

In The Court of Sri Sunil Kumar III, DASJ-VI, Danapur.
Sessions Trial No. 701/2015, CIS No. 4548/2015
State Vs Kiran Devi & Anr.
Date of Judgment: 04.06.2026

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-VI, Danapur

Present- **Sri Sunil Kumar III**
Distt. & Addl. Sessions Judge-VI, Danapur.
Date of Judgment 04.06.2026

In Ref:

Sessions Trial No. 701/15,
CIS No. 4548/2015
CNR No. BRPA20-000943-2015
F.I.R. No. 280/2012, G.R. No. 1878/2012,
P.S. Danapur, u/s 364/34 IPC.

FORM –A

Complainant/Prosecution	State of Bihar
Represented By	Md. Kalam Ansari, Ld. Addl. Public Prosecutor
Accused persons	1. Kiran Devi, aged about 44 years,w/o- Santosh Kumar 2. Santosh Kumar, aged about 46 years, s/o- Jagarnath Singh both r/o- Khorraitha, PO+PS- Bikram, District- Patna 3. Pintu Kumar, aged about 45 years, s/o- Uma Shankar Singh r/o- Sarwan Bhadsar, PO+PS- Bikram, District- Patna
Represented by	Counsel Shri Ravishankar Sharma, Ld. Advocate

FORM B

Date of Offence	28.07.2012
Date of FIR	28.07.2012
Date of Charge-sheet	30.04.2013
Date of Framing of Charges	08.12.2023
Date of Commencement of Evidence	08.12.2023
Date on which the judgment is reserved	22.05.2026
Date of Judgment	04.06.2026
Date of sentencing order, if any	NA

In The Court of Sri Sunil Kumar III, DASJ-VI, Danapur.
Sessions Trial No. 701/2015, CIS No. 4548/2015
State Vs Kiran Devi & Anr.
Date of Judgment: 04.06.2026

Accused Detail:

Rank of the Accused	Name of the accused	Date of arrest/surrender	Date of release on bail	Offences charged with	Whether Acquitted or Convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during trial for the purpose of section 428 Cr.p.c
A1	Kiran Devi	30.07.2012	01.03.2013	u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC	Acquitted	NA	NA
A2	Santosh Kumar	16.02.2013	13.11.2013	u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC	Acquitted	NA	NA
A3	Pintu Kumar	01.02.2013	16.07.2013	u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC	Acquitted	NA	NA

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)
NIL	NIL	NIL

B. Defence Witnesses, if any:

Rank	Name	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
NIL	NIL	NIL

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution:

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
NIL	NIL	NIL

B. Defence

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
NIL	NIL	NIL

JUDGMENT

1. **That the accused persons rank A1, A2 and A3 are facing trial for the offence punishable u/s 364/120(B)/34** This case has been arisen of the Danapur PS case No. 280/2012 dated registered u/s **364/34 IPC** on the basis of an application of the informant Ashish Anand. The offence alleged to have been taken place on 28.12.2012 in the **Mainpura, P.S. Danapur, Distt. Patna.**

PROSECUTION's STORY

1. **The prosecution story in brief is that** there was love marriage in the year 2009. It is further submitted by the informant in his application that Jagarnath Singh who is the father of Babli Kumari @ Akanksha Kumari, instituted a police case vide Bikram PS case No. 47/09 and his wife was under pregnancy and was under treatment of doctor Anita Singh at Jyotipunj hospital Boring Road and at 24.07.2012 he called his wife at Boring road for her medical checkup at hospital and meanwhile Santosh Kumar who is accused A1 herein, who is the brother of his wife saw and also made some conversation with him and thereafter, on 25.07.2012 informant went to his officer for his work and when at about 03:00 PM the informant tried to call his wife but her phone was switched off and later she did not return home and thereafter, informant made a station diary entry on 26.07.2012 and informed the matter to his relative. Thereafter, on 26.07.2012 his cousin (fuferi sister) told him that on 25.07.2012 at about 01:00 PM his wife told her that she was going to meet her brother Santosh Kumar and her sister in law Kiran Devi at the house of Pintu Bhaiya at Saguna more. On the said facts the informant made in suspicious that his wife was either kidnapped by the accused persons or they had committed her murder.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2. **After completion of the** investigation, the police submitted the police report(*charge-sheet*) **u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC** against accused persons **A1, A2 and A3** and thereafter the ACJM, Danapur, vide order of, took the cognizance of the offence **against all accused persons** and thereafter the police paper was supplied to the accused persons and then the record was committed to the court of Sessions and this record was received in the Court of Session on 23.02.2016 wherein this case was registered and numbered as Sessions Trial No. **701/2015**. Thereafter during the course of hearing the accused persons and the Ld. Prosecutor for the state, the Court vide its order dated 08.12.2023 framed the charge against the accused persons A1, A2 and A3 for the offence punishable **u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC** to which the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

EVIDENCE

3. **In support of its case,** the prosecution has not produced any witnesses despite sufficient and reasonable opportunities availed.

POINT OF DETERMINATION

4. **The Point of determination** is whether the prosecution has been able enough to bring home the charges as leveled against accused herein beyond the reasonable doubts or not ?

FINDINGS

5. In this case the prosecution has failed to adduce any evidence in spite of the several opportunities availed for adducing the evidence for which the court has already taken steps of issuing summons and warrants to the witnesses but the prosecution has failed to adduce any evidence and it is therefore, there is no evidence on record against the accused persons herein.

Therefore there is no incriminating evidence against the accused rank A1, A2 and A3 herein, to substantiate any of the charge u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC as leveled against them beyond the reasonable doubts and thus the material available on record do not bear out the charges as leveled against the accused persons herein, and the prosecution is miserably failed to prove the charges as leveled against the accused persons herein and thus they deserve to be acquitted.

7. With the forgoing reasons and on the basis of the evidence available on record, this court holds that the prosecution has not been able enough to bring home the charges u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC as leveled against the accused A1, A2 and A3 herein, and thus it is, therefore,

Ordered

that the accused persons A1(Kiran Devi), A2(Santosh Kumar), A3(Pintu Kumar) are hereby acquitted from the charges u/s 364/120(B)/34 IPC. As the accused A1, A2 and A3 on bail, so their bail bonds is accordingly discharged.

Typed, Corrected &
pronounced by me in
open court

Sd/-

Sunil Kumar – III
DASJ- VI, Danapur
04.06.2026

Sd/-

Sunil Kumar – III
DASJ – VI, Danapur
04.06.2026