

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (FTC),
NORTH LAKHIMPUR.

ASLK010012202018



PRESENT: SRI ABU ARIF KHAN, A.J.S.
 ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE, (FTC),
 LAKHIMPUR, NORTH LAKHIMPUR.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 31/07/2026.

SESSIONS CASE No.217(NL)/2018.
(Under Section- 366/376 of IPC)

[GR Case No.1450/2018, u/s 366/376/323 of IPC]

Prosecutor	State of Assam
Represented by	Sri Prasanta Dutta, Addl. P.P.
Accused	Sri Ratan Bhumij (A-1)
Represented by	Sri Suren Borah, DCLADC.

Date of Offence	15.06.2018
Date of FIR	17.06.2018
Date of Charge-sheet	31.07.2018
Date of framing of charge	06.12.2018
Date of commencement of evidence	10.04.2019
Date of Argument	23.07.2026
Date of the Judgment	31.07.2026
Date of sentencing order, if any	N/A

Accused details

Rank	Name of the accused	Date of Arrest	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 CrPC
A1	Sri Ratan Bhumij.	17.06.2018	28.03.2019	U/s-366/376 of IPC.	Acquitted	N/A	284 Days.



l
 Addl. District Judge (FTC)
 Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

JUDGMENT

Prosecution case.

1. The brief facts of this case, is that The informant, Md. Hamed Ali had lodged an ejahar before the Officer-In-charge of Bihpuria Police Station on 17.06.2018 alleging inter-alia that on 15.06.2018 at about 4:00 p.m., the accused person namely- Sri Ratan Bhumij had kidnapped his daughter i.e. the victim girl from the road near Dongibil Gaon Panchayat. The informant has also alleged that on being searched, on 17.06.2018 at about 12:00 p.m., they caught the accused person red-handed on the road at Dongibil Amgos along with the victim girl and handed over him to the Police Station. Hence this case.

Investigation:

2. On receipt of the ejahar, the then Office in-charge of Bihpuria Police Station registered a case vide Bihpuria P.S. Case No.1387/2018, u/s- 366 of the IPC, and then he entrusted SI Kamaleswar Deka with the charge of investigation of the case. During investigation, the IO of the case had visited the place of occurrence, prepared the sketch map of the place of occurrence. The IO recorded the statements of the witnesses including the informants and sent the victim to the North Lakhimpur Civil Hospital for medical examination and also produced the victim




Addl. District Judge (FIC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

before the Court for recording her statement u/s- 164 of CrPC. The IO also arrested the accused person namely, Sri Ratan Bhumij and forwarded him to the Court. On completion of investigation and finding sufficient incriminating materials, the IO had submitted the Charge-sheet u/s-366/376 of IPC against accused Ratan Bhumij.

Committal:

3. On the basis of the charge sheet Ld. CJM, Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur took cognizance of offence against the accused person and upon his appearance before the Ld. Court, copies and relevant document were supplied to the accused person u/s- 207 of CrPC. Subsequently, the case was committed to the Court of Sessions u/s- 209 CrPC, since the offences of Section 366/376 of IPC are exclusively triable by the Court of Sessions.

Charge:

4. After hearing learned Counsels for both sides and after perusing the materials on record, the charge u/s- 366/376 of IPC was framed against the accused person and when particulars of the charge was read over and explained to the accused person, he had pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

Trial:

5. In order to prove the charge against the accused person, the prosecution had adduced evidence of 09



1
Addl. District Judge (FC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

(nine) numbers of witnesses and exhibited 03 (Three) documents. After closure of the prosecution evidence, the statement of the accused person u/s 313 CrPC has been recorded. The plea of the accused person is of total denial and he has declined to adduce evidence in his defence.

Argument:

6. I heard the learned Counsels of both sides. I have considered the submission of the Learned Counsels of both the parties and also gone through the case record.

7. Ld. Addl. PP, Mr. P. Dutta for the prosecution has made submission that the prosecution has examined as many as Three PWs in support of the prosecution allegation. The prosecution has been able to establish the guilt of the accused person beyond all reasonable doubt.

8. In contrary, the Ld. Counsel for the defence submits that there is no cogent evidence found against the accused person. The prosecution has failed to bring home the charge against the accused person and as such, the accused person is entitled to be acquitted from the charge.

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:

(I) Whether the accused person, on 15.06.2018 at about 4:00 p.m. at Dongibil under Bihpuria PS, abducted the victim girl, with intent that she might be forced to illicit intercourse, thereby committed an offence under

Section- 366 of IPC?

Addl. District Judge (FTC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur



(II) *Whether the accused person, on or after 15.06.2018 had committed rape on the victim girl at somewhere else, thereby committed an offence under **Section- 376 of IPC?***

DISCUSSION, DECISION & REASONS THEREOF:

9. Now, let us discuss whether the evidence available on record is sufficient to prove the offence alleged against the accused person.

10. **PW1, Md. Hamid Ali**, who is the informant, has deposed that he knows the accused Ratan Bhumij. Earlier he resided in Dongibil village and the accused was the resident of Dongibil and thereby he knows him. The occurrence took place in the year 2018, one evening at about 7:00 p.m., when his victim daughter, whose mental capacity is not like other normal people, went to a nearby shop for purchasing something. The PW1 has also deposed that as his said daughter did not return home, he waited for her that night and next morning, he reported the matter to the Gaon Burha. Thereafter, he went to Bihpuria police station and reported the matter verbally before the police. After 3 days a beggar came to the residence of his nephew Sarifuddin and informed him that a girl had been kept confined by someone in a house nearby Dongibil and Hunari village. Thereafter, his said nephew brought that beggar to his house. The PW1 has


 Addl. District Judge (FTC)
 Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

further deposed that he does not know the name of the





beggar. He took the said beggar to the house of Gaon Burha and thereafter the Gaon burha took the beggar to a house shown by the beggar and it was found that the house belongs to accused Ratan Bhumij. At that time, his daughter was not at home in the house of Ratan Bhumij and the accused was also not present there. The mother of the accused was found there and his mother said that he was also not at home. Then, the gaon Burha, (he is from nepali community) contacted the accused Ratan Bhumij over phone and then the accused told him that he was at Banderdewa and Gaon Burha asked the accused to take back his daughter. The PW1 has also deposed that after an hour, the accused Ratan Bhumij came with his daughter and thereafter they immediately went to the Bihpuria police station and handed over the accused to the police. Thereafter, lodged the ejahar against the accused person and on being asked, his daughter, told that the accused had taken her away along with two other persons and kept her confined in his house for 2 days, and thereafter at about 3:00 a.m. at night, took her to Banderdewa for the purpose of selling her to someone.

11. The **PW1** has stated in her cross- examination that he has been taking steps for treatment of his daughter and that relevant time also her treatment was going on. He has two wives. The victim is the daughter of his first wife. He has denied that he did not state before police

that after 3 days a beggar came to the residence of his nephew Sarifuddin and informed him that in a house nearby Dongibil and Hunari village, a girl had been kept confined by someone, that thereafter, his said nephew brought that beggar to his house, that he took the said beggar to the house of Gaon Burha and thereafter the Gaon burha took the beggar to a house shown by the beggar and it was found that house belongs to Ratan Bhumij. They found the accused along with his daughter on the road under a Mango tree and that place is in between the residence of the accused and his house. At that time, the Gaon Burha was not with him. He was at his home which is nearby that place.

12. PW1 also denied that on the relevant date, when his daughter was walking through the road, one Gautam Mala found her on the road at about 7 PM, and then on being asked by him, she told that as she was assaulted by her step mother, she left home and proceeding towards her sister's house but, she does not know the house of her sister that and then Gautam Mala took her to the house of the accused Ratan Bhumij which is in front of that place and his wife Somari Bhumij allowed her to stay for that night with them, that next day, the accused was taking his daughter to his house in his bicycle and on the way they caught the accused with his daughter. The accused was




Addl. District Judge (F.C.)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

caught with his daughter while coming through the road on a bi-cycle.

13. The **PW2, the prosecutrix** has deposed that the informant is her father. She knows the accused Ratan Bhumij, who is her co-villager. Nearly 1 year ago, in the afternoon at about 3:00 p.m., she went to market for purchasing something for the coming Eid. She met the accused in the market. He asked her to go with him. PW2 has also deposed that two other persons were also with him in another motorcycle. Thereafter they took her to a place, she did not know the name of that place, for selling her to someone. However, her brother and father brought her to the police station. Thereafter, her father lodged the case against the accused. Police also brought her to the court to get her Statement recorded before the Magistrate and she gave her statement before the Magistrate. Police also took her to North Lakhimpur Civil Hospital for her medical examination.

14. In cross- examination, **PW2** has stated that she has step mother. Her own mother is also alive. Her step mother never assaulted her. She denied that as tutored by her father and she has deposed falsely against the accused above. In her statement given before the Magistrate as well as before the police, she did not state

that the accused took her away in his motorcycle and two




Addl. District Judge (FIC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur



other persons were also with the accused. In her statement given before the police she said that on 17.06.18. in the morning at about 10 AM, when Ratan took her for outing in front of the house of Ratan Bhumij at Dongibil village, her father found her with Ratan and thereafter took them to the Bihpuria police station. They were in a bicycle. That place was in between their house and the house of Ratan. He was taking her towards her residence. At night, at 8 PM, she met a person from Bihari community, she did not know the name of that person. And that said person asked her to stay the night in the nearly house of the accused Ratan Bhumij as she was alone. Next day, her father found her with the accused Ratan Bhumij. The accused has two wives and two children. When she was walking through the road, the person from Bihari community found her on the road. She was proceeding towards the house of her sister she has forgotten the name of her sister. She denied that in her statement given before the Magistrate she falsely implicated the accused as tutored by her father.

15. The PW3, Md. Rajab Ali, son of the informant has deposed that nearly one year ago, before the day of Eid, his victim sister went to Dongibil Panchayat for marketing. After that she became missing. Thereafter, in Bihpuria police station they reported a missing entry. After 3 days a beggar (a women). He did not know her name, came to



their residence and with her, his mother discussed about his missing sister (victim). Then, said beggar asked his mother about appearance of his victim sister and on describing the same by his mother, the beggar told that she saw his sister was in the house of the accused Ratan Bhumij. The PW3 has also deposed that they reported the whole matter to the Gaon Burha Dileram Subedi. The accused Ratan Bhumij who was a resident of the locality of the Gaon Burha and therefore, the Gaonburha contacted the accused over phone. After that the accused Ratan Bhumij brought his said sister in his bicycle to the residence of Gaon Burha. He along with his brother Md. Fajor Ali and other villagers were also present in the residence of the Gaon Burha at that relevant time.

16. In cross- examination, **PW3** has stated that his sister was suffering some mental disease and at that relevant time she was under treatment. His father has two wives and their mother is the first wife of her father. He did not state before the police that after 3 days a beggar, he does not know her name, came to their residence and with her, his mother discussed about her missing sister, that then, the said beggar asked his mother about appearance of his victim sister, that on describing the same by his mother, the beggar told that she saw his sister in the house of the accused Ratan Bhumij. At that relevant time his sister was suffering some mental disease



and she used to leave the house without informing any one. He may recognize one Gautom Mallah if he get opportunity to see him. He denied that their step mother used to torture his sister Farida at the relevant time. For last 5 year our step mother has not been residing with them. Prior to that, their step mother used to torture his sister Farida. The accused Ratan Bhumij has wife and children. He also denied that on the relevant date, when his Sister was walking through the road, one Gautam Mala found her on the road at about 7 PM, and then on being asked by him, she told that as she was assaulted by their step mother, she left home and proceeding towards her sister's house but, she does not know the house of her sister that and then Gautom Mala took her to the house of the accused Ratan Bhumij which is in front of that place and his wife Simari Bhumij allowed her to stay for that night with them, that next day, the accused was taking his sister to their house in his bicycle and on the way they caught the accused with his sister; and that actually though the accused and his wife saved the life of his sister, the instant case is lodged against the accused making false allegations and he has deposed falsely against the accused.

17. The PW4, **Mustt. Jamila Begum** (wife of the informant) has deposed that she knows the accused Ratan Bhumij, being her co-villager. Last year, on the

previous day of Eid, in the evening, her daughter i.e. the victim went for marketing. Thereafter, she did not return home. After that her husband lodged the case in the police station. After three days, a woman beggar of the village of the accused came to her house and told her that she saw her daughter in the house of the accused. The PW4 has also deposed that she was under the impression that her daughter was in kept in the house of the accused for doing house hold works. Then she replied that her daughter went missing. Getting the information regarding the whereabouts of her daughter, her husband, her son Rajob Ali, her elder daughter Afurja Begum went to the house of accused, but at that time, the victim was not at his house. Her husband and her son reported the matter to the 'Gaon Burha'. Then the Gaon Burha contacted the accused over phone whereupon the accused told that he was at Banderdewa. After that the 'gaon burha' asked the accused to bring back her daughter. Then, the accused brought back her daughter. Her husband and son took her daughter and the accused to Bihpuria Police station.

18. In cross- examination, the **PW4** stated that her daughter was suffering from some mental ailments. The accused Ratan Bhumij is married having children. His elder daughter is already married off. She knows Gautom Malla. She denied that on the relevant date, when her




Addl. District Judge (F.C.)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur



daughter was walking though the road, Gautam Mala found her on the road at about 7 PM, and then on being asked by him, she told that as she was assaulted by her co-wife of her husband, her daughter left home and proceeding towards her sister's house but, she does not know the house of her sister that and then Gautom Mala took her to the house of the accused Ratan Bhumij which is in front of that place and his wife Simari Bhumij allowed her to stay for that night with them, that next day, the accused was taking her sister to their house in his bi-cycle and on the way we caught the accused with her sister. She denied that she has deposed falsely against the accused person.

19. The PW5, Md. Ainul Ali has deposed that the informant Hamid All is his paternal uncle. He recognized the accused present in the dock. He saw the accused once earlier. The occurrence took place nearly 1½ years ago. One morning, he came to know that the victim, his cousin i.e. daughter of the informant went missing on the previous day. After two days, when a woman beggar came to their house, they asked her about the victim whereupon she said that she saw her in a house in a nearby village and therefore, he along with the informant Hamid Ali and 3/4 others went along with the said beggar who took them to the house of the accused. His mother told them that one girl had come to their house but, at

that time the girl was not there. When they were waiting in the village of the accused, they found accused coming with the victim. Thereafter they handed over the accused to the police in Bihpuria Police Station.



20. In cross- examination, the **PW5** has stated that he did not state before the police that After two days, when a woman beggar, he does not know her name, came to their house, we asked her about the victim whereupon she said that she saw her in a house in a nearby village and therefore, he along with informant Hamid Ali and 3-4 others went along with the said beggar who took them to the house of the accused, that his mother was at home at that time, that she told them that one girl had come to their house but at that time the girl was not there. They found the victim and the accused on the road towards the residence of the victim. He does not know how the victim went missing and why the accused was coming with the victim towards her residence.

21. The **PW6, Dr. Queen Boruah (M/O)** has deposed that in reference to the Bihpuria PS Case No.338/2018 u/s 366 IPC, on 18.06.2018, she examined the victim, being produced and identified by WPC-297 Madhusmita Gogoi in presence of Gr. IV of North Lakhimpur Civil Hospital.


Addl. District Judge (FC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Relevant medial history: Forceful abduction by person on 18.06.2018 by a man.

Opinion: The age of the girl is above 18 years, no any external injury seen and there is no any recent sign of recent sexual intercourse. Ext.P1/PW.6 is the medical report and Ext.P1(1)/PW.6 is her signature thereon.



22. The **PW7, Md. Saiful Ali** has deposed that the informant is his father-in-law. He knows the accused since the time of the occurrence. The victim is the daughter of the informant. One evening in the year 2018, the victim had gone out from her house to the road after quarrelling with her mother. As she did not returned home, his mother-in-law informed him about the incident. Thereafter, he along with other villagers searched for the victim here and there, but they could not trace her out. The PW7 has also deposed that on the following morning, he went to Bihpuria side along with a person named Intas Ali for searching the victim. He received a phone call from his in-laws house that a beggar woman had informed some villagers that she had seen the victim in the house of the accused. Thereafter, they returned from Bihpuria side towards the house of the accused and some other villagers also arrived there. After that, when they all entered inside the house of accused but, he was not present in the house at that time. They asked his mother about him and the victim, but she expressed her ignorance. The PW7 has further deposed that the Gaon Burha of Dongibil made phone call to the accused asking



to come to the village immediately. When the phone call was made to the accused, at that time the accused was going towards Arunachal Pradesh along with the victim. After about half an hour or one hour, the accused arrived along with the victim by a bicycle. They asked the accused as to why he did not hand over the victim to her house, but the accused did not reply anything and tried to flee away. After that, they apprehended the accused and handed over him to Bihpuria PS along with the victim girl.

23. In cross- examination, the **PW7** has denied that he had not stated before the police that:- *On the following morning, I went to Bihpuria side along with a person named Intas Ali for searching Mofida Bequm. I received a phone call from my in-laws house that a beggar woman had informed some villagers that she had seen Mofida Begum in the house of the accused.*" He also denied that he had not stated before the police that:- *"Thereafter, we returned from Bihpuria side towards the house of the accused. Some other villagers also arrived there. After that, all entered inside the house of the accused. The accused was not present in his house at that time. We asked his mother about the accused and the Mofida Begum, but she expressed her ignorance"; and that- Thereafter, the Gaon Burha of Dongibil made phone call to the accused and asked him to come to the village immediately. When the phone call was made to the*



accused, at that time he was going towards Arunachal Pradesh along with Mofida Begum." He admitted the fact that the victim is mentally dumb a little bit. She does everything properly, but she cannot communicate properly with people, and she cannot keep accounts properly. He also denied that on that day the victim had gone out of the house after quarrelling with her mother. At that time, it was about 06:00/06:30 PM.

24. The PW8, Sri Jadav Subedi (Gaonburha of Dongibil village) has deposed that he knows the informant Hamed Ali. He died about two months ago, who was a resident under his Lat and the victim is the daughter of informant. He knows the accused Ratan Bhumij being the resident under his Lat. The occurrence had taken place in the year 2018. On that day, while he was in his house, the informant Hamed Ali came to his house and informed him that his daughter had gone missing. On the following day, some Muslim boys of their village came to his house and informed him that Hamid Ali's daughter was present in the house of the accused. They asked him to accompany them to the house of the accused. Thereafter, they went to the house of accused person. They asked his mother, and she told that the accused was not at home. Then he asked her where the girl was, and she replied that the girl was present in their house on the previous day, but she had gone out in the morning that day. Thereafter, he

returned from the house of accused and went to NRC office for work.

25. The cross- examination of the PW8 has been declined by defence.

26. The **PW9, SI- Kamaleswar Deka** is the IO of this case. He deposed that on 17.06.2018 he was working as 2nd officer at Bihpuria PS. On 17.06.2018 one Hamed Ali lodged an FIR at Bihpuria PS and after registering the case OC concerned handed over the case to one ASI Dimbeswar Das for investigation. The said ASI Dimbeswar Das has already expired. On 31.07.2018 the OC, Bihpuria PS handed over the case to him for complete investigation. On perusal of the case diary, he found that the previous IO SI has already examined the informant cum victim along with other four witness, he produce the victim to hospital where her medical examination was conducted and also produced before the Court where victim's statement u/s 164 CrPC was recorded. He visited the P.O. and prepared sketch map of the P.O. and wherein another two witnesses were examined. He arrested the accused person and forwarded to the Court. The previous IO also collected the medical report. He had only submitted the charge-sheet against the accused person Ratan Bhumij u/s 366/376/323 of IPC. Ext.P2/PW9 is the said charge-sheet and Ext.P2(1)/PW9 is his signature. He



Addl. District Judge (FTC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

knows the deceased IO Dimbeswar Das and also can identify his signature. Ext.P3/PW9 is the said sketch map of the P.O. and Ext.P3(1)/PW9 is the signature of ASI Dimbeswar Das.

27. In cross examination, PW9 has denied that he has falsely submitted the charge-sheet against the accused person as there is no sufficient evidence against the accused person.

Appreciation of evidence:

28. The prosecution has failed to produce any age related document of the victim, whereas the PW6, the medical officer opined that the age of victim is above 18 years and therefore the victim is held to be a major.

29. I would like to reproduce the Section- 366 of the IPC before discussing the first point in this case. The section reads as follows:-

"whoever kidnaps or abducts any woman with intent that she may be compelled or knowing it to be likely that she will be compelled to marry any person against her will or in order that she may be forced or seduced to illicit intercourse or knowing it to be likely that she will be forced or seduced to illicit intercourse 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 whoever by means of criminal intimidation as define in the code or of abuse of authority or any other method of compulsion induces any woman to go from any place with intent that she may be or knowing that it is likely that she will be forced or seduced to illicit intercourse with another person shall be punishable as aforesaid".




Addl. District Judge (FTC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

30. So far as the fact of the kidnap or abduction is concerned, the testimony of the victim suffers from lack of corroboration and inconsistency since the victim deposed before the Court that the accused person gagged her mouth with a cloth and thereafter beat her and there were two persons also with the accused person and they took her to an unknown place by a motorcycle. But this fact was neither stated by her before the police nor before the Magistrate during the recording of the statement under section 164 of CrPC.

31. The rest of the PWs are the here-say witnesses they deposed that they heard from a beggar that they saw the victim at the house of the accused person, but the prosecution has not examined that beggar.

32. The PW1, the informant averred that he took the beggar to the house of the local Gaonbura and thereafter the local Gaonbura took the beggar to a house shown by the beggar and it was found to be the house of the accused Ratan Bhumij. But they neither found Ratan Bhumij nor the victim at the house of the accused person. Then the Gaonburha contacted the accused person Ratan Bhumij over phone when the accused person told him that he was at Banderdewa and Gaonburha asked the accused person to take back the victim girl and after an hour the accused person came with the victim girl. The PW3, PW4 PW5 and PW7 who appears to be the relatives




Addl. District Judge (FTC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

of the victim, deposed almost in similar tune with the informant but the PW8 has not corroborated testimony of the aforesaid PWs.

33. The PW8 deposed that as they did not find the victim at the house of the accused person, and the mother of the accused person told that the victim girl was in the house of the accused person on the previous night, but she had gone out on next morning. But the prosecution has not examined the mother of the accused person to bring the truth.

34. In this backdrop the prosecution has failed to prove the charge of kidnap or abduction.

35. Now let us discuss the fact of rape. In a case of sexual intercourse, the victim's testimony bears the utmost significance. On perusal of the victim deposition, it appears that the victim has not uttered a single word regarding the forceful sexual intercourse with her by the accused person, even though she had categorically stated before the Magistrate that there was sexual intercourse with her.

36. The rest of the witnesses are totally silent about the sexual intercourse by the accused person with the victim. Moreover, the medical report also reveals that there is no any external injury and no any sign of recent sexual intercourse with the victim.




Addl. District Judge (FIC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

37. Therefore the evidence of the victim is found contradictory, unreliable and does not inspire the confidence.

38. From the evidence available in the case record, it appears that the witnesses have failed to disclose any incriminating materials against the accused person to prove the offence as alleged.

39. In view of the above discussion made herein above, and considering all aspects, I find and hold that the prosecution has miserably failed to prove its case u/s- 366/376 of IPC against the accused person beyond all reasonable doubt.

34. Accordingly, the accused person namely- **Sri Ratan Bhumij** is acquitted from the charge **u/s- 366/376 of IPC.**

35. Let the accused person be released from the Jail hajot in connection with this case.

36. The case is disposed of accordingly.

37. The seized articles, if any, be disposed of in due course.

38. The Judgment is pronounced in open Court.

40. The Superintendent of District Jail, Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur is directed to release the accused person

if he is not required in any other case.

39. Inform the District Magistrate, Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.




Addl. District Judge (FC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Given under my hand and the seal of this court on
this the **31st day of July, 2026** at North Lakhimpur.

(Abu Arif Khan, AJS)
Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC),
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.
Addl. District Judge (FTC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Dictated and corrected by me:

(Abu Arif Khan, AJS)
Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC),
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.
Addl. District Judge (FTC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur
Picked up and typed by:
Shri Diganta Chetia, Steno.(Gr.-I).



LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE/ COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution

Rank	Name	Nature of witnesses (Eye-witness, Police Witness, Expert Witness, Panch Witness, other witness)
PW1	Md. Hamid Ali	Informant (Father)
PW2	The prosecutrix	Eye witness
PW3	Md. Rajab Ali	Other witness
PW4	Mustt. Jamila Begum	Other witness
PW5	Md. Ainul Ali	Other witness
PW6	Dr. Queen Boruah	Formal witness (MO)
PW7	Md. Saiful Ali	Other witness
PW8	Sri Jadav Subedi	Other witness
PW9	SI Kamaleswar Deka	Formal witness (IO)

B. Defence witnesses, if any

Rank	Name	Nature of witnesses (Eye-witness, Police Witness, Expert Witness, Panch Witness, other witness)
	NONE	

C. Court witnesses, if any

Rank	Name	Nature of witnesses (Eye-witness, Police Witness, Expert Witness, Panch Witness, other witness)
	NONE	

LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE/ COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution Exhibits

SL. No.	Exhibits Number	Description
1	Ext.P1/PW6	Medical report.
2	Ext.P2/PW9	Charge sheet
3	Ext.P3/PW9	Sketch map

B. Defence Exhibits

SL. No.	Exhibits Number	Description
	None	

C. Court Exhibits

SL. No.	Exhibits Number	Description
	None	

D. Material Object

SL. No.	Exhibits Number	Description
1	None	



(Abu Arif Khan, AJS)
Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC),
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.
Addl. District Judge (FIC)
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur