

In the Court of Judicial Magistrate First Class XXIV, Ranchi

Present- Ms. Ritwika Singh

Judicial Magistrate First Class XXIV, Ranchi

Judgment Dated This 25th Day November 2025

GR. Case No. 3021 of 2022

T.R. No. 226/2025

Kanke P.S Case No. 120/22 dated 01.05.22 u/s 447/427/387/506/34 of IPC

Informant	Through the State- Vijay Kumar
Represented by	Shashi Kacchap, Ld. APP
Accused	1. Dhiraj Kumar, aged about 37 yrs, S/o Lt. Bhagwati Sahu, R/o vill-Ghaghra, P.S. Ghaghra, Dist.- Gumla 2. Shankar Prasad Sahu, aged about 42 yrs, S/o Lt. Bhagwati Sahu, R/o vill-Gadhusir P.S.-Kanke, Dist.-Ranchi
Represented By	Vimal Kumar, Ld. Advocate

Date (s) of offence	25.04.2022
Date of FIR	01.05.2022
Date of Charge-sheet	31.08.2022
Date of Commencement of evidence	04.07.2023
Date on Judgment is reserved	25.11.2025
Date of Judgment	25.11.2025
Date of Sentencing Order, if any	N.A.

Accused details:

Ran k of the accu sed	Name of the accused	Date of Arrest	Date (s) of Released on bail	Offence charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of section 428 Cr.P.C
A-1	Dhiraj Kumar	N.A.	11.10.2022	u/s 427 and 34 of IPC	Acquitted	N.A	N.A
A-2	Shankar Prasad Sahu	N.A.	11.10.2022	u/s 427 and 34 of IPC	Acquitted	N.A	N.A

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Witnesses**A. Prosecution:- Nil****B. Defence Witnesses, if any:- Nil****C. Court/Witness, if any:- Nil****List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Exhibits.****A. Prosecution:- Nil****B. Defence:- Nil****C. Court Exhibits:- Nil****D. Material Objects Nil****u/s 427 and 34 of IPC****J U D G M E N T**

1. The accused person named above have faced trial for the accusation for offence punishable u/s 427 and 34 of IPC.

BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE:

2. *The prosecution story in brief, as transpires from the written application of the Informant namely, Vijay Kumar on the basis of which the present case has been registered on 01.05.2022, is as follows:-*

It is stated that the informant had received land no.5045 from Vanshi Mahto and Bahadur Mahato through Patta no. 6084. On 25.04.2022 at 8:00 am accused no.1 and 2 and about ten unknown persons arrived with a JCB, and demolished the four-walled semi-pucca house standing on his land. When the informant's younger brother namely, Raju Kumar Sahu protested, accused no.1 pointed a gun at him and demanded Rs.5,00,000/- as rangdari, threatening to kill him. They continued the demolition. Earlier, on 08.03.2022, the boundary wall had similarly been destroyed at night. The matter was reported at Kanke PS on 21.03.2022. Hence the case.

INSTITUTION OF FIR/COMPLAINT, SUBMISSION OF CHARGE-SHEET & COGNIZANCE:

3. Accordingly on the basis of the written statement of the informant F.I.R has been registered at Kanke PS Case No 120/22 u/s 447/427/387/506/34 of IPC against the persons named in the F.I.R. After submission of charge sheet no. 204/2022 dated 31.08.2022 u/s 427/34 of IPC against the accused persons facing trial, the cognizance has been taken on 15.09.2022 u/s 427/34 of IPC against the above mentioned accused persons.

NARRATION OF CHARGE /SUBSTANCE OF ACCUSATION:

4. On 31.03.2023 substance u/s 427/34 of IPC has been framed, read over and explained to the accused persons in Hindi to which they denied, pleaded not guilty and also claimed to be tried.

PROSECUTION & DEFENCE EVIDENCE:

5. Thereafter the matter went for prosecution evidence. After giving directions and process issued to the witnesses Ld A.P.P has not produced any witnesses after giving multiple chance. And thereafter the prosecution evidence has been closed on the prayer of the Ld. A.P.P. on 20.11.2025 itself. Thereafter, the statement of the accused persons u/s 313 Cr.P.C. was recorded on 25.11.2025, in which they have pleaded innocence. Then in the interest of justice without any unnecessarily delay the matter has now come up for judgment today.

DEFENCE ARGUMENTS:

6. The case of the defence is total denial of the prosecution case and hence prayed that the accused persons may be acquitted.

PROSECUTION ARGUMENTS:

7. On the other hand the ld. APP opposed it.

POINT FOR DETERMINATION:

The question is whether the prosecution has been able to prove this case beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubts ?

FINDINGS

8. After hearing the ld. Counsels for the parties as well as on perusal of the case record it transpires that not a single witness has been examined by the prosecution and thus neither the place of occurrence is established nor the accused persons are identified nor the alleged offence have been proved to be committed by them.

Court's Observation

9. On the basis of discussions made herein above I find that the prosecution have been failed to establish this case beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubts for want of evidence, and thus the accused persons deserve to be acquitted.

ORDER

10. Thus the prosecution have been failed to establish this case beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubts for want of evidence and thus the accused persons facing trial namely **1) Dhiraj Kumar** and **2) Shankar Prasad Sahu** are hereby acquitted from all the charges levelled against them u/s 379, 411 of IPC. The accused persons namely **1) Dhiraj Kumar** and **2) Shankar Prasad Sahu** are already on bail and now they alongwith their bailors are also discharged from the liability of bail and bail bond.

11. Judgment is pronounced in the open court.

12. Pending interlocutory petition if any is dismissed as not pressed.

13. Accordingly the case is disposed of. O/c to consign the case record to the record room as per rule.

**Dictated and corrected by me.
Pronounced by me in open court**

Sd/-

**(Ritwika Singh)
JO Code: JH00634
Judicial Magistrate First Class XXIV
Ranchi
Dated: 25th November, 2025**

**Dictated and corrected by me.
Pronounced by me in open court**

Sd/-

**(Ritwika Singh)
JO Code: JH00634
Judicial Magistrate First Class XXIV
Ranchi
Dated: 25th November, 2025**