and the same find place in '**FORM C**' appended herewith.

5.3. The defence has brought on record eight (08) witnesses to exert to create doubt on the prosecution version. They are **DW1** Ajay Mahto, **DW2** Meena Devi, **DW3** Anita Devi, **DW4** Rukhsana Khatoon, **DW5** Vishawanath Chaudhary, **DW6** Afsar Ali , **DW7** Lal Mohammad and **DW8** Mahboob Alam.

5.4. The documentary evidences produced by the defence are not repeated herein for the sake of brevity and the same find place in '**FORM C**' appended herewith.

6. Analysis:

6.1. I have gone through the evidence on record meticulously and consciously. I am not extracting deposition of the witnesses in the

Judgement as it is matter of records and further, to avoid the judgement becoming more lengthy. However, I would be quoting relevant pieces of evidence wherever required for arriving at just decision in this case.

6.2. Before coming down to the evidence on record, I want to place on record that Section 143 BNS deals with 'Trafficking of Person' without making any age bar for the victim. In other words, this provision of law talks of persons of any age. There is no pre condition that the victim must be below 18 years for invoking the provision.

6.3. Section 143 (1) BNS reads as "whoever, for the purpose of exploitation recruits, transports , harbours, transfers, or receives a person or persons, by (a) using threats; or (b) using force ; or any other form of coercion; or (c) by abduction ; or (d) by practising fraud , or deception; or (e) by abuse of power; or (f) by inducement , including the giving or receiving of payments or benefits , in order to achieve the consent of any person having control over the person recruited, transported , harboured , transferred or received commits the offence of trafficking.

Explanation 1.-The expression 'exploitation' shall include any act of physical exploitation or any form of sexual exploitation , slavery or practices similar to slavery , servitude, beggary or forced removal of organs.

Explanation-2.The consent of the victim is immaterial in determination of the offence of trafficking.

6.4. So far as the position with regard to JJ Act or the Child Labour Act is concerned, there is pre-condition that the victim must be below 18 years. Section 2 (i) of the Child Labour Act defines 'Adolescent' means a person who has completed his fourteenth year of age but has not completed his eighteenth years. Further, Section 2(ii) says 'Child' means a

person who has not completed his fourteenth year of age or such age as may be specified in the Right to free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, whoever is more. Further, Section 2(12) of JJ Act provides 'Child' means a person who has not completed eighteen years of age.

Recovery of the Victims and Place of the occurrence:

6.5. The recovery of 22 persons from Karmbhumi Express (Train No. 12407) between Samastipur Railway Station and Muzaffarpur Railway Station on 15-01-2025 is undisputed and validated fact in the present set of evidence. It is for the reason that evidence of recovery of 22 persons / the children given by the prosecution witnesses has not been questioned in their respective cross examination by the defence. Therefore, the piece of evidence relating to the fact of recovery of 22 persons/the Children on 15-01-2025 is remained intact and without being subjected to any doubt. Even the defence witnesses have accepted in their respective deposition that the victim were with the accused persons.

6.6. PW1 who was part of the team which was constituted for stopping human trafficking has deposed that when he reached Samastipur Railway Station, he found 22 children along with four trafficker in Karmbhumi Express . The same facts stands corroborated from the deposition of PW2 (the Informant), PW3 and PW5. They all have stated in their respective evidence that the children were recovered from Karmbhumi Express on 15-01-2025. There is no rebuttal in any form either in the cross examination of the witnesses or in defence evidence on this counts. Thus, this court concludes that the fact of recovery of 22 persons on 15-01-2025 from Karmbhumi Express stands proved beyond reasonable doubt by the Prosecution.

6.7. During the course of cross examination, the learned counsel for the accused persons has not questioned recovery rather he has raised doubt with regard to place of the occurrence as to from where, the recovery actually made. Was it Samsptipur Railway Station or Muzaffarpur Railway Station? In this way, he has tried to dispute the place of the occurrence. He has drawn attention of this court regarding evidence of PW 4 (the Investigation Officer) who has deposed in his evidence that the place of the occurrence is RPF Post, Platform No.1, Muzaffarpur where search, seizure and arrest made.

6.8. The argument of learned counsel with regard to place of the occurrence appears to be simply misinterpretation of the sequence of events. PW1, PW2 , PW 3 have clearly stated in their evidence that the children along with the accused persons were found in general boggy of Karmbhumi Expresses and they were made to board down at Muzaffarpur Rail Station and taken to RPF post whereupon the legal formalities like institution the FIR, search and seizure took place. It appears to this court that the train was in moving condition from Samastipur Railway Station to Muzaffarpur Railway Station and the offence was continuing. PW 2 vide paragraph 4 of his cross examination has stated that there is no stoppage of 'Karmbhumi Express' between Samastipur Railway Station and Muzaffarpur Railway Station. Hence, the entire stretch was place of the occurrence. PW 2 and PW 3 have stated in their evidence that the victims and the accused noticed in Karmbhmi express and in the meantime, the train reached at Muzaffarpur Railway Station where they were made to board down and taken to police station. This court does not find any merit

in argument with regard to the place of the occurrence and further, not inclined to doubt the prosecution's case in this context.

Age of the Victims:

6.9. So far as the age of the victims are concerned which are only relevant for the purpose of testing the evidence in connection with offence under JJ Act and the Child Labour Act, the Prosecution has alleged in the FIR that all twenty-two children recovered were between the age of 12 years to 16 years. PW1, PW2, PW3 , PW4 and PW 5 have stated the word 'the Children' in their respective evidence rather brining evidence age specific of every victim. It is an important to take note of the fact that the defence has not questioned the fact of the victim being 'minor' or 'children' in cross examination of any of the witnesses. Rather, cross examination of the prosecution witnesses discloses that the defense appears to have accepted the fact of the victim being children. It can be gathered from the evidence of PW1 who vide paragraph ' 16' of the cross examination has stated that "Un bachcho ke abhibhabako ne un bachcho ke gumshudgi ka koi mukadama iss mukadama ke darj hone ke pahle nahi karaya tha." PW2 has stated vide paragraph '11' of his cross examination that the guardian of the children had been informed. PW3 has stated vide paragraph 15 of his cross examination that he cannot tell age of the recovered children separately but all the children were below the age of 18 years.

6.9. DW 3 Anita Devi has stated in her evidence that his son Suren Kumar was aged 15 years. DW7 Lal Mohammad has stated in his evidence that his son Rahil Alam was aged 15 years. Some of the defense witnesses have tried to give age of their ward 18 years or more.

6.10. Thus, by considering the evidence on record , this court safely concludes that the victims were children. This could only on the basis of oral evidence of either side. At least for two children , that is , Suren Kumar and Rahil Alam, no doubt so to speak that they are minor. It is for the reason it has also been admitted in defense evidence and the law is well settled that the fact which is admitted need not be proved.

Are the Victims were being taken to different places of Punjab for labour work or for other purposes? And the role of the accused Persons”.

6.11. PW2 who is the Informant of this case has stated in his evidence that “ Jab Karib 18:00 baje train narayanpur anant railway station paar ki to uss train ke samanya coach me kuchh bachcho ko dare sahme awastha me dekha gaya, jinse puchh tachh karne par unke dwara bataya gaya ki unhe kuchh log punjab me majdoori karanne le ja rahe hai, jo issi koch me bathe hue hai. unke nishandehi par char aadmi ko usi coach se pakda gaya jisne ne apna naam Shivdayal Mahto, Sushil Mandal, Ekabl Hussain and Rehan Raja Bataya.”

6.12. The aforesaid piece of evidence also corroborates from the further fact that the route chart of the Karmbhumi Express (12407) as checked from website of Indian Railway and of which, the court is entitled to take judicial notice, depicts that it runs between Jalpaiguri to Amritsar. The children were recovered from this train. PW 2 has clearly stated in evidence that the accused persons noticed on the instance of the children and they were made to board down and thereafter, formal arrest and other legal formalities made. It is further to be noted down that the accused persons were along with the children and they were found in the same

train from where the children recovered, have not been rebutted in cross examination of any of the witnesses. Further, defense evidence has also not contravened this piece of prosecution evidence. The defense evidence is also disclosing that the accused persons were with the children.

6.13. The argument of the defense counsel to the effect that they were travelling with valid general ticket as of no use for the purpose of evaluating the charges for the simple reason that carrying a valid ticket does obliterate the allegation made by the prosecution of human trafficking.

6.14. The defense evidence brought on record suggesting that some of the children/persons were going with consent of their guardian have no bearing because explanation attached to Section 143 BNS clearly spells out that consent of the victim is immaterial in case of trafficking. Moreover, in the present case, the consent of guardian has been brought in terms of defense evidence which has for sure no impact in the present case. Hence, the defense evidence led by the defense is of no benefit for the accused persons and further, to tarnish the prosecution's case.

6.15. Thus, this court finds that the evidence on record is clean, commanding and unwavering to prove the fact that 22 Children were being transported by the four accused persons facing trial to the state of Punjab for labour work through Karmbhumi Express (Train No. 12407) on 15-01-2025. There is no reason to doubt the prosecution case. The involvement of the accused persons appears to be sure and certain by all stretch of imagination. The evidence brought on record by the prosecution stands corroborated from the FIR and further, from the version of independent witness PW5 Jai Ballabh Mishra. The suggestion given by the

defense to each of the prosecution witnesses to say that when the accused persons did not give extortion money to the police , then they were falsely implicated in this case is nothing but liable to be beneath the surface at the threshold. Such suggestion seems to be flimsy without any sort of evidence to substantiate it. Rather, it intends to prove the fact that the accused persons presence on the place of the occurrence and ultimately emboldens the prosecution's case.

7. Finding(s):

7.1. In view of foregoing analysis, this court is of informed conclusion that the prosecution has been successful in proving the charges levelled against the accused persons. In consequence thereto, the accused persons namely (i) Sushil Mandal (A1), (ii) Md. Ekbal Hussain (A2), (iii) Shiv Dayal Mahto @ Dayal Mahto (A3) and (iv) Md. Rehan Raza are found and held guilty for commission of the offence punishable under section 143(5) BNS, Section 79 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and Section 14 of the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986.

7.3. The accused Persons namely Sushil Mandal (A1), Md. Ekabl Hussain (A2), Md. Rehan Raza (A4) are in judicial custody. They have been produced before the court. The accused Shiv Dayal Mahto @ Dayal Mahto (A3) is on bail. He is present before the court. His bail bonds stands cancelled. He is, hereby, taken into judicial custody.

7.3. The recovered persons/the children who are mentioned in the First Information Report are hereby declared 'the Victim' in terms of Section 2(1)(y) BNSS for the purpose of compensation, if any.

7.4. Pending application , if any and not pressed, is disposed of in terms of this judgement.

7.5. Let this case be put up on 16-05-2026 for hearing on the point of the sentence.

Pronounced, Signed and Sealed in the open court on this 07th day of May,2026.

(Suman Kumar Divakar)
Addl. Sessions Judge-V
Muzaffarpur.

Sessions Trial No. 448/2025**16-05-2026: On the point of the Sentencing:**

The convicts have been produced from the custody. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor is present. Learned Advocates(s) for the convicts is (are) also present.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that a very heinous crime has been committed by the convicts. Human Trafficking is just a menace for the society. The victim of human trafficking suffers from severe physical trauma and profound psychological scars that require long term care. It is a means of dirty profits and the convicts are engaged in it. He further prays for maximum punishment to deter others to do such kind of act in future.

Learned Counsel for the convict submits that they are having family to look after. They are the first time offenders. It is further prayed on their behalf for considering leniency in awarding the punishment.

Section 143(5) BNS reads as " where the offence involves the trafficking of more than one child , it shall be punishable with rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than fourteen years, but which may extend to imprisonment for life and shall also be liable to be fine.

Section 79 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 reads as " Notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, whoever ostensibly engages a child and keeps him in bondage for the purpose of employment or withholds his earnings or uses such earning for his own purpose shall be punishable with rigorous imprisonment for a term which may extend to five years and shall also be liable to fine of one lakh rupees.

Section 14 of the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 reads as " whoever employs any child or permits any child to work in contravention of the provision of section 3 shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than six months but which may extend to two years , or with fine which shall not be less than twenty thousand rupees but which may extend to fifty thousand rupees, or with both: provided that the parents or guardian of such children shall not be punished unless they permit with children for commercial purpose in contravention of the provision of section 3.

Heard the parties. Considered the submissions. This court, after taking into consideration, all the attending circumstances available on the record coupled with likely impact of the offence so committed to the society at large deems it fit to pass the following orders:

Order(s)

- (i) The convict **Sushil Mandal** is sentenced to undergo 14 (fourteen) years rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 10,000/-for commission of the offence punishable under Section 143(5) BNS. In default to pay fine, One (01) year simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 03 (three) years and a fine of Rupees 1,00,000 (one lakh) for the offence punishable under section 79 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. In default to pay fine, six (06) months simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo Six (06) months rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 20,000/-for the offence punishable under section

14 of the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986. In default to pay fine, One (01) months simple imprisonment.

(ii) The convict **Md. Ekbal Hussain** is sentenced to undergo 14 (fourteen) years rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 10,000/- for commission of the offence punishable under Section 143(5) BNS. In default to pay fine, One (01) year simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 03 (three) years and a fine of Rupees 1,00,000 (one lakh) for the offence punishable under section 79 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. In default to pay fine, six (06) months simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo Six (06) months rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 20,000/-for the offence punishable under section 14 of the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986. In default to pay fine, One (01) months simple imprisonment.

(iii) The convict **Shiv Dayal Mahto @ Dayal Mahto** is sentenced to undergo 14 (fourteen) years rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 10,000/-for commission of the offence punishable under Section 143(5) BNS. In default to pay fine, One (01) year simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 03 (three) years and a fine of Rupees 1,00,000 (one lakh) for the offence punishable under section 79 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. In default to pay fine, six (06) months simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo Six (06) months rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 20,000/-for the offence punishable under section 14 of the Child and

Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986. In default to pay fine, One (01) months simple imprisonment.

(iv) The convict **Md. Rehan Raza** is sentenced to undergo 14 (fourteen) years rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 10,000/-for commission of the offence punishable under Section 143(5) BNS. In default to pay fine, One (01) year simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 03 (three) years and a fine of Rupees 1,00,000 (one lakh) for the offence punishable under section 79 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. In default to pay fine, six (06) months simple imprisonment. He is further sentenced to undergo Six (06) months rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rupees 20,000/-for the offence punishable under section 14 of the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986. In default to pay fine, One (01) months simple imprisonment.

(v) All the sentences so imposed shall run concurrently.

(vi) The sentences already undergone by the convicts would be set off , if applicable, in terms of Section 468 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Surakasha Sanhita, 2023.

(vii) Office Clerk is directed to supply a copy of the Judgement and Order to the convicts forthwith . He/She is further directed to send a copy of the Judgement to the District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur in terms of Section 395 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Surakasha Sanhita, 2023. He/she is further directed to prepare a warrant of imprisonment which , in turn, would be sent to the concerned for kind information and needful.

(viii) Office clerk is further directed to send a copy of this Judgement to the Secretary, District Legal Services Authority (In short 'DLSA') ,

Muzaffarpur for doing needful for the purpose of awarding compensation to the victim in terms of mandate as stipulated under the Bhartiya Nagrik Surakasha Sanhita, 2023.

(ix) The convicts have been informed in the open court that they have right to appeal against the Judgement before the Hon'ble Court. They have been further informed that either through Jail Suprintendent or relatives or by themselves, they may **get in touch with Patna High Court Legal Services Committee, Patna. (The Contact Number is 0612-2504475, 2504477. E-mail id: phclsc@gmail.com) for free legal aid.**

(x) Office Clerk is further directed to keep the case records safe, secure and in ready position for onward transmission to the Hon'ble Court , in case, an appeal is preferred against the Judgment.

Pronounced, signed and sealed in the Open Court on this 16th day of May, 2026.

(Suman Kumar Divakar)
Additional Sessions Judge-V
Muzaffarpur

FORM C

LIST OF PROSECUTION /DEFENCE/COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
PW 1	Manoj Kumar Singh	Police witness/Eye witness
PW 2	Gokulesh Pathak (the Informant)	Police witness/Eye witness
PW 3	Girish Kumar	Police witness/Eye witness
PW 4	Birendra Kumar (the Investigation Officer)	Police witness/Eye witness
PW 5	Jai Ballabh Mishra	Eye witness

B. Defence Witness, if any:
DW1 Ajay Mahto, **DW 2** Meena Devi , **DW3** Anita Devi , **DW4** Rukhsana Khatoon, **DW5** Vishwanath Chaudhary, **DW6** Afsar Ali and **DW7** Lal Mohammad and **DW8** Mahboob Alam.

C. Court Witness, if any:
NIL

LIST of PROSECUTION /DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS.

Serial No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit P-1/PW1	Seizure list related to the accused Shivdayal Mahto @ Dayal Mahto and signature of PW1 over it.
2	Exhibit P-2/1/PW1	Seizure list related to the accused Md. Rehan Raza and signature of PW1 over it.
3	Exhibit P-3/PW2	Written application and signature of PW2 over it.
4	Exhibit P-4 to 4G/ PW2	Talasi-cum-seizure memo and signature of PW2 on each page.
5	Exhibit P-4h to 4i/ PW3	Talasi-cum-seizure memo and signature of PW3 on each page.
6	Exhibit A / DW2	Signature of DW2 on affidavit

(Suman Kumar Divakar)
Additional Sessions Judge-V
Muzaffarpur.