

ASLK030030052016



APPENDIX-12

**IN THE COURT OF ADDL. CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
LAKHIMPUR, NORTH LAKHIMPUR**

**Present: Smti Saraswati Johori Padun, AJS
Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur, Assam**

(Date of Judgment: 24.07.2026)

(G.R. Case No.282/2016)

**North Lakhimpur P.S. Case No.143/2016
under section 365/342/506 IPC**

COMPLAINANT	STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY	Sri Ratul Dutta, Learned Asstt. P.P.
ACCUSED	A.1. Sri Mukta Prasad @ Biswas S/o: Late Sanyasi Biswas R/o: Ward No.8, North Lakhimpur PS: North Lakhimpur Dist- Lakhimpur
REPRESENTED BY	Sri Nitul Ray, Learned Advocate

APPENDIX-13

Date of offence	11.01.2016
Date of FIR	06.02.2016
Date of Charge Sheet	30.06.2017
Date of Framing of Charges/offence explanation	10.07.2025
Date of commencement of evidence	31.10.2025
Date of argument	10.07.2026
Date on which judgment is reserved	10.07.2026
Date of Judgment	24.07.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	Acquitted

Accused Details:

Rank of the Accused	Name of 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 purpose of Sec. 428 Cr.P.C.
A1	Sri Mukta Prasad @ Biswas	26.06.2025	10.07.2025	Sec.365/342/506 of IPC	Acquitted	N/A	14 days

J U D G M E N T

1. The accused, Mukta Prasad Biswas (hereinafter referred to as A1), has been brought to trial by the North Lakhimpur Police Station for facing charges for committing offences punishable under **Section 342** (Wrongful Confinement), **Section 365** (Kidnapping or abducting with intent secretly and wrongfully to confine a person), and **Section 506** (Criminal Intimidation) of the **Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC)**, in connection with North Lakhimpur Police Station case no.143/2016 lodged by Sri Makhan Singh (hereinafter referred to as 'informant').

PROSECUTION'S CASE IN BRIEF:

2. The case of the prosecution originates from an *Ejahaar* (First Information Report) lodged on 17.01.2016 by the informant Sri Makhan Singh. The informant alleged that on 11.01.2016 at about 3:00 P.M., while he was returning home from Dolghat on his bicycle, the accused intercepted him from the south. The accused allegedly forced the informant and his bicycle into a tempo vehicle and drove him to the accused's house at 8 no. ward, Lakhimpur. It is further alleged that the accused ordered him not to make a hue and cry and wrongfully confined him in a room. During the night, the accused supposedly coerced the informant into signing five blank bank stamp papers and one white paper bearing a pasted revenue stamp. The informant asserted that he was released the next morning only on the persistent insistence of his wife. Due to severe fear induced by the accused's threats of dire

- consequences, the informant kept himself confined at home, resulting in a 6-day delay in lodging the Ejahar on 17.01.2016.
3. Based on the charge-sheet cognizance u/s-365/342/506 of IPC was taken against A-1. He was summoned but he did not appear and police arrested him on the strength of NBWA issued against him. Later on, he was allowed to go on bail and copies of relevant documents were furnished to him u/s 207 Cr.P.C. Considering the materials on record and after hearing both the parties, formal charges u/s 365/342/506 of IPC were read over and explained to A-1, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.
 4. The prosecution in support of its case examined eight witnesses whereas the defence did not adduce any evidence. A-1 was examined u/s 313 Cr.P.C. wherein he stated that he is totally innocent. Prior to this case the accused had eloped with his wife and left her after 20 days. He had lodged ejahar against the accused Makhan Singh for abducting his wife which was numbered as GR Case no. 1097/2011.
 5. I have heard the arguments of Ld. A.P.P. and the learned counsel for A-1.
 6. Upon hearing and on perusal of record I have framed the following points for determination

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:

- (i) Whether A-1, on 10.01.2016 at about 03:00 p.m. at Dholghat Road kidnapped the informant Sri Makhan Singh with intention of causing the said Makhan Singh to be

secretly and wrongfully confined him and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s 365 of IPC?

(ii) Whether A-1, on the same date, time and place, wrongfully confined Makhan Singh for one day and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s 342 of IPC?

(iii) Whether A-1, on the same date, time and place, committed criminal intimidation by threatening the informant to kill him and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s 506 of IPC?

DISCUSSION OF EVIDENCE, DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF:

7. The depositions of the witnesses are produced below for ready reference.
8. PW-1 Sri Makhan Singh in his evidence deposed that he has filed this case against Mukta Biswas. Ext.P1/PW1 is the ejahar filed against the accused wherein Ext.P1(1) is his signature. On 11/01/2016 while he was coming from Dolghat towards his home on his bicycle at about 3:00 P.M. the accused coming from the south direction picked him up in his tempo vehicle along with his bicycle and took him to his house at 8 no. ward Lakhimpur. He told him not to make any hue and cry and confined him in one of the rooms of his house. They reached his house at around 4:00 P.M. In the night he took his signature on a paper. He put his signature accordingly. His wife scolded him as to why he was doing such thing. He also prevented his wife from making any hue and cry. He took his signatures on five bank stamp papers

and one white paper where revenue stamp was pasted. He had an agreement with Mukta Biswas for a sale of land and he had taken about Rs.20 lakhs from him. He does not know why he took his signature. He had handed over his papers to the police. Ext.P2/P1 is the seizure list of the said papers wherein Ext.P2(1) is his signature. On the insistence of his wife the accused released him on the next day. The accused threatened him of dire consequences if he filed any case against him. He had also filed a civil suit against the accused. As he was scared he kept himself confined in his house and as such he lodged ejahar on 17.01.2016.

9. In cross-examination he denied to the suggestion that as there was no such incident he lodged the ejahar after eight days. He denied to the suggestion that he deposed falsely that on 11/01/2016 while he was coming from Dolghat towards his home on his bicycle at about 3:00 P.M. the accused coming from the south direction picked him up in his tempo vehicle along with his bicycle and took him to his house at 8 no. ward Lakhimpur. He told him not to make any hue and cry and confined him in one of the room of his house. They reached his house at around 4:00 P.M. In the night he took his signature on a paper. He put his signature accordingly. His wife scolded him as to why he was doing such thing. He also prevented his wife from making any hue and cry. He took his signatures on five blank stamp papers and one white paper where revenue stamp was pasted. He denied to the suggestion that he did not state before the

police that his wife scolded him as to why he was taking his signature on a stamp papers. He denied to the suggestion that he did not state before the police that the accused took his signatures on five blank stamp papers and one white paper where revenue stamp was pasted. He denied to the suggestion that on 29.07.2011 he had abducted the wife of the accused and that Mukta Biswas had filed a case vide GR 1097/2011 u/s 366 IPC against him. It is correct that in the said case he was lodged in jail. The said case has been disposed of as of now. He denied to the suggestion that in that case in Session case 100/2012 his wife Madhubala Biswas had deposed that he had eloped with the wife of the accused and had put vermillion on her forehead. He denied to the suggestion that he conspired with Madhumala Biswas and took the signature of the accused for usurping his land. He denied to the suggestion that in connivance with Madhumala Biswas he took signature of the accused on some agreement and tried to usurp his property. He denied to the suggestion that the accused did not take his signatures on stamp papers and he has filed this case falsely implicating him just to harass him to usurp his property. He denied to the suggestion that Madhumala has also filed a case against him. He denied to the suggestion that on 11/01/2016 he had gone to the house of the accused in his absence and was discovered by the accused in a compromising situation with his wife and for the same he has filed this case falsely against him to save his skin. He

denied to the suggestion that accused never took his signatures on any blank stamp papers.

10. PW-2 Sri Paluwan Das in his evidence deposed that he knows the informant and the accused person. His surname is Biswas but he does not know his name. Makhan Singh filed this case in the year 2016. One day in the year 2016 he was going home on his bicycle via Dolghat. While going home he saw that accused forcefully shoved the informant into his tempo vehicle and took him away. Thereafter he went his own way. He only know this much.
11. In cross-examination he denied to the suggestion that he did not state before the police that one day in the year 2016 he was going home on his bicycle via Dolghat. While going home he saw that accused forcefully shoved the informant into his tempo vehicle and took him away. Thereafter he went his own way. He denied to the suggestion that he has deposed false evidence in favour of the accused.
12. PW-3 Sri Pulin Das in his evidence deposed that he knows the informant Makhan Singh and the accused person. Makhan Singh filed this case in the year 2016. The police had taken him to the place where the informant was kept on the next day of the kidnap of the informant. Police took his signature while they seized documents from informant. Ext.P2(2) is his signature in the seizure list. In cross-examination he deposed that he does not know why the police took his signature. They took his signature on a blank

paper. He also does not know what were the documents seized by the police.

13. PW-4 Sri Jagat Das in his evidence deposed that he knows the informant Makhan Singh and the accused person. Makhan Singh filed this case in the year 2016. He used to run one hotel in the land of the informant. At that time, he came to know from the police that informant was abducted by the accused. The police took his signature. Ext.P-2(3) is his signature but he does not know its contents. In cross-examination he deposed that he does not know who kidnapped whom.
14. PW-5 Smti Madhumala Biswas in her evidence deposed that she knows the informant Makhan Singh. Accused is her husband. The case was filed by the informant about 9 years ago. Her husband deals in business of dry fish. One day her husband had gone to Shillong. After five days of return of her husband, Makhan Singh came to their house for dinner. Her husband reached home while accused person was having his dinner at their house and asked him as to what he was doing at their house in absence of her husband and children. Her husband warned the accused that he will lodge ejahar against him. People gathered in their house and the accused fled away. He then lodged a false case against her husband on the next day.
15. Before this incident Makhan Singh had abducted her. At that time the accused had forcefully took her husband's

signature on a blank paper after threatening him. After bringing her back the accused had again forcefully took her husband's signature on a blank paper after threatening him.

16. PW-6 Sri Lalit Saikia in his evidence deposed that he does not know the informant Makhan Singh. Accused is known to him but he does not remember his name. He does not recall why he put his signature on Exhibit-P-3/PW-6 although he could recognize his signature on the seizure list as Exhibit-P-3(1). Defence declined to cross-examine him.
17. PW-7 Md. Abdul Jalil in his evidence deposed that he knows the informant Makhan Singh of this case. He also knows the accused Mukta Biswas. He deals in fish. He used to sell fish. Accused Mukta Biswas had taken his signature on a stamp paper near the court ten years ago asking him to be a witness. He does not know the content of that stamp paper. After the case was lodged by the informant his statement was recorded by the learned Court. Exhibit-P-4/PW-7 is his statement recorded by the court wherein Exhibit-P-4(1) and Exhibit-P-4(2) are his signatures thereon. Defence declined to cross-examine him.
18. PW-8 ASI Sri Lalit Kakati is the Investigating Officer of this case and in his evidence deposed that on 06.02.2016, he was posted at N.L P.S as ASI and after registration of the case as N.L P.S case No.143/2016, u/s 143/365/342/506 of IPC, he was entrusted with the investigation of the case. During investigation, he recorded the statement of the

informant Makhan Singh and other witnesses. He visited the place of occurrence i.e. on the road at Dholghat near Higher Secondary school and prepared the sketch map. Exhibit P-5/PW-8 is the sketch map and Exhibit P-5(1)/PW-8 is his signature. He seized one 100 rupee stamp paper of land transaction from the possession of informant. Exhibit P-2(4)/PW-8 is his signature on seizure list. He also seized another stamp paper of Rs.20/- from the possession of accused Mukta Prasad Biswas. Exhibit-P-3(2) is his signature. He also got the statement of Nur Ahmed and Abdul Jalil recorded by the court u/s-164 Cr.P.C. on 06.05.2016 and 20.06.2016 respectively. The accused appeared before the police station with anticipatory bail order from the court. He was accordingly released on his appearance. After completion of investigation, he handed over the case-diary to the then O/C, NLPS who endorsed the case to SI Jyoti Mili. SI Jyoti Mili filed the charge sheet against the accused person Sri Mukta Prasad Biswas u/s 342/365/506 of IPC vide CS No.348/2017 on the basis of investigation conducted by him. Exhibit P-6/PW-8 is the charge sheet and Exhibit P-6(1)/PW-8 is the signature of SI Jyoti Mili, which he knows.

19. In cross-examination he deposed that PW-1 Makhan Singh in his 161 statement did not state before him that wife of the accused had scolded the accused by questioning him as to why he had taken his signature on the stamp paper. He also did not state that accused had taken his signature on

five blank stamp papers and one blank paper where one revenue stamp was pasted. He denied to the suggestion that SI Jyoti Mili has filed C/S against the accused on the basis of improper investigation conducted by him.

ARGUMENTS AT THE BAR:

20. Mr. Ratul Dutta, the Learned Asst. Public Prosecutor opened the arguments by forcefully submitting that the ocular evidence of the informant, Sri Makhan Singh (PW-1), provides a direct, uninterrupted, and categorical narrative of the incident which stands fully proved before this Court. It was argued that the informant's testimony is not isolated but is heavily reinforced by an independent eyewitness, Sri Paluwan Das (PW-2), who directly observed the accused using criminal force to push the informant and his bicycle into a tempo vehicle at Dolghat. The prosecution further submitted that the physical elements of the crime, specifically the land transaction records, were recovery instruments seized directly from the active possession of the parties by the Investigating Officer (PW-8), which establishes a clear economic and coercive motive underlying the abduction.
21. The State additionally contended that all necessary procedural parameters were systematically satisfied by the investigating apparatus, as seen through the prompt recording of independent statements under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1860 (CrPC) to preserve

unblemished evidence. Addressing the defense's objection regarding the structural delay of six days in registering the First Information Report, the Learned Prosecutor vehemently argued that the delay was a natural psychological reaction. The state emphasized that the informant was thoroughly paralyzed by fear following the accused's explicit threats of death and dire consequences, which legally explains the temporal gap between the rescue and the formal lodgement of the *Ejahaar*.

22. Mr. Nitul Roy, the Learned Counsel for the Defense strongly countered the state's allegations, characterising the entire criminal proceeding as a malicious fabrication born out of chronic civil hostility and a deep-seated desire for personal revenge. The defense brought to light that the informant (PW-1) had a strong motive to falsely implicate the accused, pointing out that PW-1 had previously been sent to jail in connection with an earlier criminal case (*GR 1097/2011 u/s 366 IPC*) for abducting the accused's wife, Smti Madhumala Biswas. It was argued that this background, combined with an ongoing dispute over a land deal involving ₹20 Lakhs, formed the foundation for a calculated legal counter-strike by the informant.
23. The defense counsel further highlighted fatal structural contradictions within the prosecution's own evidence, pointing out that the cross-examination of the Investigating Officer (PW-8) completely unmasked massive improvements made by PW-1 during the trial. The court's attention was

drawn to the fact that crucial details—such as the mention of "five blank stamp papers" and the accused's wife "scolding him"—were completely absent from the informant's initial statements to the police under Section 161 CrPC. Furthermore, the defense argued that the prosecution's case was completely demolished by its own witness, PW-5 (the accused's wife), who testified under oath that the informant was never kidnapped, but was caught uninvited inside her house while her husband was away, proving that the present case was merely a preemptive shield to avoid a criminal complaint against himself. To conclude, the defense emphasized that the total collapse of the independent recovery witnesses (PW-3 and PW-4), who admitted to signing completely blank sheets of paper without any knowledge of the contents, thoroughly broke the chain of custody and left the prosecution's allegations uncorroborated and legally unsustainable.

Evaluation of Evidence, Discussion and Decisions:

24. The statutory framework governing the charges against the accused requires strict adherence to the distinct legislative ingredients embedded within Sections 365, 342, and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.
25. To sustain a conviction under Section 365 IPC, the prosecution must establish a two-stage criminal progression consisting of the *actus reus*—wherein the accused either

kidnapped the victim under Section 359 or abducted them under Section 362 by using force or deceitful inducement to compel movement—and a specific *mens rea*, proving that such abduction was executed with the targeted intention or knowledge that the victim would be secretly and wrongfully confined.

26. This operates in tandem with the charge under Section 342 IPC, which penalizes "wrongful confinement" as defined under Section 340 IPC; its core legal ingredients demand proof of total wrongful restraint under Section 339 IPC, wherein the victim's liberty is completely circumscribed, preventing them from proceeding beyond a defined, structural boundary without any viable means of exit.
27. Furthermore, to bring home guilt under Section 506 IPC for criminal intimidation, the prosecution must satisfy the statutory definition under Section 503 IPC by proving that the accused issued a threat of injury to the victim's person, reputation, or property, and that such threat was intentionally delivered to cause severe alarm or to coerce the victim into acting against their legal will to avert the execution of that threat
28. To prove its charges, the prosecution's case relies heavily on the ocular story of PW-1. However, a major crack appears when comparing his court deposition with his previous statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. The Investigating Officer, PW-8 (ASI Lalit Kakati), categorically confirmed during cross-examination that PW-1 did not state

before the police that the accused's wife had scolded him, nor did he state that the accused had taken five blank stamp papers and one white paper. These are not minor slip-ups or standard memory lapses; they represent substantial, structural enhancements designed to inflate a simple property dispute into an offense of extortionate abduction.

29. Under the settled principles of witness classification laid down in ***Vadivelu Thevar v. State of Madras*, AIR 1957 SC 614**, the court must divide witnesses into three categories: wholly reliable, wholly unreliable, and neither wholly reliable nor wholly unreliable. Given these stark structural updates, PW-1 firmly falls into the category of a **wholly unreliable witness**.

30. Furthermore, because the defense established that PW-1 had previously been jailed for abducting the accused's wife (*GR 1097/2011*), he constitutes an "interested witness" driven by a personal grievance.

31. On the point in ***Sahabuddin v. State of Assam*, (2012) 13 SCC 213**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that while the testimony of an interested witness is not automatically disqualified, it must be subjected to strict and cautious scrutiny. Where deep-rooted previous enmity exists, the danger of false implication is incredibly high.

32. On the legal weight of major improvements made during a trial, this Court relies upon the recent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kannaiya v. State of Madhya***

Pradesh, 2025 INSC 1246, where the Hon'ble Apex Court reinforced that:

"When the genesis and the manner of the incident itself are doubtful and the prosecution's version suffers from material contradictions, the conviction cannot be sustained, as conflicting versions cannot co-exist within a credible narrative."

33. This aligns with **Vibhuti Singh v. State of Bihar, (2010) 13 SCC 536**, which ruled that where material omissions touch upon the very core of the alleged occurrence, they completely destroy the fundamental credibility of the witness.
34. There is an unnatural Conduct of the Independent Eyewitness (PW-2). The prosecution attempted to salvage its case by relying on PW-2 (Paluwan Das) as an independent corroborative eyewitness. PW-2 claimed that he saw the accused forcefully shove the informant into a tempo vehicle at Dolghat in broad daylight. However, under cross-examination, he admitted that after witnessing this violent, criminal kidnapping, *"he went his own way"* without alerting neighbours, raising a hue and cry, or contacting police.
35. The behavior of PW-2 is entirely incompatible with ordinary human nature. In **Ram Ashrit v. State of Bihar, (1981) 2 SCC 60**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court mandated that when a purported eyewitness displays completely passive and unnatural conduct by failing to inform the community or the

police after seeing a grave crime, their evidence must be rejected as highly improbable.

36. Because PW-2 acts with such apathy, he belongs to the category of a witness who is "neither wholly reliable nor wholly unreliable." As established in ***Lallu Manjhi v. State of Jharkhand, (2003) 2 SCC 401***, a conviction cannot be sustained on the back of such a compromised witness unless there is independent, untainted corroboration elsewhere. No such corroboration exists here.
37. There is broken seizure chain and physical Contradictions in evidence of witnesses. Regarding physical recoveries, while PW-1 claimed he signed *five blank stamp papers*, PW-8 recovered only *one 100 stamp paper* from the informant and *one 20 stamp paper* from the accused. This physical reality completely contradicts the oral evidence. Furthermore, the recovery witnesses **PW-3 and PW-4 completely collapsed**, with PW-3 admitting he signed a **blank paper** and PW-4 deposing that **he did not know who kidnapped whom**.
38. On this point the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Moti Lal v. State of Rajasthan, (2009) 11 SCC 344***, observed that a seizure backed by witnesses who admit to signing blank papers or lack any awareness of the underlying transaction carries zero weight.
39. There is also unexplained delay in filing the FIR by the informant. On this point the 6-day gap between the alleged

incident (11.01.2016) and the FIR (17.01.2016) is a critical flaw. Given that PW-1 admitted to an ongoing civil property dispute involving ₹20 Lakhs and his past incarceration in jail for abducting the accused's wife (*GR 1097/2011*), the opportunity for calculated fabrication is undeniable.

40. This brings the case squarely under the rule of the Supreme Court in the landmark case of ***Thulia Kali v. State of Tamil Nadu, (1972) 3 SCC 393***, which mandates:

"The delay in lodging the first information report quite often results in embellishment which is a creature of after-thought. On account of delay, the report not only gets bereft of the advantage of spontaneity, danger creeps in of the introduction of colored version... as a result of deliberation and consultation."

41. The classic standard of proof in criminal trials was set out by the three-judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra, (1984) 4 SCC 116***, which held that the distance between "may be true" and "must be true" must be fully crossed by concrete evidence, and any lingering reasonable doubt must benefit the accused.
42. In this trial, there are no "two views." Relying solely on the interested, heavily improved story of PW-1 and the highly unnatural, indifferent behavior of PW-2 while actively ignoring the binding exculpatory testimony of PW-5 would

amount to a grave perversion of justice. The prosecution's narrative has completely collapsed.

43. The production of **PW-5 (Smti Madhumala Biswas)** by the prosecution proved to be completely fatal to its own case. She clearly testified that her husband was away in Shillong during the alleged period and that the informant entered her house uninvited. When the accused unexpectedly returned and caught the informant, an altercation ensued, and the informant subsequently lodged a false case to save his own skin.
44. Under the law, since the Ld. APP did not declare PW-5 hostile and did not cross-examine her, her testimony remains a binding narrative on the prosecution. In ***Raja v. State of Karnataka, (2016) 10 SCC 506***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court established that the evidence of a prosecution witness who is not declared hostile can be fully relied upon by the defense, and its exculpatory contents bind the State.
45. This view was followed in ***State of U.P. v. Ramesh Prasad, (2004) 9 SCC 461***, which affirmed that if a prosecution witness gives clear evidence that explicitly exonerates the accused, it fundamentally damages the core foundation of the State's case. Her evidence completely destroys the prosecution's theory of abduction and wrongful confinement.

46. Thus, at the end after considering the entire evidence on record this Court finds that the prosecution has failed to prove its charges against the accused beyond reasonable doubt.

All the points for determinations are decided in the negative.

ORDER

47. In view of the discussions made above and the decisions reached in the foregoing points for determination, the accused, **Mukta Prasad Biswas**, is hereby **Acquitted** of all charges levelled against him under Sections 342/365/506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

48. Any property or documents seized during the investigation shall be returned to their rightful possessors following standard formal procedures.

49. The bail bond of A-1 stands extended for six months.

The case is disposed of on contest.

This judgment is given under my hand and seal of this court on this the 24th day of July, 2026.

(Saraswati Johori Padun)
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

APPENDIX – 14**LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT WITNESSES****A. Prosecution:**

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESSES, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
PW1	Sri Makhan Singh	Informant
PW2	Sri Paluwan Das	Other witness
PW3	Sri Pulin Das	Panch witness
PW4	Sri Jagat Das	Panch witness
PW5	Smti Madhumala Biswas	Other witness
PW6	Sri Lalit Saikia	Panch witness
PW7	Md. Abdul Jalil	Panch witness
PW8	ASI Sri Lalit Kakaty	Police witness

B. Defence Witnesses, if any : Nil**C. Court Witnesses, if any : Nil****LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE/ COURT EXHIBITS****A. Prosecution:**

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
--------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

1	Exhibit-P-1/PW-1	Ejahar
2	Exhibit-P-1(1)/PW-1	Signature of PW-1
3	Exhibit-P-2/PW-1	Seizure list
4	Exhibit-2(1)/PW-1	Signature of PW-1
5	Exhibit-2(2)/PW-3	Signature of PW-3
6	Exhibit-2(3)/PW-4	Signature of PW-4
7	Exhibit-P-3/PW-6	Seizure list
8	Exhibit-3(1)/PW-6	Signature of PW-6
9	Exhibit-P-4/PW-7	Statement of PW-7
10	Exhibit-4(1)(2)/PW-7	Signatures of PW-7
11	Exhibit-P-5/PW-8	Sketch map
12	Exhibit-5(1)/PW-8	Signature of PW-8
13	Exhibit-P-6/PW-8	Charge-sheet
14	Exhibit-6(1)/PW-8	Signature of PW-8

B. Defence:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit D-1/DW-1	Nil

C. Court Exhibits :

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit C-1/CW-1	Nil

D. Material Objects:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	MO1	Nil

(Saraswati Johori Padun)
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Visit **ecourts.gov.in** for updates or download mobile app "**eCourts Services**" from Android or iOS