

FORM A

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-III, NALANDA AT BIHARSHARIF	
Present- Ankur Gupta, Addl.S.J.-III, [Date of judgement-19.06.2026]	
Sessions Trial No.-499/2013, C.I.S. No.-BRNL010000682013, Arising out of Silao P.S. Case No. 09/2008 corresponding G.R. No 221/2008	
Informant/com-plainant	State through Ramkhilawan Kewat, S/O.- Roopchandra Kewat, R/O. Village- Chakdilabar, P.S. - Deepnagar, District- Nalanda
Represented by	Kumari Snehlata Sujal, Ld. A.P.P.
Accused	1. Nagina Kewat, S/o.- Late Sahdev Kewat, Aged 58 Years 2. Shankar Kewat, S/o- Late Sahdev Kewat, Aged 52 years, Both R/o. Village- Gorma, P.S.- Silao, Distt- Nalanda
Represented by	Sri Shashi Bhushan Kumar, Ld. Advocate

FORM B

Date of offence	17.11.2007
Date of FIR	04.02.2008
Date of charge-sheet/Issuance of process	20.07.2008
Date of cognizance	20.08.2008
Date of commitment	26.06.2013
Date of framing of charges	19.08.2013
Date of commencement of evidence	26.09.2013
Date on which judgment is reserved	11.06.2026
Date of judgment	19.06.2026
Date of sentencing order,if any	Not applicable

ACCUSED DETAILS

Rank of the ac-cused	Name of the accused	Date of ar-rest	Date of re-lease on bail	Offence charged with	Whether acquitted or con-victed	Sen-tence imposed	Period of de-tention un-dergone dur-ing trail for purpose of section 428 of Cr.Pc.
1.	Nagina Ke-wat, S/o.-	26.05.2008	01.09.2008	U/s-498A,	Acquitted	N/A	03 Months 05 Days

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-III, NALANDA AT BIHARSHARIF

Present- Ankur Gupta, Addl.S.J.-III,

S.T. No.-499/2013, Silao P.S. Case No. 09/2008

State Vs Ramprit Kewat & Others

[Date of Judgment-19.06.2026]

2/6

	Late Sahdev Kewat			304B/34, 302/34, 201/34 I.P.C.			
2.	Shankar Kewat, S/o-Late Sahdev Kewat	N.A.	08.12.2011		Acquitted	N/A	N.A.

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	Karu Devi	Witness of fact
PW-2	Jagdish Kewat	Witness of fact
PW-3	Krishna Kewat	Witness of fact
PW-4	Balmiki Kewat	Witness of fact
PW-5	Girani Devi @ Girja Devi @ Giro Devi	Witness of fact
PW-6	Ramashray Kewat	Witness of fact
PW-7	Nitish Kumar	Witness of fact

B. Defence witnesses, if any

Rank	Name	Nature of evidence(eye witness,police witness,expert witness, medical witness, panch witness other witness
Nil		

C. Court witness, if any

Rank	Name	Nature of evidence(eye witness, police witness, expert witness, medical witness,panch witness other witness
Nil		

FORM-D

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
Nil		

B. Defence

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
Nil		

C. Court Exhibits

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
Nil		

JUDGMENT

1. Accused (1) Nagina Kewat and (2) Shankar Kewat are facing trial for offences under Sections 304B, 302, 498A and 201/34 of the IPC for causing the dowry death of Rinku Devi.

PROSECUTION CASE

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that Rinku Devi was married to Rampreet Kewat in the year 1996 according to Hindu rites and customs. Several gifts, including a bicycle, watch, garments worth ₹5,000, jewellery worth ₹2,000, and cash of ₹18,000, were given at the time of the marriage. However, after the marriage, Nagina Kewat, Shankar Kewat and Rampreet Kewat started demanding a colour television and ₹11,000 in cash. The informant could not fulfil these demands, due to which the accused persons started torturing Rinku Devi. Later, Rampreet Kewat obtained a job in Madras and started residing there, whereas Rinku Devi continued to reside in her matrimonial home at Village Gorma, where the other accused persons used to assault her in connection with the demand for dowry. Subsequently, the informant was informed by her maternal grandson that the accused persons had killed Rinku Devi and had concealed her dead body. The informant went to the matrimonial house of her daughter but did not find her there. The villagers informed her that, in the absence of her husband, the other accused persons had murdered Rinku Devi for dowry.

COGNIZANCE AND COMMITMENT

3. On the basis of the above fardbeyan, Silao P.S. Case No. 9 of 2008 was registered and investigation commenced. Upon completion of investigation, charge-sheet was submitted against Nagina Kewat. However, cognizance was taken against Nagina Kewat, Shankar Kewat and Rampreet Kewat on 20.08.2008, and investigation was kept pending against the remaining accused persons. Subsequently, by order dated 26.06.2013, the trial of Rampreet Kewat was separated due to his continued absence, and the record was committed for trial against the two remaining accused, namely, Nagina Kewat and Shankar Kewat.

CHARGE

4. Charge was framed on 19.08.2013 against Nagina Kewat and Shankar Kewat for offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 304-B/34, 302/34 and 201/34 of the IPC. The charges were read over and explained to them in Hindi, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

STATEMENT OF ACCUSED

5. The statements of the accused persons under Section 313 of the CrPC were recorded on 12.05.2026. They claimed the evidence adduced against them to be false and pleaded innocence as their general defence.

POINT OF DETERMINATION

6. The sole point for determination before this Court is whether the prosecution has been able to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt against the accused persons or not.

FINDINGS

7. In this case, seven witnesses have been examined on behalf of the prosecution. PW-1 is Karu Devi, PW-2 is Jagdish Kewat, PW-3 is Krishna Kewat, PW-4 is Balmiki Kewat, PW-5 is Girani Devi, PW-6 is Ramashray, and PW-7 is Nitish Kumar.

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES

8. **PW-1, PW-2 and PW-3** were declared hostile by the prosecution and have not stated anything regarding the occurrence.
9. **PW-4** has stated that Rinku Devi was his sister and that she had been married to Rampreet Kewat about fifteen years earlier. He has further stated that Rinku Devi was murdered for dowry and that Nagina Kewat, Shankar Kewat and Rampreet Kewat used to demand a colour television and ₹11,000 in cash. According to him, when the demand was not fulfilled, all three accused persons killed her.

However, in his cross-examination, he has stated that he had no personal knowledge of the occurrence. In paragraph 4, he has stated that he deposed on the basis of what he had heard. In paragraph 5, he has stated that his sister used to live properly in her matrimonial home. In paragraph 7, he has stated that no dowry was ever demanded from him. In paragraph 8, he has stated that his statement was never recorded by the police.

10.PW-5 has stated that Rinku Devi was his daughter and that she was married to Rampreet Kewat. He has stated that his daughter was poisoned by her in-laws. However, he has also stated that nobody had ever demanded dowry from him.

In his cross-examination, he has stated that he does not know who had poisoned his daughter. In paragraph 4, he has stated that he had cordial relations with his son-in-law and his family members. In paragraph 5, he has stated that his daughter had never complained to him regarding her husband or in-laws.

11.PW-6 has stated that he had only heard that Rinku Devi had died. He was declared hostile by the prosecution.

12.PW-7 has stated that Rinku Devi was his mother and that the name of his father was Rampreet Kewat. He has stated that his parents were married about twenty years earlier and that his mother used to remain ill. He has denied that his mother committed suicide due to harassment by his father.

In his cross-examination, in paragraph 4, he has stated that his father and other family members used to keep his mother properly and never harassed her.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE PARTIES

13.On the basis of the above evidence, the learned APP has submitted that the accused persons are liable to be convicted.

14.On the other hand, the learned counsel for the defence has submitted that there is no reliable evidence against the accused persons and, therefore, they deserve acquittal.

APPRECIATION OF EVIDENCE

15. From the testimony discussed above, it is evident that the material witnesses have not supported the prosecution case. PW-1, PW-2, PW-3 and PW-6 have not incriminated the accused persons in any manner. The evidence of PW-4 is admittedly based on hearsay, and he has specifically stated that he had no personal knowledge of the occurrence. PW-5 has categorically stated that no demand of dowry was ever made from him and that his daughter had never complained against her husband or in-laws. PW-7, who is the son of the deceased, has also not supported the prosecution case and has stated that his mother was properly treated by the accused persons.

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-III, NALANDA AT BIHARSHARIF

Present- Ankur Gupta, Addl.S.J.-III,

S.T. No.-499/2013, Silao P.S. Case No. 09/2008

State Vs Ramprit Kewat & Others

[Date of Judgment-**19.06.2026**]

6/6

16. Thus, there is no reliable and cogent evidence on record to establish either the alleged demand of dowry or the involvement of the accused persons in the death of Rinku Devi.

17. Consequently, I find that the prosecution has failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt against the accused persons. It is therefore

ORDERED

18. That accused (1) Nagina Kewat and (2) Shankar Kewat are found not guilty of the offences punishable under sections 498A, 304B/34, 302/34 and 201/34 of the I.P.C. and are hereby **ACQUITTED** of the said charges. They are discharged from the liability of bail bonds.

19. Let a copy of the judgment be sent to the learned District Magistrate in compliance with Section 365 CrPC, and let the record be consigned to the record room.

This judgment is pronounced on **19th day of June, 2026** in the open court by me.

(Dictated & Corrected by me)

(Ankur Gupta)
District. & Addl. Sessions Judge-III
Nalanda at Bihasharif
19.06.2026

(Ankur Gupta)
District. & Addl. Sessions Judge-III
Nalanda at Bihasharif
19.06.2026