

KABC010301942023



IN THE COURT OF THE XXXIV ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND
SESSIONS JUDGE & SPECIAL JUDGE, (NDPS),
BENGALURU.

Present: Sri. Syed Baleegur Rahaman, B.A.L., LL.B.,
XXXIV Addl.City Civil and Sessions Judge &
Special Judge, (NDPS), Bengaluru.

Dated this the 29th day of August 2025

Spl.C.No.2379/2023

Complainant : The State of Karnataka,
By Contonment Railway Police
Station, Bengaluru.

(By the Ld Public Prosecutor)

-V/s-

Accused : 1.Deepak Barman,
S/o.Susheel Barman,
Aged about 27 years,
R/a.Najirganj Bhulki,
Cooch Behar,
West Bengal-736 134.

2.Dipak Barman,
S/o.Chakradhar Barman,
Aged about 32 years,

2nd Cross, Near Viveknanda Ashra
Hoodi, Mahadevapura,
Bengaluru.

Permanently R/a
Bathriganj
Singimari
Madnagura
Dinahata
Tana
West Bengal-736134.

(By Sri.T.S.,Advocate)

1.Date of the offence : 03-07-2023

2.Date of report of
the offence : 03-07-2023

3.Arrest of the accused : 04-07-2023

4.Date of release : 07-08-2023

Period of custody:	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s
	00	01	03

4.Name of the complainant: Sri.Nagaraj (Police Officer)

5.Date of commencement of recording
the evidence: 20-06-2025

6.Date of closing the evidence: 11-08-2025

7.Offences complained of: U/s.20(b) (ii) B of NDPS Act.

8.Opinion of the Judge: Accused not found guilty.

XXXIV Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge &
Special Judge, (NDPS), Bengaluru.

JUDGMENT

The Bengaluru Contonment Railway Police have filed this charge sheet against the accused for the offences punishable U/s.20(b) (ii) (B) of NDPS Act.

2. It is the case of prosecution that on 03.07.2023 at 2.20 p.m, when CW-1, 4 and 5 had secured the accused No.1 at Platform No.4 of K.R.Puram Railway Station. On verification, it was found that the accused No.1 was carrying ganja weighing 6 kg 70 gms without holding any valid license. On interrogating the accused No.1, it was found that the accused No.1 had transported the said ganja and Train No.22502 New Tinsukia Express from West Bengal to Bengaluru. It was also found that the accused No.2 had brought the said ganja

through accused No.1 for the purpose of selling the same. On the above said fact, as per the report submitted by the first informant, this case has been registered against the accused for the commission of offence referred above.

3. This court being designated as a special court to try the offences under NDPS Act, cognizance of the offences taken and S.207 of Cr.P.C. has been complied with.

4. The accused are on bail and represented by their counsel.

5. On hearing the prosecution and defence, my learned predecessor in office has framed charge against the accused for offences punishable U/s.20(b) (ii) (B) of NDPS Act, read over and explained to the accused, for which, they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. The prosecution in support of its case has examined witnesses as P.W.1 to 4 and got marked documents as Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.9 and M.O.1 to 3. After closing of prosecution side evidence, accused were examined under S.313 of Cr.P.C., and they have denied the incriminating circumstances appearing against them in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses.

The case of the accused are one of the total denial that they have been falsely implicated in this case. The accused did not choose to lead any defence evidence.

7. Heard the learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the accused.

8. Perused oral and documentary evidence on record.

9. Based on the materials, the following points are framed.

POINTS

1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on 03.07.2023 at 2.20 p.m, the accused No.1 was found transporting ganja through Train No.22502 New Tinsukia Express from West Bengal without holding any valid license. It was also found that the accused No.1 had brought the said ganja at the instance of the accused No.2 for the purpose of selling the same and thereby the accused No.1 and 2 have committed the offence punishable U/s.20(b)(ii)B of NDPS Act?

2. What order ?

10. My findings on the above points are as under:

Point No.1 : In the **Negative**

Point No.2 : As per final order
for the following:

REASONS

11. **POINT NO.1** :- PW-1 Sri.Nagaraj has deposed that on 03.07.2023, the DYSP had instructed him CW-4 and 5 to verify the transportation of the ganja from Orissa and Bihar. Accordingly, himself and CW-4 and 5 were on the duty at 2.00 p.m in K.R.Puram Railway Station. Train No.22502 New Tinsukia Express came from West Bengal at 2.20 p.m. While on patrol duty, they found one person sitting on steel bench at Platform No.4 with a bag. As they were having suspicion on the said person, they asked about contents of the bag which was in possession of the said person. Ganja was found in the said bag. They informed the said fact to the DYSP. The DYSP instructed him to conduct panchnama. Therefore, he requested CW-11 to send staff and investigating kit. Thereafter, CW-7 and 8 came to the spot along with the investigation kit. CW-6 has secured CW-2 and 3 as panchas. He verified the bag in possession of accused No.1 in presence of the panchas. Aadhar Card and Railway Ticket was found in the bag. The bag was also having ganja weighing 6 kg 70 gms. The said ganja was seized under Ex.P-1. Thereafter, he had been to the police station along with accused and seized

articles submitted a report as per Ex.P-2.

12. PW-2 Sri.Muniyappa has deposed that in July-2023, the police had secured the accused No.1 at Platform No.4 of K.R.Puram Railway Station. On verification of the plastic cover which was with the accused No.1, it was found that the same was having ganja. The said ganja was seized in his presence.

13. PW-3 Dr.Sunagar Manjunath Gulappa has deposed that on 31.07.2023, F.S.L, Madiwala, Bengaluru received one sealed article in Cr.No.23/2023 sent by the DYSP, Bengaluru Railway Sub Division. The article was examined from 18.08.2023 to 22.08.2023. The article was sealed with the seal impression CMM Court, Bengaluru, which was intact and tallied with the specimen seal sent by the Investigating Officer. On opening the packet it was having 99.16 gms of broken stalks bearing greenish brown coloured small leaves with fruiting and flowering tops seeds, stalks having characteristic smell. He conducted five different chemical tests and submitted report as per Ex.P-8 stating that the Article No.1 responded positive for cannabis.

14. PW-4 Sri.Nataraj.M.G has deposed that on 03.07.2023 at 2.50 p.m, CW-1 called him and told that he has secured the accused along with ganja at K.R.Puram Railway Station. He gave information to the Higher Officer and obtained permission to conduct raid. He requested to send the investigation kit along with the staff. Accordingly, he sent CW-7 and 8 to the spot along with the investigation kit. On the same day on 7.30 p.m, CW-1 had produced one person along with seized articles on the basis of which he registered Cr.No.23/2023 and submitted F.I.R to the court and Higher Officer. The accused was interrogated, subjected to the Medical Examination and produced before the court. On the same day, he recorded the statements of CW-2, 3, 6, 7 and 8. On 04.07.2023, he had sent CW-4 and 5 to secure the accused No.2. On the same day, the accused No.2 was produced before him. He was interrogated and after compliance of the guidelines of the Supreme Court the said accused was produced before the court. On 07.07.2023 he submitted a requisition to the Magistrate requesting him to certify the inventory. On 19.07.2023 the inventory was got certified and samples was drawn. He sent the samples to the F.S.L. On 22.09.2023, he received the FSL report as per Ex.P.9. As the investigation of this case was complete, he

submitted final report before the court.

15. In this case charge has been framed against the accused for the commission of offence punishable U/s.20(b)(ii)(B) of NDPS Act. It is the specific case of prosecution that the accused No.1 was secured on 03.07.2023 at Platform No.4 of K.R.Puram Railway Station at 2.20 p.m, along with wet ganja weighing 6 kg 70 gms. As the seized quantity was intermediary, The Investigating Officer has invoked Sec.20(b)(ii)(B) of NDPS Act. During the course of interrogation it was found that the accused No.1 had brought the said ganja from West Bengal at the instance of accused No.2 in order to sell the same. In view of the said voluntary statement of accused No.1, the accused No.2 has been implicated in the present case. During the course of examination in chief, PW-4 Sri.Nataraj.M.G, Investigating Officer of the present case has deposed that he had instructed CW-4 and 5 to secure the accused No.2 and as per his instruction, the accused No.2 was secured. He has also deposed that after interrogating the accused No.2, he was produced before the court. Needless to say that the Investigating Officer has not seized anything from the possession of the accused No.2. Only the reason for implicating the accused No.2 in the present case is the

voluntary statement of the accused No.1 which was said to have been recorded in terms of U/s.67 of the NDPS Act. It is now well settled that the voluntary statement of the co-accused is not admissible in evidence. At this juncture, it is relevant to refer to the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Tofan Singh V/s State of Tamil Nadu** reported in **(2021) 4 SCC Page-1**, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under :-

"235. Compulsion is an essential ingredient of the bar of Article 20 (3) of the Constitution. Article 20 (3) does not bar the admission of a statement, confessional in effect, which is made without any inducement, threat or promise, even though it may have subsequently been retracted. The article also does not debar the accused from voluntarily offering himself to be examined as a witness. The constitutional protection against compulsion to be a witness is available only to persons "accused of an offence", and not persons other than the accused. It is a protection against compulsion to be a witness and it is a protection against compulsion resulting in giving evidence against

himself.

236. As held in Balkishan A Devidayal vs State of Maharashtra⁴⁸, a formal accusation may be made in an FIR or a formal complaint or any other formal document or notice served which ordinarily results in his prosecution in court. The protection would not apply before the person is made as an accused in a formal complaint.

237. In Nandini Satpathy v. P.L.Dani and Anr.⁴⁹ cited by Mr. Jain, a three-Judge Bench of this Court held that the protection of Article 20(3) goes back to the stage of investigation and that accordingly he is entitled to refuse to answer incriminating questions.

An accused has the right of silence. As held in Nandini Satpathy (supra) any mode of pressure, subtle or crude, mental or physical, direct or indirect, but sufficiently substantial, applied by the policeman for obtaining information from an accused strongly suggestive of guilt, becomes compelled testimony. This principle would apply with equal force to any testimony in an investigation before a person other than a police officer including an officer under the NDPS Act.

238. Compulsion may be in many forms. It may

be physical or mental. However, mental compulsion takes place when the mind has been so conditioned by some extraneous process, as to render the making of the statement involuntary and therefore, extorted. This proposition finds support from the judgment of this Court in [State of Bombay v. Kathi Kalu Oghad](#)⁵⁰; [Poolpandi and Ors. v. Superintendent Central Excise and Ors.](#)⁵¹. Statements obtained by continuous and prolonged interrogation for hours at a stretch in unhealthy, unhygienic, uncomfortable and inconvenient conditions, without proper food, drinking water, washroom facilities etc. may not be accepted as voluntary.

239. The immunity under [Article 20\(3\)](#) does not extend to compulsory production of documents or material objects or to compulsion to give specimen writing, specimen signature, thumb impression, finger prints or blood samples. However, compulsion regarding documents attracts the bar of [Article 20 \(3\)](#) if the documents convey personal knowledge of the accused relating to the charge. Reference may be made to the judgments of this Court in [Mohamed Dastagir v. State of Madras](#) ⁵² and [State of Bombay v. Kathi Kalu Oghad](#)⁵³. Similarly, this Court has frowned upon narco

analysis as the statement so made is induced and, therefore, involuntary.

240. In Sampath Kumar v. Enforcement Office, Enforcement Directorate, Madras⁵⁴, this Court held that when a person was summoned and examined under Section 40 of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1973, it could not be presumed that the statement was obtained under pressure or duress. The statement cannot be attacked on the ground of infringement of the constitutional guarantee of protection against incrimination under Article 20(3) of the Constitution of India.

241. There can be no doubt that any confession made under compulsion to any person whether or not a police officer would attract Article 20(3) of the Constitution. Any confession made under compulsion would also be hit by Section 24 of the Evidence Act. Confession under compulsion is no evidence in the eye of law.

242. A confessional statement, if not obtained by compulsion, as judicially explained, would be hit by Sections 25 and 26 only if such statement is made to a police officer (Section 25 of the Evidence Act) or while in the custody of a police officer and not in the presence of a Magistrate (Section 26 of the Evidence Act). It is

now settled by the Constitution Bench in Badku Joti Sawant (supra) and Romesh Chandra Mehta (supra) and a plethora of judgments of this Court that Section 25 would only apply to a police officer or an officer who exercises all the powers of a police officer including the power of filing a police report under Section 173 of the Cr.PC. An officer under the NDPS Act does not have the power to file a police report under Section 173 of the Cr.P.C.

243. A confessional statement does not automatically result in the conviction of an accused offender. Such statements have to be tendered and proved in accordance with the law. The evidentiary value of the statement which is confessional in nature has to be weighed and assessed by the Court at the trial."

16. In view of the said observation of Hon'ble Apex Court in the judgment referred to supra, it can be said that absolutely, there is no material available on record to connect the accused No.2 to the present case. Hence, it can be said that the accused No.2 is entitled to get the benefit of doubt.

17. As already discussed in the earlier part of this judgment, the accused No.1 had secured the wet ganja

weighing 6 kg 70 gms at Platform No.4 of K.R.Puram Railway Station. In order to establish the charges leveled against the accused No.1, the prosecution has examined the first informant of the present case by name Sri.Nagaraj as CW-1. During the course of his examination in chief, PW-1 has deposed about securing the accused No.1 at Platform No.4 of K.R.Puram Railway Station on 03.07.2023 at 2.20 p.m and informing the same to the Higher Officer and recovering the ganja in presence of CW-2 and 3 under Ex.P-1. He has also deposed about submitting his report before PW-4 as per Ex.P.2. Needless to say that the NDPS Act provides for stringent punishment in case of violation of any of the provision made thereunder. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the officer conducting raid to strictly comply the mandatory provision of Sec.41 to 43, 50, 52A and 57 of the NDPS Act.

18. Now let me appreciate how far PW-1 has complied Sec.50 of the NDPS Act. Sec.50 of the NDPS Act provides for the conditions under which search of person shall be conducted. As per Sec.50(1) of NDPS Act, an officer who is authorize U/s.42 of the NDPS Act to conduct search has to take the person to any nearest Gazetted Officer of any Department or to the nearest Magistrate, if the person so

desires to conduct search. It is the responsibility of the officer conducting search to inform the accused regarding his right of being searched before the nearest Gazetted Officer or the Magistrate, if he wishes to do so.

19. On careful perusal of the examination in chief of PW-1, one can find that he has not at all whispered anything regarding informing the accused No.1 regarding his right of being searched before a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate. Therefore, it can be said that the Officer conducting search i.e. PW-1 has not at all complied the mandatory provision of Sec.50 of the NDPS Act. At this juncture, it is relevant to refer to the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court reported in **(1999) 6 SCC page 172 between State of Punjab V/s Baldev Singh**, wherein larger bench of Hon'ble Apex Court has considered the questions regarding the compliance of mandatory provision of Sec.50 of the NDPS Act which are as under :-

"1. In this bunch of appeals/special leave petitions the following questions of law (besides other questions of law and facts) fall for determination:

(i) Is it the mandatory requirement of Section 50 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, (Act for short) that

when an officer, duly authorised under Section 42 of the Act, is about to search a person he must inform him of his right under sub- section (1) thereof of being taken to the nearest Gazetted Officer or nearest Magistrate baldev singh for making the search?

(ii) If any search is made without informing the person of his such right would the search be illegal even if he does not of his own exercise his right under Section 50(1)? And

(iii) Whether a trial held in respect of any recovery of contraband articles pursuant to such a search would be void ab initio?"

20. The Hon'ble Apex court after considering the questions referred to supra, answered as under :-

"Therefore we find it necessary to set out our conclusions which are as follows :

"(1) If a police officer without any prior information as contemplated under the provisions of the [NDPS Act](#) makes a search or arrests a person in the normal course of investigation into an offence or suspected offences as provided under the provisions of [CrPC](#) and when such search is completed at that stage [Section 50](#) of the NDPS Act would not be attracted and the question of complying with the requirements

thereunder would not arise. If during such search or arrest there is a chance recovery of any narcotic drug or psychotropic substance then the police officer, who is not empowered, should inform the empowered officer who should thereafter proceed in accordance with the provisions of the [NDPS Act](#). If he happens to be an empowered officer also, then from that stage onwards, he should carry out the investigation in accordance with the other provisions of the [NDPS Act](#).

(2-A) Under [Section 41\(1\)](#) only an empowered Magistrate can issue warrant for the arrest or for the search in respect of offences punishable under [Chapter IV of the Act](#) etc. when he has reason to believe that such offences have been committed or such substances are kept or concealed in any building, conveyance or place. When such warrant for arrest or for search is issued by a Magistrate who is not empowered, then such search or arrest if carried out would be illegal. Likewise only empowered officers or duly authorized officers as enumerated in [Sections 41\(2\)](#) and [42\(1\)](#) can act under the provisions of the [NDPS Act](#). If such arrest or search is made under the provisions of the [NDPS Act](#) by anyone other than such officers, the same would be illegal.

(2-B) Under [Section 41\(2\)](#) only the empowered officer can give the authorization to his subordinate officer to carry out the arrest of a

person or search as mentioned therein. If there is a contravention, that would affect the prosecution case and vitiate the conviction.

(2-C) Under [Section 42\(1\)](#) the empowered officer if has a prior information given by any person, that should necessarily be taken down in writing. But if he has reason to believe from personal knowledge that offences under Chapter IV have been committed or materials which may furnish evidence of commission of such offences are concealed in any building etc. he may carry out the arrest or search without a warrant between sunrise and sunset and this provision does not mandate that he should record his reasons of belief. But under the proviso to [Section 42\(1\)](#) if such officer has to carry out such search between sunset and sunrise, he must record the grounds of his belief.

To this extent these provisions are mandatory and contravention of the same would affect the prosecution case and vitiate the trial.”

21. On careful perusal of the observation of Hon'ble Apex Court in the judgment referred to supra, it becomes clear that if the officer who is authorized to conduct search U/s.42 and 43 of the NDPS Act has not complied Sec.50 of NDPS Act, then search becomes illegal and thereby the court cannot rely on such evidence to base conviction. Therefore, the evidence

of PW-1 which speaks about the recovery of contraband from the possession of the accused cannot be relied on as search has become illegal.

22. The Investigating Officer has seized the contraband from the possession of accused under Ex.P-1. CW-2 Sri.K.Tirumalai and CW-3 Sri.Muniyappa S/o.Venkatesh are the panch witnesses to Ex.P-1. In order to prove Ex.P-1, the prosecution has examined CW-3 Sri.Muniyappa S/o.Venkatesh as PW-3. During the course of his examination in chief, he has deposed that ganja has been seized from the possession of the accused No.1 at K.R.Puram Railway Station, Platform No.4. During the course of cross examination, it is elicited from the mouth of PW-2 that he is working as a Ticket Collector at parking plot of K.R.Puram Railway Station for 15 years. The said answer given by PW-2 makes it clear that he is a stock witness. However, as already discussed in the earlier part of this judgment, due to non compliance of mandatory provision of Sec.50 of the NDPS Act, the search and seizure procedure has become illegal and therefore the evidence of PW-2 will not help the prosecution to prove Ex.P-1 beyond all reasonable doubt. Apart from all the above said facts, it is pertinent to note that, the evidence

of PW-2 is ambiguous in nature. He has not at all deposed anything about exact quantum of ganja that has been seized from the possession of the accused No.1. Therefore, PW-2 cannot be considered as a trustworthy witness. Hence, it can be said that the evidence of PW-1 and 2 is insufficient to bring home the charges leveled against the accused No.1 beyond all reasonable doubt.

23. PW-4 Sri.Nataraj.M.G is the Investigating Officer of the present case. During the course of his examination in chief, he has spoken about securing the accused on 03.07.2023 at 2.50 p.m and registration of F.I.R against the accused, recording the statements of the witnesses, submitting a requisition to the Magistrate for the purpose of certification of the inventory, drawing of samples, sending the samples to the F.S.L for analysis and submission of the charge sheet before the court. It is pertinent to note that, F.I.R was registered on 03.07.2023 requisition was submitted to the Magistrate on 07.07.2023 for the certification of inventory. On 19.07.2023 the inventory was certified. Therefore, it can be said that there is a substantial delay in producing seized contraband before the learned Magistrate and certification of the inventory. It is now well settled that the seized contraband

has to be produced before the court as early as possible in compliance of Sec.52A of the NDPS Act for the purpose of certification of the inventory. No explanation has been offered for delay in producing the seized articles before the learned Magistrate. The certificate of inventory is available on record. Though the same has not been marked through the Investigating Officer, but the court can take judicial notice of the same. On perusal of the certificate of the inventory, it is found that 100 gms of ganja was separated and the same was kept in a cover and packed with the seal impression "CMM". However, Rule-10 of NDPS Act, (seizure, storage, sampling and disposal) Rules-2022 mandates that one sample in duplicate shall be drawn from each packet or container seized. The samples ought to have been taken in duplicate as per Rule-10 of NDPS Act, (seizure, storage, sampling and disposal) Rules-2022. Therefore, it can be said that the Investigating Officer has not strictly complied Sec.52A of the NDPS Act.

24. It is pertinent to note that as per Sec.57 of the NDPS Act, the officer making arrest or seizure as the case may be, has to submit a report to his immediate official superior regarding the successful raid conducted by him. On careful

perusal of the examination of PW-1, it becomes clear that he has not at all whispered anything regarding submission of detailed report regarding successful raid conducted by him. Therefore, it can be said that the Investigating Officer or PW-1 as the case may be has not strictly complied the provision of Sec.57 of the NDPS Act.

25. As already discussed in the earlier part of this judgment, the NDPS Act provides for stringent punishment in case of violation of the provision made under. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Investigating Officer to strictly comply the mandatory provision of the NDPS Act. When it is established that the Investigating Officer has not strictly complied the mandatory provision of the NDPS Act, then the court cannot rely on the search and seizure as it has become illegal due to non compliance of the mandatory provision of the NDPS Act.

26. PW-3 Dr.Sunagar Manjunath Gulappa, Scientific Officer, F.S.L, Hubli has spoken about the receipt of article from the DYSP, Bengaluru Railway Sub Division for Forensic Analysis and examining the article and submitting report as per Ex.P-8 stating that the article has responded positive for

cannabis. As already discussed, in order to sustain conviction, it is the responsibility of the prosecution to establish the illegal possession of the contraband. If the prosecution has failed to establish the illegal possession of contraband, then the evidence of PW-3 will not help the prosecution to establish the charges leveled against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt.

27. In criminal cases it is the responsibility of the prosecution to establish the charges leveled against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. The standard of proof that is required to base conviction is “must be” and not “may be”. If two views are possible from the evidence adduced by the prosecution then the view which favours the accused has to be accepted.

28. On overall verification of the evidence adduced by the prosecution, it can be said that the prosecution has not been able to establish the charges leveled against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. Hence, I am of the view that the accused deserves to get the benefit of doubt. Therefore, I answer the **Point No.1 in the Negative.**

29. **POINT NO.2** :- In view of my finding to Point No.1, I

proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Acting under S.235(1) of Cr.P.C., the accused are acquitted of the charge brought against them.

The bail bond of the accused and that of their surety shall continue for a period of six months in terms of S.437(a) of Cr.P.C., to ensure their appearance before the higher court in case of any appeal or revision.

M.O.1 to 3 being worthless articles shall be destroyed after expiry of the appeal period, if an appeal is preferred, then after its disposal, as per law.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-I, transcribed and typed by her, script corrected and signed by me, then pronounced in the open court on this the 29th day of August 2025.)

(Syed Baleegur Rahaman)
XXXIV Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge &
Special Judge, (NDPS), Bengaluru.

ANNEXURE**List of the witnesses examined for the prosecution:**

PW-1	:	Sri.Nagarj
PW-2	:	Sri.Muniyappa
PW-3	:	Dr.Sunagar Manjunath Gulappa
PW-4	:	Sri.Nataraj.M.G

List of the documents marked for the prosecution:

Ex.P-1	:	Mahazar
Ex.P.1(a)	:	Signature of PW-1
Ex.P.1(b)	:	Signature of PW-2
Ex.P.2	:	Complaint
Ex.P.2(a)	:	Signature of PW-1
Ex.P.2(b)	:	Signature of PW-4
Ex.P.3 & 4	:	Notice to Panchas
Ex.P.3(a)&4(a)	:	Signature of PW-1
Ex.P.5	:	6 Photos
Ex.P.6	:	Aadhar Card
Ex.P.7	:	1 Ticket
Ex.P.8	:	F.S.L Report
Ex.P.8(a)	:	Signature of PW-3
Ex.P.9	:	F.I.R
Ex.P.9(a)	:	Signature of PW-4

List of material objects:-

M.O.1	:	Ganja
M.O.2	:	Black Colour Bag
M.O.3	:	Pink Colour Plastic Bag

List of documents got marked for the defence:-

-Nil-

(Syed Baleegur Rahaman)
XXXIV Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge &
Special Judge, (NDPS), Bengaluru.