

KABG410028952016



**IN THE COURT OF I ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND
JMFC COURT, CHIKODI**

PRESENT: SRI. ZAHEER ATANUR

B.Sc,LL.B.,

I Addl.C.J & JMFC, Chikodi

Dated this the 01st Day of August, 2026

C.C No.1495/2016

Complainant	The State of Karnataka Through PSI Sadalaga Police Station
Represented by	APP
Accused	1. Shri. Vishal Mahadev Darnaik, Age: 27 years, R/o: Examba, Tal: Chikodi, Dist: Belagavi. 2. Shri. Shivaraj Maruti Kamble, Age: 26 years, R/o: Examba, Tal: Chikodi, Dist: Belagavi. 3. Shri. Rahul Jambu Prabhat, Age: 24 years, R/o: Examba, Tal: Chikodi, Dist: Belagavi.
Represented by	SBV/AGP Advocates

Date of Offence	10-09-2016
Date of FIR	03-10-2016
Date of Charge Sheet	03-10-2016
Date of Commencement of Evidence	05-12-2019

Date of Which Judgment is reserved	01-08-2026
Date of Judgment	01-08-2026
Date of the sentencing Order, if any	Accused No.1 to 3 not found guilty

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 of purpose of section 387 of BNSS
01	Shri. Vishal Mahadev Dharnaik and Others	---	---	U/s 457 and 380 of IPC.	Acquitted	---	---

(Zaheer Atanur)

I Addl. CJ and JMFC, Chikodi.

JUDGEMENT

The PSI of Sadalga Police Station has filed this charge sheet against the accused No.1 to 3 for the offences punishable under Section 457, 380 of IPC.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are as under:

On 03.10.2016 complainant by name Meenaxi Shreemant Jadhav has lodged complaint alleging that on 10.09.2016 at about 05:30 PM sister of complainant Smt. Mangal locked the house and went to Chikodi, on 12.09.2016 one Jyoti Subash Chitale called the complainant and informed that the door of

house is opened. Hence the complainant reached home and enquired got to know that door lock was broken and she further saw in the bedroom that her locker was opened, one pair of 1.5 gms Gold Ear Rings, one pair of 30 gms Anklet Chain, one pair of 09 gms Toe Rings, one pair of 3.5 gms Toe Rings, 300 Rupees of denomination of 5 Rupees were stolen by unknown person.

Based on the above allegation the PSI of Sadalga PS has registered the case as Sadalga PS Crime No.207/2016 for the offence punishable u/s 454, 457 and 380 of IPC and submitted the FIR before the Court. Thereafter, upon completion of the investigation, the Investigation Officer has filed Charge Sheet against the accused No.1 to 3 for the offence punishable U/S. 457 and 380 of IPC. On receipt of police report, this court has taken cognizance for the aforesaid offence. Further, cognizance for the said offence was taken against accused No.1 to 3 for the aforesaid offence.

3. Copies of charge sheet were furnished to the accused No.1 to 3 in compliance of Section 207 of Cr.P.C/230 of BNSS.

4. Heard Learned APP and Learned Counsel appearing for accused No.1 to 3 before framing Charge. As there were sufficient material, charge under Sections 457 and 380 of IPC was framed,

read over and explained to the accused No.1 to 3 in the language known to them, having understood the allegations, the accused No.1 to 3 pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. Hence the case is posted for prosecution evidence.

5. In order to bring home the guilt of the accused No.1 to 3, the prosecution has got examined 08 witnesses as PW-1 to PW-8 and got marked 10 documents as Ex. P1 to P10. The statement of the accused No.1 to 3 as contemplated U/S 313 of Cr.P.C/351 of BNSS is recorded and read over in the language known to them. Having understood, the accused No.1 to 3 denied the allegations in toto and submitted that they have no evidence to lead on their behalf.

6. Heard the arguments addressed by the Learned APP and Learned advocate for the accused No.1 to 3.

7. On going through the facts and circumstances of the prosecution case, the following points would arise for my determination:

- 1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubts that within the jurisdiction of Sadalga PS in Examba between 10.09.2016 at 05:30 PM to 12.09.2016 at about 02:15 PM, the accused No.1 to 3**

committed the lurking house trespass in house of complainant by breaking open the door and thereby the accused has committed the offence punishable U/s.457 of IPC?

- 2. *Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, the accused No.1 to 3 committed theft of one pair of 1.5 gms Gold Ear Rings, one pair of 30 gms Anklet Chain, one pair of 09 gms Toe Rings, one pair of 3.5 gms Toe Rings, 300 Rupees of denomination of 5 Rupees by taking it out of the possession of the complainant without her knowledge and consent and thereby the accused No.1 to 3 have committed the offence punishable under section 380 of IPC?***

- 3. *What Order?***

- 8. The findings of this Court on above points are as under:-**

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

Point No.2 : In the ***Negative***

Point No.3 : As per final order for the following:-

REASONS

- 9. Points No.1 and 2 :** These points are inter-linked each other, hence to avoid repetition, afore narrated facts and evidence, they are taken up together for common discussion.

- 10.** In order to bring home the guilt of the accused, prosecution has examined CW-1/Meenaxi Shrimant Jadhav as PW-1, in the

examination-in-chief she has deposed that that she, her mother and sister live in Examaba Village. On 10-09-2016 in the evening as her mother was admitted to the hospital some belongings were brought to the hospital. Thereafter on 12-09-2016 herself and her sister reported to the duties. On the same day at 12:15 PM her relative CW-7 informed over phone that their house might have been broken, come and check it. She along with her sister at about 03:00 hours went to home and saw that door of the house was appearing like closed, lock of the house was broken, when they saw inside the house there are 3 lockers in one room and key of one locker was opened. When they saw it, all the belongings were scattered and 1.5 gms Gold Ear Ring, old 30 gms Anklet Chain, 09 gms Toe Ring, 3 to 3.5 gms Toe Ring, 5 Rupees coins worth Rs.200/- were stolen. She further deposed that they inspected outside and then called the police. The police came to the house and conducted investigation. She has filed complaint before the police. PW-1 identified her signature on complaint which is marked as Ex.P1 and her signature is marked as Ex.P1(a). She further deposed that on 01-10-2016 police have called them to the Police Station and informed that above mentioned items have been recovered from the accused present

before the Court today. In this regard she has given statement before the police and she can identify the articles seized. She has identified one pair of Gold Ear Rings marked as M.O.1, one pair of Anklet Chain marked as M.O.2, one pair of new Toe Rings marked as M.O.3, one pair of old Toe Rings marked as M.O.4 and 5 Rupees coins marked as M.O.5.

10.1 At this stage the L/APP has treated PW-1 as partly hostile and cross examined PW-1. During the cross examination PW.1 admitted that accused have broken the house of Subhash Hukkeri and stolen Rs.15,000/- out of which they have spent Rs.12,000/- and remaining Rs.3,000/- were seized by the police. She denied about further statement given to police in this regard. She has identified the accused present before the Court. Learned counsel for accused has cross examined PW.1 wherein she has deposed that she do not know the date of incident and the date of lodging complaint. She has lodged the complaint which is typed as per her instruction. She do not know who has typed it. She has affixed her signature on complaint as per the instruction of the person who typed it. On 12th she has informed the Sadalaga Police over phone and went to the Police Station after one week. She went to her house at Examba on the day of theft itself. When

she went to house she came to know about the theft of gold ear rings, anklet chain, toe rings and money. She has kept the said items in her Locker. Mahazar was drawn on the day she lodged the complaint. Police have called her to police station 2 to 3 times after lodging the complaint. Thereafter she has not given any information to the police. She has denied the suggestion that false complaint is lodged against the accused persons out of personal grudge.

11. CW-4/Rajkumar Krishnaji Malage, Mahazar Witness examined as PW-3, in the examination-in-chief he has deposed that he knows CW-5. Many years ago police have called him to the Police Station and showed him the accused who are present before the Court and told that they have committed theft in the house of CW-1. The accused took him and police to the house of accused No.2. They went in a police Jeep. Accused have taken them to Ambedkar Nagar at Examba. Accused No.2 has taken them to his house. Accused have shown money and ear rings. Police have taken his signature on a document. PW-3 identified his signatures on Seizure Mahazar which is marked as Ex.P3 and his signatures are marked as Ex.P3(a) and Ex.P.3(b). He can identify the jewelry and money shown by the accused on that day. He has

identified the chain, rings and coins shown in the photo that are same items which were seized by the police at the time of conducting the Mahazar. The photo is marked as Ex.P4.

11.1 Learned APP has treated PW.3 as partly hostile and cross examined PW.3. In the cross examination he has admitted that that goldsmith accompanied them when they went to the house of accused No.2. Further he has admitted that accused No.2 has brought the silver, gold and coin kept in his Locker. He has presented one pair of Silver Anklet, two pairs of silver Toe Rings and cash amount of Rs.3,000/-. Police have conducted the Mahazar between 05:30 PM to 07:00 PM and obtained his signature. PW.3 was confronted with Ex.P4 and he denied the suggestion that the police have seized the said coins.

11.2 The counsel for accused has cross examined PW.3, wherein he has deposed that Police have never called him in respect of this case, no Mahazar is drawn in his presence, police has not recorded his statement. Further he has admitted that he has signed as per the instructions of police.

12. CW-6/Mangala Kautuk Chikade, Hearsay Witness and sister of complainant examined as PW.6. She has deposed that while

she was on duty CW-7 has informed CW-1 over phone about the theft in the house. On 08-08-2016 her mother was not keeping well. They have admitted her to KLE Hospital, Belagavi. At that time she was working as CDPO Chikodi. Both sisters are looking after their mother. On 10-09-2016 went to home, taken money and locked the house and returned to Belagavi. On 12-09-2016 CW-7 has informed CW-1 about the theft of the house over phone. Immediately they came and enquired. There were 3 Lockers in their house. One of the Locker was opened. They saw that Silver chain, Gold Ear Rings, two pairs of Toe Rings, 5 rupees Coins worth Rs.300/- were stolen. CW-1 has lodged complaint in the month of October 2016. She has stated the said fact before the police. The Police has again called her and shown 3 accused persons and told their names as Shivaraj Kamble, Vishal and Prabhat and shown the articles and told that accused have committed the theft and said accused have also committed theft in other village. PW.6 has identified the accused present before the Court. PW.6 has identified the jewellery as per Ex.P.4.

12.1 The counsel for accused has cross examined PW.6 wherein she has deposed that she do not remember when she got the information about theft. She has not asked anything to anybody.

She has not stated anything to the police over phone. Locker was open. She has not lodged complaint on that day. She cannot remember when she has gone to Examba again. She has not gone to the Police Station for lodging complaint. She do not know when complaint was lodged. CW-1 has given complaint in respect of theft of house. Police have not told her when and who has committed the theft. Police have recorded her statement.

13. CW-9/Siddappa Paramanand Galagali, CPC 3028, examined as PW.7. In his examination-in-chief PW.7 has deposed that on 13-10-2016 as per the instructions of PSI he along with CW-10 arrested accused at Ambedkar Nagar at Examba Village at about 13-30 hours and produced them before PSI at 14-30 hours. On enquiry, accused admitted that on 10-09-2016 in the night 12-30 PM they have committed the theft in the house of CW-1 by breaking open the lock and stolen Gold, Silver jewelry and Coins and on 26-06-2016 in the night 1-00 p.m. they have committed theft in the house of Subhas Gurunath Hukkeri by breaking open lock of the house and stolen Rs.15,000/- kept in the Locker, out of which they have spent Rs.12,000/-. PSI has seized Rs.3,000/-. PW-7 has identified accused Nos.1 and 3 present before the Court.

13.1 Counsel for accused has cross examined PW-7. In the cross examination PW.7 has deposed that he was on beat duty when he caught hold the accused. He received information when he was on duty at Examba Out Post. He left at 01:15 PM on his motor cycle. CW-10 accompanied him. He does not know where the accused are staying. They searched the accused in Ambedkar Nagar. He has not gone to the house of accused. Accused No.1 and 3 were wandering in Ambedkar Nagar. He doesn't remember the exact area where they have arrested the accused. The accused have not tried to flee. They have produced the accused on same day. Already complaint was lodged. He has only produced the accused. He does not know what was seized from them.

14. CW-12/Sangamanath Hanamant Hosamani, IO examined as PW-8. In his examination-in-chief PW.8 has deposed that on 03-10-2016 at 07:40 AM while he was on duty CW-1 came and lodged complaint, he has received the same and registered FIR vide Cr.No.207/2016. PW-8 identified his signature marked as Ex.P.1(b) and FIR is marked as Ex.P-5, his signature is marked as Ex.P.5(a). He has sent Ex.P1 and P.2 to the Court. He asked CW-1 the reason for delay in lodging the complaint for which she told that her mother was admitted to KLE Hospital for treatment

and therefore delay was caused. On the same day he has conducted Spot Mahazar between 09:00 AM to 10:00 AM. He has identified Spot Mahazar, marked as Ex.P2 and his signature is marked as Ex.P2(b). On the same day he has recorded further statement of CW-1 and statements of CW-6 to 8. He has issued directions to CW-9 and 10 as per Ex.P6 and his signature is marked as Ex.P.6(a). On the same day CW-9 and 10 have produced accused Nos.1 to 3 before him in the afternoon at 02:15 PM. On enquiry, the accused have confessed of committing theft in this case in Sadalaga PS Cr.No.146/2016. On enquiry, they told disclosed that the articles were kept in the house of accused No.2 and they will show the house if IO accompanies. The portion of voluntary statements of accused are marked as Exs.P7 to P9. He has called CW-2 and CW-3 as panchas and CW-11 for weighing the gold to the police station and informed about the incident and thereafter taken accused and CW-2, 3 and 11 to the house of accused No.2 in Ambedkar Nagar and he has shown the jewelry and money kept in the Locker. CW-11 has weighed the jewelry. One pair Gold Ear Rings-1.690 grams, one pair Silver Anklet Chain-30.400 gram, one pair Silver Toe Ring-9.290 gram, one pair Silver Toe Ring-3.640 grams, 5 rupees 60 Coins worth

Rs.300/- and cash of Rs.3,000/-. He has seized the said items in presence of the CW-2, 3 and 11. He has taken photo while conducting Seizure Mahazar. PW-8 has identified the photo which is marked as Ex.P.10 and his signature is marked as Ex.P.10(a). He has produced the accused before the Court. On the same day he has recorded the further statements of CW-1, 6 to 8 and statement of CW-11. On the same he has obtained documents in Cr.No.146/2016 and annexed to the file. On 17-10-2016 he has obtained house property extract of accused No.2 and found that it was standing in the name of father of accused No.2 and the same is annexed to file. On the same day after completion of investigation he has submitted charge-sheet against the accused before the Court. He has identified the accused Nos.1 and 3 present before the Court. He has deposed that he can identify the M.Os marked. They are already marked as M.O.1 to 6.

14.1 The counsel for accused has cross examined PW-8. Wherein he has deposed that he has not obtained the documents pertaining to house of CW-1. Further he has deposed that he has not taken photographs while conducting Spot Mahazar as per Ex.P2. He has testified that due to delay in filing complaint, no foot prints were found on scene of offence. He has not investigate

about finger prints on Locker. He has admitted that in the photograph as per Ex.P10 clicked during Seizure Mahazar, weighing machine is not visible. Further PW8 has denied all the suggestions that the accused have not committed any offence, he has not conducted any investigation so on and so forth.

15. CW-3/Shivaji Jayawant Kamble, Spot Mahazar Witness examined as PW.2, CW-7/Jyoti Subhash Chitale, Hearsay Witness examined as PW.3, CW-5/Mahantesh Shrimant Kurani, Seizure Mahazar Witness examined as PW.5 all of them have turned hostile and did not support the case of prosecution, though Learned APP has cross examined them at length, nothing is elicited from their mouth which establishes the guilt of accused persons.

16. Analysis of evidence

PW1 in her examination in chief has testified that she has informed about the theft to police on same day when they got to know, which means on 12.09.2016, in the noon the police received information. But the complaint is lodged on 03.10.2016 which is delayed by 21 days. When the jurisdictional police received information of cognizable offence, as per section 154 of CrPC and guidelines issued by Hon'ble Apex Court in **Lalita Kumari's** case, it was incumbent upon the SHO of Sadalga Police

Station to register FIR and set the law into motion. It was not expected from the SHO to sit idle until the complainant approaches Police Station to lodge FIR. In other words, it indicates that though the IO has suppressed one more complaint in order to implicate the accused persons.

16.1 Further in her cross-examination, PW-1 has deposed that she do not know the date on which she has lodged the complaint, she also do not know who as typed the complaint. Moreover, the delay in lodging complaint is duly explained by PW-1 and in order to corroborate the fact that mother of PW-1 was admitted at KLE Hospital, prosecution has not produced any documents to show that the mother of PW-1 was admitted at KLE Hospital. So also, IO has not taken photographs at scene of offence to show that the door was break open or one of the Lockers inside room was broken. Failure to prove said aspect is fatal to case of prosecution.

17. PW3 Seizure Mahazar Witness in his examination-in-chief has testified that accused have taken the police to house of accused No.2 and gave the hidden ornaments and cash to police. L/APP cross examined PW3 wherein he has admitted about the specific ornaments handed over by accused to police. A careful

analysis of evidence adduced by PW3, it is seen that there is joint recovery from the accused persons. It is settled principle of law that there cannot be joint recovery which is against the provision of section 27 of Indian Evidence Act. So also the recovery is not in accordance with law as held by Hon'ble Supreme Court as reproduced below:

This extract is taken from Babu Sahebagouda Rudragoudar v. State of Karnataka, (2024) 8 SCC 149 : (2024) 3 SCC (Cri) 535 : 2024 SCC OnLine SC 561 at page 169

66. Further, in *Subramanya v. State of Karnataka* [Subramanya v. State of Karnataka, (2023) 11 SCC 255], it was held as under : (SCC pp. 299-300, paras 76 to 78)

“76. Keeping in mind the aforesaid evidence, we proceed to consider whether the prosecution has been able to prove and establish the discoveries in accordance with law. Section 27 of the Evidence Act reads thus:

‘27. How much of information received from accused may be proved.—*Provided that, when any fact is deposed to as discovered in consequence of information received from a person accused of any offence, in the custody of a police officer, so much of such information, whether it amounts to a confession or not, as relates distinctly to the fact thereby discovered, may be proved.*’

77. The first and the basic infirmity in the evidence of all the aforesaid prosecution witnesses is that none of them have deposed the exact statement said to have been made by the appellant herein which ultimately led to the discovery of a fact relevant under Section 27 of the Evidence Act.

78. If, it is say of the investigating officer that the appellant-accused while in custody on his own free will and volition made a statement that he would lead to the place where he had hidden the weapon of offence, the site of burial of the dead body, clothes, etc. then the first thing that the investigating officer should have done was to call for two independent witnesses at the police station itself. Once the two independent witnesses would arrive at the police station thereafter in their presence the accused should be asked to make an appropriate statement as he may desire in regard to pointing out the place where he is said to have hidden the weapon of offence, etc. When the

accused while in custody makes such statement before the two independent witnesses (panch witnesses) the exact statement or rather the exact words uttered by the accused should be incorporated in the first part of the panchnama that the investigating officer may draw in accordance with law. This first part of the panchnama for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act is always drawn at the police station in the presence of the independent witnesses so as to lend credence that a particular statement was made by the accused expressing his willingness on his own free will and volition to point out the place where the weapon of offence or any other article used in the commission of the offence had been hidden. Once the first part of the panchnama is completed thereafter the police party along with the accused and the two independent witnesses (panch witnesses) would proceed to the particular place as may be led by the accused. If from that particular place anything like the weapon of offence or bloodstained clothes or any other article is discovered then that part of the entire process would form the second part of the panchnama. This is how the law expects the investigating officer to draw the discovery panchnama as contemplated under Section 27 of the Evidence Act. If we read the entire oral evidence of the investigating officer then it is clear that the same is deficient in all the aforesaid relevant aspects of the matter."

(emphasis supplied)

17.1 Moreover, PW-3 in his cross examination has retracted his entire version and testified that police have not recovered in his presence and he has affixed his signature as per the instructions of police. Whereas, PW-8 Investigation Officer has testified that he has taken CW2 and 3 for Seizure Mahazar, if that is the fact, then the testimony of PW3 that he was present during Seizure Mahazar is false.

PW6 has supported the case of prosecution to some extent but in her cross-examination, she has deposed that she do not know when the complaint was lodged, police have not stated

about who has stolen and when the theft was committed. She is not aware whether police has taken her to scene of offence or not.

18. Further PW-8 has admitted that he has not taken photographs while conducting Spot Mahazar. Even fingerprints from the Locker which is alleged to be broken is not lifted. All these aspect goes to the root of prosecution. Other witnesses have turned hostile.

19. Thus on careful appreciation of entire oral evidence of the prosecution. Burden lies upon prosecution to establish that the said stolen articles were seized from the possession of the accused. But the testimony of PW3 and PW8 are contradictory to each other. Merely based on testimony of PW-8 it cannot be believed, unless the same is supported by the evidence of independent witnesses. On careful perusal of entire oral evidence, the prosecution has failed to prove the seizure of the stolen articles from the custody of the accused by way of independent witnesses. Hence this Court is of the opinion that prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of the accused persons beyond all reasonable doubts. Accordingly this Court has answered point No.1 and 2 in the **Negative**.

20. Point No.3 : In view of discussion held on above points, this Court proceed to pass the following:-

-:: ORDER ::-

Acting under section 271(1) of BNSS 248(1) of Cr.P.C., the accused No.1 to 3 are hereby acquitted of the offences punishable under section 457, 380 of IPC.

The bail bond of the accused No.1 to 3 and their sureties stands cancelled.

Interim custody of MO. No.1 2 and 5 are hereby made absolute subject to appeal period.

MO.No. 3 and 4 shall be released in favour of complainant upon furnishing one surety to the like sum of Rs. 1000/-

Mo.No.6 is confiscated to State.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, typed by her, corrected by me and then pronounced in the Open Court on this 01st Day of August, 2026)

(Zaheer Atanur)
I Addl CJ and JMFC, Chikodi.

:ANNEXURE:

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/ COURT WITNESS

A. Prosecution:

Rank	Name	Nature Of Evidence
CW-1/PW-1	Smt. Meenaxi Shrimant Jadhav	Complainant
CW-3/PW-2	Shri. Shivaji Jayawant Kamble	Scene of offence

		pancha
CW-4/PW-3	Shri. Rajkumar Krishnaji Malage	Seizure Mahazar Witness
CW-7/PW-4	Smt. Jyoti Subhash Chitale	Hearsay Witness
CW-5/PW-5	Shri. Mahantesh Shrimant Kurani	Seizure Mahazar Witness
CW-6/PW-6	Smt. Mangala Kautuk Chikade	Hearsay Witness
CW-9/PW-7	Shri. Siddappa Paramanand Galagali	Official Witness
CW-12/PW-8	Shri. Sangamnath Hanamant Hosamani	IO

B. Defence Witness, If Any:

Rank	Name	Nature of evidence
	Nil	

LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS**A. Prosecution:**

Sr No.	Exhibits Number	Description
1.	Ex.P1/PW-1	Complainant
2.	Ex.P1(a), (b)/PW1/PW8	Signatures
3.	Ex.P2/PW2	Spot panchanama
4.	Ex.P2(a)/PW2	Signature
5.	Ex.P3/PW3	Seizure mahazar
6.	Ex.P3(a), (b), (c)/PW3/PW5	Signatures
7.	Ex.P4/PW3	Photo
8.	Ex.P5/PW8	FIR
9.	Ex.P5(a)/PW8	Signature
10.	Ex.P6/PW8	Letter issued by I.O

11.	Ex.P6(a)/PW8	Signature
12.	Exs.P7 to P9/PW8	Statements of accused
13.	Ex.P10/PW8	Photo
14.	Ex.P10(a)/PW8	Signature

B. Defence:

Sr No.	Exhibits Number	Description
	Nil	

D. Material Objects:

Sr No.	Exhibits Number	Description
01.	M.O-1	One pair of Gold Ear Rings
02.	M.O-2	One pair of Silver Anklet Chain
03.	M.O-3	One pair of new Silver Toe Rings
04.	M.O-4	One pair of old Silver Toe Rings
05.	M.O-5	5 Rupees 60 Coins
06.	M.O-6	Cash Amount of Rs.3,000/-.

(Zaheer Atanur)
I Addl CJ and JMFC, Chikodi.