

**IN THE COURT OF SH. PITAMBER DUTT:
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE (NEW DELHI),
PATIALA HOUSE COURTS: NEW DELHI**

In the matter of:

State	Vs.	1.	Sh. Jeewan Lal S/o Sh. Hari Prasad R/o Village Mangal Theka, Bungaon, PS Katra Bazar, Ghonda, U.P.
		2.	Sh. Sanchit S/o Sh. Hari Prasad R/o Village Mangal Theka, Bungaon, PS Katra Bazar, Ghonda, U.P.

- | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| • | CNR No. | : DLND01-000602-2022 |
| • | Registration No. of the Case | : 50/2016 |
| • | SC Number | : 39/2022 |
| • | FIR Number | : 50/2016 |
| • | PS | : Mandir Marg |
| • | Under Section | : 307/34 IPC. |
| • | Date of Institution | : 09.10.2020 |
| • | Case Committed to the
Court of Sessions for | : 06.01.2022 |
| • | Case Received by this Court
by way of Transfer on | : 21.01.2022 |
| • | Case Reserved for
Judgment on | : 30.04.2026 |
| • | Judgment Announced on | : 05.05.2026 |

Appearance:

Sh. Shiv Kumar, Ld. Addl. PP for State.
Sh. Deepak Kumar, Ld. Counsel for both accused persons.

JUDGMENT

1. Vide this judgment, I shall decide the case bearing SC No. 39/2022, being FIR No. 50/2016, PS Mandir Marg, registered under Sections 307/34 IPC. The brief facts necessitated in registration of this case, as per the prosecution are given as under:-

Brief Facts

2. The prosecution has alleged that on the intervening night of 10/11.03.2016 at about 02.20 AM, upon receipt of DD no. 5B HC Nahnu Ram along with IO SI Dharmender reached at Lady Harding Medical College and Hospital, where injured Janardan was found hospitalized and on inquiry, doctor declared the injured unfit for making statement. Thereafter, IO tried to locate the eye witness of the incident in the hospital but none could be found. Accordingly, after preliminary inquiry, IO prepared rukka, pursuant to which FIR No. 50/2016 under Section 307/34 IPC at PS Mandir Marg was registered and investigation was initiated.
3. After registration of FIR, IO met Sh. Suresh, brother of injured Janardan at hospital, who told them about the quarrel of injured Janardan with accused persons. Thereafter, IO along with HC Nanhu Ram reached at Jhandewalan Metro Station where one Lale along with Ram Kishan met them and on inquiry, informed them that they got injured Janardan

admitted in the hospital and thereafter their statements were recorded. Efforts were made by the IO to locate the accused persons but they could not be traced.

4. On 14.03.2016, during the course of investigation, IO went to the hospital, where injured was admitted and the doctor declared the injured to be fit to make statement, accordingly, statement of injured Janardan was recorded by the IO, who on inquiry told to the IO that he had been living on the footpath in Mukherjee Market, Lal Masjid, Laxmi Narayan Mandir, Karol Bagh, Delhi for the last ten years and was plying a rickshaw. He further stated that along with him Jeevan Lal, Ram Kishan, Lale were also plying rickshaws below Jhandewalan Metro Station. He further stated that accused Jeewan Lal and his brother co-accused Sanchit, who were his distant relatives were also living in Mukherjee Market in Delhi and co-accused Sanchit was working as scrap dealer. The injured further informed that on 10.03.16 at around 10.40 pm, Ram Kishan and Lale were standing together with their rickshaws in front of Jhandewalan Metro Station and were talking amongst themselves, when accused Jeevan Lal came there with his rickshaw, in drunken condition and started joking with them, and in the course of joking, he started fighting with him and pushed him, on which he also pushed accused Jeewan Lal, then accused Jeewan Lal grabbed him and slapped him and started fighting with him on which Lale and Ram Kishan got them separated, thereafter accused Jeevan Lal called his brother

co-accused Sanchit, who came at the spot and on the instigation of accused Jeevan co-accused Sanchit, started fighting with the injured and hit him with his hands and slapped him and when he tried to free himself from the clutches of co-accused Sanchit, he took out a knife from the waist of his pants and gave the same to accused Jeevan. Thereafter co-accused Sanchit caught the injured Janardan from behind and accused Jeevan stabbed him in his stomach, due to which blood started oozing out from his body, thereafter accused Jeevan again stabbed him due to which injured Janardan fell down and became unconscious and regained consciousness next day in the hospital.

5. During the investigation, IO searched for accused persons and served notice at their homes but accused persons absconded to avoid their arrest. Initially the FIR was registered under Section 324 IPC but as the nature of injury was opined as grievous, thus Section 324 of IPC was converted into Section 307 of IPC.
6. On 15.01.2020, injured Janardan produced both the accused persons before the IO in the police station, who confessed their crime after which their statements were recorded and their personal search was conducted and thereafter both the accused persons were arrested by the IO and produced before the Court, from where both the accused persons were sent in JC.
7. After completion of investigation, charge sheet was filed

before the Ld. Metropolitan Magistrate on 09.10.2020. On the basis of charge sheet, Ld. Metropolitan Magistrate had taken the cognizance against accused Jeevan Lal and accused Sanchit and after complying with the provisions of Section 207 Cr.P.C., committed the present case.

8. The Ld. Predecessor of this Court vide order dated 11.05.2022 framed charges for the offence punishable under Section 307/34 IPC against both the accused persons. Charges were read over and explained to both the accused persons, who pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.
9. The, matter was, thereafter posted for Prosecution Evidence. To prove their case, prosecution has examined **16 witnesses**, which are as under:-

PW-1:- Victim Janardan Gautam, at whose instance site plan Ex. PW-1/A was prepared by the police officials. He also proved the arrest and personal search memo(s) of accused persons as Ex.PW-1/B, Ex.PW-1/C, Ex. PW-1/D and Ex.Pw-1/E respectively and statement of accused persons Ex.PW-1/F and Ex.PW-1/G respectively. He also identified the blood stained pant and underwear worn by him at the time of incident as Ex. P-1/1 and Ex.P-1/2.

PW – 2:- Sh. Suresh, Public witness.

PW – 3:- ASI Harikishan was posted as Duty Officer in PS Mandir Marg on 11.03.2016. He exhibited

computer copy of FIR as Ex. PW-3/A, his endorsement on rukka as Ex. Pw-3/B and certificate under Section 65 B of the Indian Evidence Act as Ex. PW-3/C.

PW-4:- HC Nahnu Ram was posted as constable at PS Mandir Marg in the intervening night of 10/11.03.2016 and upon receipt of DD No. 5 B, he joined the investigation with IO.

PW-5:- Sh. Lale Trivedi, Public witness, who got admitted injured Janardan in the Lady Harding Hospital. PW – 5 turned hostile and was confronted by the Ld. APP with his statement recorded under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. Ex.PW-5/A.

PW-6:- Sh. Ram Kishan, Public witness.

PW-7:- ASI Kamlesh Singh was posted as Head Constable in PS Mandir Marg on 30.09.2018. He served the notice to join the investigation to wives of accused Jeewan Lal and accused Sanchit as they were not found present at their respective houses.

PW – 8:- HC Sandip Kumar was posted as Head Constable in PS Mandir Marg on 27.04.2016. He took the sealed exhibits of the case along with forwarding letter and relevant documents from MHC(M) vide RC no. 34/21 for depositing the same with RFSL, Chanakyapuri. He exhibited

acknowledgment slip qua the same as Ex. PW-8/A.

PW- 9:- Constable Govinda was posted at PS Mandir Marg on 15.01.2020, when complainant / victim Janardan came to the police station along with accused Jeevan Lal and accused Sanchit, who were interrogated and on the basis of their confession both the accused persons were arrested by the IO.

PW-10:- Dr.V. Sankaranarayanan, Retired SSO (Bio/DNA), presently working in FSL Puducherry. He exhibited his detailed biological examination report no. RFSL (CH.P) 2016/B-462 Bio no. 153/2016 as Ex.PW-10/A, DNA Examination Report No. RFSL (CH.P) 2016/B-462 as Ex.PW-10/B and Allelic Data as Ex.PW-10/C.

PW-11:- HC Pradeep Kumar was posted as Duty Constable in Lady Harding Hospital in the intervening night of 10/11.03.2016. He deposed that on that day at around 11:45 PM, victim Janardan was admitted in the hospital vide MLC No. 56415/15. He exhibited the memo(s) Ex.Pw-11/A and Ex.PW-11/B, vide which he took the sealed pullanda(s) from the doctor, containing clothes and blood samples of the injured and handed over the same to the IO.

PW-12:- Inspector Dharmendra Kumar is the investigating Officer of this case.

PW – 13:- Dr. Praveen Kumar Das, Professor Lady Harding Medical College and Hospital, New Delhi.
He exhibited MLC of the injured as Ex.Pw-13/A.

PW-14:- Dr. Pawan Kumar Rattu, Professor Lady Harding Medical College and Hospital, New Delhi.
He identified the signatures of Dr. Manzoor on the MLC Ex.PW-13/A as Ex.PW-14/A.

PW – 15:- Retired SI Tulsi Ram, subsequent IO in the present case.

PW – 16:- HC Harkesh was posted as MHC(M) at PS Mandir Marg. He exhibited photocopies of the relevant entries dated 27.04.2016 and 30.11.2016, vide which sealed pullandas were sent to and received from RFSL as Ex. Pw-16/A respectively.

10. After completion of prosecution evidence, all the incriminating material was put to accused persons in their statement recorded u/s 313 Cr.P.C.. Both the accused persons have denied all incriminating material put to them and opted not to lead any defence evidence. Consequently, matter was posted for final arguments.
11. Sh. Shiv Kumar, Ld. Additional PP for the State has contended that prosecution has established its case against both the accused persons beyond any reasonable doubt. He further argued that prosecution has established all the circumstances against accused persons unmistakably. He

further contended that prosecution has placed on record sufficient material to prove the guilt of accused persons. He prayed that accused persons may be convicted under appropriate provisions of law.

12. Sh. Deepak Kumar, Ld. Counsel for accused persons has contended that prosecution has failed to place on record requisite material to hold the accused guilty for the offence punishable under Section 307 of IPC. He further contended that the complainant of this case, on the basis of which present FIR has been registered, had turned hostile and not supported the case of prosecution. He further contended that the prosecution has not collected even the weapon of offence, vide which injury was caused to the injured. He further contended that the prosecution has miserably failed to establish the guilt of both the accused persons beyond any reasonable doubt. He prayed that accused persons may be acquitted.
13. I have heard Ld. Additional PP for the State, Ld. Counsel for the accused, perused the charge-sheet, statement of witnesses recorded in the Court and other material placed before the Court. Both accused persons has been charged for the offence punishable under ***Section 307 of IPC i.e. for an attempt to murder***, which reads as under:-

307. Attempt to murder.—Whoever does any act with such intention or knowledge, and under such circumstances that, if he by that act caused death, he would be guilty of murder, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine;

and if hurt is caused to any person by such act, the offender shall be liable either to imprisonment for life, or to such punishment as is hereinbefore mentioned.

Attempts by life convicts.— When any person offending under this section is under sentence of imprisonment for life, he may, if hurt is caused, be punished with death.

Illustrations

(a) A shoots at Z with intention to kill him, under such circumstances that, if death ensued. A would be guilty of murder. A is liable to punishment under this section.

(b) A, with the intention of causing the death of a child of tender years, exposes it in a desert place. A has committed the offence defined by this section, though the death of the child does not ensue. (c) A, intending to murder Z, buys a gun and loads it. A has not yet committed the offence. A fires the gun at Z. He has committed the offence defined in this section, and if by such firing he wounds Z, he is liable to the punishment provided by the latter part of the first paragraph of this section.

(d) A, intending to murder Z by poison, purchases poison and mixes the same with food which remains in A's keeping; A has not yet committed the offence defined in this section. A places the food on Z's table or delivers it to Z's servant to place it on Z's table. A has committed the offence defined in this section.

14. **Section 307 IPC** deals with two situations so far as the sentence is concerned. Firstly, whoever does any act with such intention or knowledge, and under such circumstances that, if he by that act caused death, he would be guilty of murder, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine; and secondly if hurt is caused to any person by such act the offender shall be liable either to imprisonment for life or to such punishment as indicated in

the first part i.e. 10 years.

15. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in "*State of Maharashtra Vs Balram Patil*", reported as 1983 (2) SCC 28, has held that:-

"9...To justify a conviction under this section it is not essential that bodily injury capable of causing death should have been inflicted. Although the nature of injury actually caused may often give considerable assistance in coming to a finding as to the intention of the accused, such intention may also be deduced from other circumstances, and may even, in some cases, be ascertained without any reference at all to actual wounds. The section makes a distinction between an act of the accused and its result, if any. Such an act may not be attended by any result so far as the person assaulted is concerned, but still there may be cases in which the culprit would be liable under this section. It is not necessary that the injury actually caused to the victim of the assault should be sufficient under ordinary circumstances to cause the death of the person assaulted. What the Court has to see is whether the act, irrespective of its result, was done with the intention or knowledge and under circumstances mentioned in this section. An attempt in order to be criminal need not be the penultimate act. It is sufficient in law, if there is present an intent coupled with some overt act in execution thereof."

16. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in "*Jage Ram Vs State of Haryana*", 2015 (11) SCC 306 has held that:-

"12. For the purpose of conviction under Section 307 IPC, the prosecution has to establish (i) the intention to commit murder; and (ii) the act done by the accused. The burden is on the prosecution that the accused had attempted to commit the murder of the prosecution witness. Whether the accused person intended to commit murder of another person would depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. To justify a conviction under Section 307 IPC, it is not essential that fatal injury capable of causing death should have been caused. Although the nature of injury actually caused may be of assistance in coming to a finding as to the intention of the accused, such intention may also be adduced from other circumstances. The intention of the accused is to be gathered

from the circumstances like the nature of the weapon used, words used by the accused at the time of the incident, motive of the accused, parts of the body where the injury was caused and the nature of injury and severity of the blows given, etc.”

17. In “*Sarju Prasad Vs State of Bihar*”, AIR (1965) SC 843, Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has observed that:-

“Whether there was intention to kill or knowledge that death will be caused is a question of fact and would depend on the facts of a given case. The circumstances that the injury inflicted by the accused was simple or minor will not by itself rule out application of Section 307 IPC. The determinative question is intention or knowledge, as the case may be, and not nature of the injury. The basic differences between Sections 333 and 325 IPC are that Section 325 gets attracted where grievous hurt is caused whereas Section 333 gets attracted if such hurt is caused to a public servant.’

18. In order to bring home the guilt of both the accused persons, the prosecution has mainly relied upon the testimony of PW – 1 Sh. Janardan Gautam (injured), who briefly deposed in his examination in chief that on 10.03.2016 at about 10:30 PM, he, Ram Kishan and Lale were talking to each other at opposite to gate no. 1 Jhandewalan Metro Station after parking their rickshaws. He further deposed that accused Jeewan Lal, who was under the influence of liquor, started abusing him and pushed him and in the scuffle accused Jeewan Lal slapped him and in the process, Ramkishan and Lale intervened and rescued him and thereafter Ramkishan and Lale left the place. He further deposed that accused Jeewan Lal started making conversation on his mobile and called his brother accused Sanchit and on his arrival, accused

Jeewan Lal signaled towards him and told his brother that he was quarreling with him, thereafter, accused Sanchit slapped him 2-3 times and took out a knife from the left pocket of his pant and handed over the same to his brother Jeewan Lal and accused Sanchit caught hold of him from behind and accused Jeewan Lal stabbed him with the knife on the left side of his stomach, due to which blood started oozing out from his wound and he became unconscious and gained consciousness on the next day and found himself admitted in the hospital.

19. During cross-examination, PW-1 admitted that on 11.03.2016 at about 12 midnight, he was under the influence of liquor. He also admitted that at that time he was not in his senses. He further admitted that there was dark at the place of occurrence. He admitted that he cannot say whether both the accused persons were present there as he was under the influence of alcohol.
20. Ld. Additional PP for the State sought permission to re-examine the witness, which was allowed and during re-examination PW – 1 stated that whatever he stated today was correct. He volunteered that on 15.12.2022, he was under some misconception and could not understand the situation, so he could not depose properly. He denied that he deposed falsely at the behest of accused persons as he has been won over by them. He admitted that today he is deposing after a period of three years and there are every possibility that he

had forgotten all the things. He denied that on the day of incident, his signatures were not obtained by the IO on blank papers. He further denied that on the day of incident, accused Jeewan Lal slapped him and gave him beatings with leg and fist blow. He further denied that accused Sanchit inflicted stab injury to him.

21. Ld. Additional PP for the State has contended that PW – 1 Janardan Gautam has categorically deposed in his examination in chief regarding injury caused to him by the accused persons on 10.03.2016. He further contended that PW – 1 has turned hostile during his cross-examination as his cross-examination was recorded after around 3 years. He further contended that it is well settled law that testimony of witnesses who turned hostile, should not be discarded altogether.
22. No doubt that testimony of a hostile witness is not required to be discarded altogether and same can still be relied upon, if found trust worthy and corroborated. However, in the instant case, prosecution has not placed on record even an iota of proof, besides the testimony of PW – 1, to establish the guilt of accused persons.
23. The prosecution has claimed that accused Jeewan Lal caused stab injury to PW – 1 in the incident held on 10.03.2016. However, surprisingly, prosecution has not recovered the weapon of offence, by which that injury was caused.
24. PW- 15 Retired SI Tulsi Ram, deposed in his examination in

chief that he tried to search the weapon of offence i.e. knife but same could not be recovered. During cross-examination PW – 15 stated that complainant had not given any measurement of knife and he did not ask about the measurement from the complainant.

25. The prosecution has thus not made any efforts to recover the weapon of offence, by which injury was caused to PW – 1. It is also relevant that MLC of PW – 1 Ex. PW-13/A was got prepared by Dr. Sunny. However, in the MLC, though, it is mentioned that injured was having stab wound, but, detail of the wound is not given in the MLC. Even the size of injury caused to PW – 1 Janardan Gautam has not been mentioned.
26. Ld. Additional PP has contended that PW – 1 turned hostile during his cross-examination, because his cross-examination was recorded after 3 years of recording of his examination in chief.
27. PW – 1 Janardan Gautam was examined in chief on 15.12.2022 and in the ordersheet dated 16.12.2022, it is recorded that both the parties have amicably resolved their dispute and they shall be moving an application for seeking quashing of present FIR. However, no such proceeding was filed before the Hon'ble High Court, thereafter.
28. PW – 1 Janardan Gautam appeared for cross-examination on 18.12.2025 and gave a completely different version. During cross-examination, PW – 1 not only disputed his own testimony recorded in his examination in chief but has stated

that he was under the influence of liquor at about 12 Mid Night on 11.03.2016 and he sustained injury due to falling from his rickshaw on some sharp edged object.

29. PW – 1 Janardan Gautam during his re-examination has stated that his statement made by him today is correct and his previous statement made on 15.12.2022 was under some misconception.
30. The testimony of PW – 1, made by him during his cross-examination, shows that he is a unreliable witness. The prosecution has not placed on record any material to prove the guilt of accused persons, except the testimony of PW – 1.
31. The prosecution though examined PW – 5 Lale Trivedi. However, the said witness has also not supported the prosecution case and turned hostile and stated during his cross-examination conducted by Ld. Additional PP for State that he had not told the IO that due to mocking, Jeewan and Janardan started scuffling and a quarrel took place between them and he and Ram Kishan pacified the matter between them.
32. The prosecution has also recorded the testimony of PW – 6 Ram Kishan. However, PW – 6 had not witnessed the said incident.
33. The prosecution was required to prove the guilt of accused persons beyond any reasonable doubt. However, in the

instant case, except the testimony of PW – 1 Janardan Gautam, the prosecution has not placed on record any other material to establish the guilt of accused persons.

34. The prosecution has not placed on record the weapon of offence. Even the injury sustained by the PW-1, are not mentioned in MLC Ex. PW-13/A.
35. PW – 1 Janardan Gautam has not supported the version of prosecution during his cross-examination and has refuted his own testimony and even claimed that he sustained injury because he fell from his Rickshaw on some sharp edged object.
36. The prosecution has thus not placed on record requisite material to prove the guilt of accused persons beyond any reasonable doubt.
37. In view of the above facts and circumstances, I am of the considered view that the prosecution has failed to prove on record that accused Jeewan Lal and accused Sanchit have committed attempt to murder, punishable under Section 307 read with Section 34 of IPC, beyond any reasonable doubt. Accordingly, accused Jeewan Lal and accused Sanchit are acquitted from the charges leveled against them.
38. A copy of this judgment be given dasti to Prosecution.
39. In view of the directions given by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India to all Trial Courts across the country vide judgment dated 15.12.2025 in case titled ***Manojbhai Jethabhai Parmar***

(Rohit) vs State of Gujarat, Criminal Appeal No(s). 2973 of 2023, following charts have been appended to enhance the legibility of criminal judgments.

Chart of Witnesses Examined

Srl. No.	Prosecution Witness Number	Name of Witness	Description
1	PW 1	Sh. Janardhan Gautam.	Injured/Victim.
2	PW 2	Sh. Suresh.	Brother of injured/met injured in LHMC Hospital.
3	PW 3	ASI Harikishan.	Duty Officer, who recorded FIR No. 50/16 U/s 324 IPC.
4	PW 4	HC Nahnu Ram.	Went to PS for getting registration of FIR and assisted SI Dharmender during investigation regarding search of accused persons and eyewitnesses.
5	PW 5	Sh. Lale Trivedi.	Got hospitalized injured Sh. Janardhan in LHMC Hospital/Witness of last seen circumstances.
6	PW 6	Sh. Ram Kishan.	Known of injured PW 1 Sh. Janardhan/witnessed heated arguments between injured and accused Jeewan Lal/Witness of last seen circumstances.
7	PW 7	ASI Kamlesh Singh.	Got executed notices of accused Jeewan Lal and Sanchit at PS Katra Bazaar, District Ghonda, UP.
8	PW 8	HC Sandip Kumar.	Got deposited exhibits of this case with RFSL, Chanakyapuri and collected acknowledgment slip from there.
9	PW 9	Ct. Govinda.	Witness of arrest, personal search, medical examination of both accused persons.
10	PW 10	Dr. V. Sankaranarayanan.	Conducted biological and DNA examination of exhibits/Expert

			witness.
11	PW 11	HC Pradeep Kumar.	Duty Constable at LHMC Hospital.
12	PW 12	Inspector Dharmendra Kumar.	Complainant/1 st Investigating Officer.
13	PW 13	Dr. Praveen Kumar Das.	Deposed about admission of injured Sh. Janardhan in LHMC Hospital vide MLC No. 56415/16/Medical Jurist.
14	PW 14	Dr. Pawan Kumar Rattu.	Deposed about the nature of injury on MLC No. 56415/16 of injured Sh. Janardhan/Medical Jurist.
15	PW 15	Retired SI Tulsi Ram.	2 nd Investigating Officer.
16	PW 16	HC Harkesh.	MHC(M) CP.

Chart of Exhibited Documents

Srl. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by/Attested by
1	Ex. PW 1/A	Site Plan of the place of incident.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
2	Ex. PW 1/B	Arrest Memo of accused Jeewan Lal.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
3	Ex. PW 1/C	Personal Search Memo of accused Jeewan Lal.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
4	Ex. PW 1/D	Arrest Memo of accused Sanchit.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
5	Ex. PW 1/E	Personal Search Memo of accused Sanchit.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
6	Ex. PW 1/F	Disclosure Statement of accused Jeewan Lal.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
7	Ex. PW 1/G	Disclosure Statement of accused Sanchit.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
8	Ex. PW 3/A	Computer copy of FIR No. 50/16 U/s 324 IPC.	PW 3 ASI Harikishan.
9	Ex. PW 3/B	Endorsement on Rukka.	PW 3 ASI

			Harikishan.
10	Ex. PW 3/C	Certificate U/s 65-B of Indian Evidence Act.	PW 3 ASI Harikishan.
11	Ex. PW 5/A	Statement U/s 161 Cr. PC of PW 5 Lale Trivedi.	PW 5 Lale Trivedi.
12	Ex. PW 8/A	Copy of acknowledgment slip of RFSL, Chanakayapuri.	PW 8 HC Sandip Kumar.
13	Ex. PW 10/A	Biological examination Report No. 153/2016.	PW 10 Dr. V. Sankaranarayanan.
14	Ex. PW 10/B	DNA examination Report.	PW 10 Dr. V. Sankaranarayanan.
15	Ex. PW 10/C	Allelic Data.	PW 10 Dr. V. Sankaranarayanan.
16	Ex. PW 11/A	Seizure memo of cloths of injured Sh. Janardhan along with sample seal.	PW 11 HC Pradeep Kumar.
17	Ex. PW 11/B	Seizure memo of blood sample in gauze of injured Janardhan.	PW 11 HC Pradeep Kumar.
18	Ex. PW 12/A	Copy of DD No. 5B.	PW 12 Inspector Dharmendra Kumar.
19	Ex. PW 12/B	Endorsement on DD No. 5B.	PW 12 Inspector Dharmendra Kumar.
20	Ex. PW 12/C	Site Plan from where Lale took injured Sh. Janardhan to hospital.	PW 12 Inspector Dharmendra Kumar.
21	Ex. PW 12/D (Colly)	Notices served upon accused persons regarding joining of investigation.	PW 12 Inspector Dharmendra Kumar.
22	Ex. PW 13/A	MLC No. 56415/16 of injured Sh. Janardhan.	PW 13 Dr. Praveen Kumar Das.
23	Ex. PW 14/A	Encircled portion i.e. nature of injury on MLC No. 56415/16 of injured Sh. Janardhan.	PW 14 Dr. Pawan Kumar Rattu.
24	Ex. PW 16/A	Photocopy of relevant entries regarding exhibits of case property.	PW 16 HC Harkesh.

Chart for material objects/Munddamals

Srl. No.	Material Object Number	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by/Attested by
1	Ex. P-1/1	Pant of injured PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.
2	Ex. P-1/2	Underwear of injured PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.	PW 1 Sh. Janardhan Gautam.

**Announced in the open Court today
i.e. on 05th of May, 2026.**

**(PITAMBER DUTT)
Principal District & Sessions Judge,
New Delhi District,
Patiala House Courts New Delhi.**