

In The Court of Sri Sunil Kumar III, DASJ-VI, Danapur.
Sessions Trial No. 874/2019
State Vs Raju Singh & Anr.
Date of Judgment: 26.05.2026

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-VI, Danapur

Present- **Sri Sunil Kumar III**
Distt. & Addl. Sessions Judge-VI, Danapur.
Date of Judgment 26.05.2026

In Ref:

Sessions Trial No. 874/2019
CNR No. BRPA20-001819-2019
FI.R. No. 331/2017, G.R. No. 3436/2017,
P.S. Naubatpur, u/s – 304(B)/201/302/34 IPC

FORM –A

Complainant/Prosecution	State of Bihar
Represented By	Md. Kalam Ansari, Ld. Addl. Public Prosecutor
Accused persons	1. Raju Ram, s/o- Baleshwar Ram 2. Kaushalya Devi, d/o- Baleshwar Ram 3. Baleshwar Ram, s/o- Late Satrugan Ram 4. Chhotu Kumar, s/o- Baleshwar Ram all r/o Cheshi Dhibra, PS- Naubatpur, District- Patna 5. Rubi Devi, s/o- Bihari Ram r/o- Mamrejpur, PS- Naubatpur, District- Patna
Represented by	Counsel Shri Kamal Dev, Ld. Advocate

FORM B

Date of Offence	18.10.2017
Date of FIR	19.10.2017
Date of Charge-sheet	31.12.2018
Date of Framing of Charges	13.11.2019
Date of Commencement of Evidence	17.04.2020
Date on which the judgment is reserved	25.05.2026
Date of Judgment	26.05.2026
Date of sentencing order, if any	NA

In The Court of Sri Sunil Kumar III, DASJ-VI, Danapur.
Sessions Trial No. 874/2019
State Vs Raju Singh & Anr.
Date of Judgment: 26.05.2026

Accused Detail:

Rank of the Accused	Name of the accused	Date of 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	Raju Ram	08.01.2018	20.01.2022	u/s <u>304(B)/302/201/34 IPC</u>	Acquitted	NA	NA
A2	Kaushalya Devi	15.05.2018	15.05.2018	u/s <u>304(B)/302/201/34 IPC</u>	Acquitted	NA	NA
A3	Baleshwar Ram	12.10.2018	12.10.2018	u/s <u>304(B)/302/201/34 IPC</u>	Acquitted	NA	NA
A4	Chhotu Kumar	28.02.2019	28.02.2019	u/s <u>304(B)/302/201/34 IPC</u>	Acquitted	NA	NA
A5	Rubi Devi	24.07.2018	24.07.2018	u/s <u>304(B)/302/201/34 IPC</u>	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)
PW1	Ram Babu Ram	Informant
PW2	Ajit Ram	Other witness
PW3	Sant Lal Ram	Other witness
PW4	Rajeev Ranjan Kumar	Investigating Officer
PW5	Prince Kumar	Other witness

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

In The Court of Sri Sunil Kumar III, DASJ-VI, Danapur.
Sessions Trial No. 874/2019
State Vs Raju Singh & Anr.
Date of Judgment: 26.05.2026

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution:

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Ext. 1	Signature of PW1 Ajit Ram on the fardbyan of the informant.
2	Ext. 1/A	Signature of PW5 Prince Kumar on the fardbyan of the informant.
3	Ext. 2	Signature of Investigating Officer on chargesheet.

B. Defence

Sl. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
NIL	NIL	NIL

JUDGMENT

1. That the accused persons rank A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 are facing trial for the offence punishable u/s 304(B)/302/201/34 IPC. This case has been arisen of the Naubatpur PS case No. 331/2017 dated 19.10.2017 registered u/s 304(B)/201/302/34 IPC on the basis of *Fardbyan* of the informant **Ram Babu Ram**. The offence alleged to have been taken place on 18.10.2017 in the **village Cheshi Dhibra, PS- Naubatpur, District- Patna**.

PROSECUTION's STORY

2. The story of the prosecution in brief is that the informant's daughter was married to the accused Raju Ram i.e the accused A1 herein. On 28.04.2016 at Mahadev Mandir Bihta and after the marriage his daughter remained peacefully and during the said wedlock she gave birth to a baby girl and his daughter visited his house 10 days before of the alleged occurrence and she told him his wife and his son that her husband Raju Ram her mother-in-law, her father-in-law and brother-in-law were demanding a motorcycle and they intimidated her to face with dire consequences if their demands are not fulfilled. He further stated in his fardbyan that her brother-in-law took his daughter to her matrimonial home on his

motorcycle thereafter, on 18.10.2017 at 05:30 PM his sister-in-law informed him on mobile phone that his daughter Gudiya Devi was assaulted and burnt by her in laws and thereafter, her dead body was taken towards Punpun river and thereafter, the informant along with some relatives and villagers went to the police station Naubatpur and also searched for her daughter Gudiya Devi but he could not find her dead body and the family members of her in laws fled away by locking their house and on the said facts the informant made allegations against the accused persons herein that they burnt and killed her daughter and thereafter, they disappeared her dead body.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

3. **After completion of the** investigation, the police submitted the police report(*charge-sheet*) **u/s 304(B)/201/34 IPC** against accused persons **A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5** and thereafter the ACJM, Danapur, took the cognizance of the offence **against the 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 31.07.2017 wherein this case was registered and numbered as Sessions Trial No. **874/2019**. Thereafter on hearing the accused persons and the Ld. Prosecutor for the state, the Court vide its order dated 13.11.2019 framed the charge against the accused persons A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 for the offence punishable **u/s 304(B)/302/201/34 IPC** to which the accused persons pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

EVIDENCE

4. **In support of its case**, the prosecution has examined five witnesses PW1 Ram Babu Ram who is the informant, PW2 Ajit Ram, PW3 Sant Lal Ram, PW4 Rajiv Ranjan Kumar and PW5 Prince Kumar.

POINT OF DETERMINATION

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

Heard the arguments advanced on behalf of the state by the Ld. Addl. Public Prosecutor for the state as well as by the Ld. Cl. for the accused persons and perused the record.

FINDINGS

6. PW 1 Ram Babu Ram who is the informant of this case and the father of the deceased Gudiya Devi. He deposed that his daughter Gudiya Devi married to Raju Ram i.e the accused A1 herein, and gifted all the necessary goods and articles in the marriage ceremony and later on his father-in-law of his daughter and his son-in-law i.e Raju Ram accused A1 herein, informed that untowards incident was committed with his daughter and they called him by saying that his daughter burnt herself and thereafter, he along with some other persons visited her matrimonial home. He further stated that his daughter told him that she was living happily in her matrimonial home but later there was some dispute. He further appears that when he reached at Mithu Bandh, he found the dead body of his daughter was already burnt and thereafter, he lodged this case he further stated when the dead body of his daughter was found, he was present there and thereafter, the inquest report was prepared upon which was he put his thumb impression. In cross examination he stated that he was informed by his son in law i.e *damad* and father in law of his daughter and he further stated that the villager and his sister in law Savita Devi also told him that his daughter burnt during the cooking and she never told him regarding the demand of dowry of motorcycle and entire funeral ceremony done by her in laws and he also participated in funeral and **he also stated that the accused persons are not involved in commission of the death of his daughter.** PW2- Ajit Ram also stated that the accused Raju Ram i.e accused

A1 herein, informed that his sister got fire during cooking and in cross examination, he stated that police obtained his signature on plain paper and police did not record his statement and the accused persons never demanded dowry and he further stated that during the funeral ceremony, he also participated. PW2 identified his signature (Ext. 1) on the fardbyan of the informant. PW3- Sant Lal Ram also stated that the accused persons did not demand the dowry and no cruelty was done to the deceased for the demand of dowry and he further stated that he has no personal knowledge regarding the occurrence. PW4- Rajiv Ranjan Kumar is the Investigating Officer (IO) and he stated that he took the charge of investigation on 31.12.2018 and thereafter, on completion of the investigation, he submitted chargesheet against the accused persons u/s 304(B)/201/34 IPC and he identified the signature Ext. 2, on the police report (chargesheet). In cross examination, he stated that he has no personal knowledge regarding the occurrence, and PW5- Prince Kumar who is brother of the deceased Gudiya Devi, also stated that his cousin Gudiya Devi never complaint regarding the behaviour of her in laws and he also identified his signature on fardbyan and his signature marked as Ext. 1. Ext. 1 is already marked signature of the witness PW2 and this signature considered to have been marked as Ext. 1/A.

In this case only five witnesses were examined were PW1 is informant who also participated in the funeral ceremony of his daughter performed by her in laws and his daughter never complaint regarding the assault or cruelty for the demand of dowry and he stated the villager and his sister in law Savita Devi told him that his daughter got and burnt while she was cooking and he stated that there is no involvement of accused persons facing trial herein in the commission of the death of his daughter. The story as shown in the testimony of the informant PW1 is contradicted with the story of the prosecution as made in the fardbyan where he stated that, his sister in law informed him his daughter was burnt to kill by her in laws after pouring the kerosine upon her and the testimony of the informant showing that the occurrence was committed as an accident. The witness PW2, PW3, PW5 also stated nothing regarding the allegation of demand of dowry by the

accused persons and they stated that deceased was living peacefully in her matrimonial home. The PW4 is IO however, identified his signature mark as Ext. 2 on the chargesheet but he stated that he has no personal knowledge regarding the occurrence.

Therefore, the testimony of the witnesses shows the deceased was leading happy marriage life and there was no complaint regarding demand of dowry as alleged in the story of the prosecution. The prosecution also failed to adduce medical evidence on record in spite of the several opportunities availed and the informant who is the father of the deceased as well as the other family members of the deceased examined did not whisper regarding the demand of dowry as alleged in the story of the prosecution and thus the basic ingredients for the offence constituted u/s 304(B) IPC is failed and regarding the charge of disappearing the evidence by removing the dead body is also failed. The informant further stated that the accused persons are informed the witnesses PW2, PW3 & PW5 also stated that the occurrence was not intentional but accidental as the deceased caught fire during cooking thus the offence of murder u/s 302 IPC is also failed.

It is therefore, there is no incriminating evidence is available on record against the accused persons and thus the prosecution has failed to prove this case and beyond the reasonable doubt and the accused persons A1, A2 and A3 deserve to be acquitted.

Therefore there is no incriminating evidence against the accused persons rank A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 herein, to substantiate any of the charge u/s 304(B)/302/201/34 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 and thus the accused persons A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 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

**In The Court of Sri Sunil Kumar III, DASJ-VI, Danapur.
Sessions Trial No. 874/2019
State Vs Raju Singh & Anr.
Date of Judgment: 26.05.2026**

home the charges **u/s 304(B)/302/201/34 IPC** as leveled against the accused persons herein, and thus it is, therefore,

Ordered

that the accused Raju Ram(A1), Kaushalya Devi (A2), Baleshwar Ram (A3), Chhotu Kumar(A4) and Rubi Devi(A5) are hereby acquitted from the charges u/s 304(B)/302/201/34 IPC. As the accused persons are on bail, so their bail bonds are accordingly discharged.

**Typed, Corrected &
pronounced by me in open
court**

**Sd/-
Sunil Kumar – III
DASJ- VI, Danapur
26.05.2026**

**Sd/-
Sunil Kumar – III
DASJ – VI, Danapur
26.05.2026**