

SC No.6484/16
FIR No.348/13
PS: Saket
State vs. Ram Kumar & Ors.

20.01.2018

Present: Mr. Rakesh Mehta, Addl. Public Prosecutor for State.
All accused persons are present on bail.
Ms. M. Begum, Ld. counsel for all accused persons.
Mr. Anand Kumar Pandey, Ld. counsel for complainant
IO/SI Rajdeep Singh as well as SHO Inspector Neeraj
Kumar are present.

It is submitted by IO as well as SHO that pursuant to the notice of the court, they inquired about the subsequent opinion from DIU because investigation of this case was carried out by South District and they brought into their notice that subsequent opinion has already been filed with viscera report.

Perusal of file shows that viscera report was filed by way of supplementary charge sheet, on 16.01.2017. There is no mention of any subsequent opinion on the viscera report which could not have been there even otherwise because date of subsequent opinion is of 17.10.2017 which clearly shows that subsequent opinion was filed only after filing of viscera report. But no order sheet reflects about filing of said opinion on any of the subsequent dates either by the IO or by DIU.

But be that as it may, the subsequent opinion is now on record, let copy of the said subsequent opinion dated 17.10.2017 be given to the counsel for complainant as well as accused persons.

A date is requested by both sides to address

(Contd.....2)

arguments on charge.

Put up for arguments on charge on **17.03.2018.**

It is however, made clear to both the parties that matter has already been delayed on account of aforementioned report hence, no further opportunity shall be given in the matter for advancing arguments on charge.

(Sunena Sharma)
Additional Sessions Judge-03 (South)
Saket Courts/New Delhi/20.01.2018