



**IN THE COURT OF III ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C. AT
KADUR.**

**Present : Sri.THAHAKALEEL. K.A. B.A. LL.B.,
III Addl Civil Judge and J.M.F.C., Kadur.**

Dated: This 30th day of June 2026

C.C.No. 699/2019

**Complainant : The State of Karnataka,
Represented by Birur
Police Station
(Rep. by learned APP)**

V/s

**Accused : 1. Sri. Hemantha,
S/o Nagappa @ Nagarajappa,
Aged about 26 years, Coolie,

2. Sri. Yogendra S/o Lakshmappa,
Aged about 33 years, Coolie,

Both are R/o Hirenallur Village,
Kadur Taluk, Chikkamagalur Dist.**

**(A.1 Rep. by Sri. K.S.R. Advocate)
(A.2 Rep. by Sri. M.B. Advocate)**

TABULATION OF EVENTS

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. | Date of commission of offence. | 21.06.2017 |
| 2. | Date of report of offence. | 21.06.2017 |
| 3. | Date of arrest of accused. | Not arrested |
| 4. | Date of release of Accused. | - |
| 5. | Name of the Complainant | Sri. Devaraja |



- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 6. | Offences for which the accused has been charged | U/Sec.504, 324, 326, 506 R/w 34 of IPC |
| 7. | Date of registration of the case | 13.12.2017 |
| 8. | Date of commencement of recording evidence | 14.01.2022 |
| 9. | Date of closing of recording evidence. | 21.01.2026 |
| 10. | Date of judgment. | 30.06.2026 |
| 11. | Opinion of the Judge. | Charges against accused No.1 and 2 not proved. |
| 12 | Duration of the case | Year/s. Month/s Day/s
08 06 18 |

(THAHAKALEEL K.A.)

III Addl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Kadur.

:: J U D G M E N T ::

The PSI Birur Police station, has filed charge sheet against the accused No.1 and 2 alleging the commission of offense punishable under section 504,324, 326, 506 r/w Section 34 of Indian Penal Code.

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

It is the case of the prosecution that on 21.06.2017 at about 5.30 p.m., near the brandy shop situated at



Hirenallur Village, within the jurisdiction of Birur Police Station, accused No.1 and accused No.2, sharing a common intention, picked up a quarrel with CW2 regarding a financial transaction. It is alleged that both the accused took CW2 to the backside of Thimmana's Hotel, where they abused him in filthy language with an intention to provoke a breach of peace. It is further alleged that accused No.1 assaulted CW2 on the back portion of his head by using a mud block, while accused No.2 assaulted him with a glass bottle on his chest and back and left little finger. As a result of the said assault, CW2 is stated to have sustained simple injuries on his chest and back and a grievous injury to his left little finger. It is also alleged that accused No.2 criminally intimidated CW2 by threatening him with dire consequences.

3. On the basis of the complaint lodged by CW1, Birur Police registered a criminal case, conducted investigation, visited the scene of occurrence, drew the



necessary mahazar, recorded the statements of witnesses, collected the wound certificate and other relevant documents, and after completion of the investigation, the Police Sub-Inspector of Girur Police Station filed the charge sheet against accused Nos.1 and 2 for the offences punishable under Sections **504, 324, 326 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.**

4. After submission of the charge sheet, this Court, upon perusal of the materials placed on record and being satisfied that there existed sufficient grounds to proceed against the accused, took cognizance of the offences punishable under Sections 504, 324, 326 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and issued process to the accused persons.

5. It is pertinent to note that during the investigation stage itself, accused Nos.1 and 2 appeared before the Court and were enlarged on bail by order dated 28.06.2017. Subsequently, accused No.2 remained absent before the



Court, and therefore, he was secured under a warrant, remanded to judicial custody, and thereafter enlarged on bail.

6. Thereafter, copies of the charge sheet and all the documents relied upon by the prosecution were furnished to the accused persons in compliance with Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. Upon hearing the learned Senior Assistant Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel appearing for the accused, and on finding that there were sufficient grounds to presume that the accused had committed the alleged offences and that no case for discharge was made out, this Court framed charges against accused Nos.1 and 2 for the offences punishable under Sections 504, 324, 326 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. The substance of the charges was read over and explained to accused Nos.1 and 2 in the language known to them on 31.07.2019. The accused pleaded not



guilty and claimed to be tried. Accordingly, the case was posted for recording the prosecution evidence.

7. In order to bring home the guilt of the accused, the prosecution examined eleven witnesses as PWs.1 to 11 and got marked eleven documents as Exhibits P1 to P11.

8. After completion of the prosecution evidence, the statements of accused Nos.1 and 2 were recorded under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, by putting to them all the incriminating circumstances appearing in the evidence adduced by the prosecution. The accused denied all such incriminating circumstances as false and claimed innocence. They did not choose to adduce any oral or documentary evidence in defence. Consequently, the defence evidence was taken as nil and the case was posted for arguments.

9. Heard Arguments from both sides, perused materials available on records, now the following points would arise for the determination of this court.



1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on 21.06.2017 at about 5.30 p.m., near the brandy shop situated at Hirenallur Village, within the jurisdiction of Birur Police Station, accused Nos.1 and 2, in furtherance of their common intention, intentionally insulted CW2 by abusing him in filthy language, knowing that such provocation was likely to cause him to break the public peace or commit any other offence, thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 504 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code?
2. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, accused No.2 voluntarily caused hurt to CW2 by assaulting him with a glass bottle on his chest and back, which is a dangerous weapon or means, thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 324 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code?
3. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, accused No.1 assaulted CW2 with a mud block on the back portion of his head and accused No.2 assaulted him with a glass bottle on his left little finger, thereby voluntarily causing grievous hurt by dangerous weapon



or means, in furtherance of their common intention, and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 326 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code?

4. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, accused No.2 criminally intimidated CW2 by threatening him with dire consequences, thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code?

5. What order?

10. The answer of this court for the above points are as follows :

Point No.1	:	In the Negative.
Point No.2	:	In the Negative.
Point No.3	:	In the Negative.
Point No.4	:	In the Negative.
Point No.5	:	As per the final Order for the following;

:: R E A S O N S ::

11. POINT NO.1 TO 4: Since all these points arise out of the same transaction and are interconnected, they



are taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid repetition of facts and evidence. Before appreciating the evidence available on record, it is necessary to refer to the essential ingredients of the offences alleged against the accused.

12. To constitute an offence punishable under **Section 504 of the Indian Penal Code**, the prosecution must establish that the accused intentionally insulted the victim by using abusive or insulting words, that such insult was intended or known to be likely to provoke the victim, and that such provocation was likely to cause the victim to break the public peace or commit any other offence.

To establish an offence under **Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code**, the prosecution must prove that the accused voluntarily caused hurt to the victim and that such hurt was caused by using a dangerous weapon or dangerous means.



13. For an offence punishable under **Section 326 of the Indian Penal Code**, the prosecution is required to prove that the accused voluntarily caused grievous hurt and that such grievous hurt was inflicted by means of a dangerous weapon or dangerous means.

14. To bring home the charge under **Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code**, the prosecution must prove that the accused threatened the victim with injury to his person, reputation or property with an intention to cause alarm to him or to compel him to do or omit to do any act which he was not legally bound to do.

15. Further, as the charges have been framed with the aid of **Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code**, the prosecution must also establish that the criminal acts were committed by both the accused in furtherance of their common intention. Mere presence of the accused at the place of occurrence is not sufficient to attract Section 34



IPC unless the prosecution proves a prior meeting of minds or participation in furtherance of the common intention.

16. It is a settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that the burden of proving the guilt of the accused lies entirely upon the prosecution, and such burden never shifts. The prosecution must establish each and every ingredient of the alleged offences beyond all reasonable doubt by producing cogent, reliable and convincing evidence. The accused is presumed to be innocent unless the contrary is proved, and if two views are possible from the evidence on record, the view favourable to the accused must necessarily be adopted. Suspicion, however strong, cannot take the place of legal proof. Keeping these well-settled principles in mind, the oral and documentary evidence adduced by the prosecution requires careful appreciation.

17. The prosecution, in order to establish the guilt of accused Nos.1 and 2, has examined eleven witnesses as



PWs.1 to 11 and has produced eleven documents marked as Exhibits P.1 to P.11 and 2 material object as per MO-1 and MO-2.

18. CW.3, Sri Murthappa, who was cited as an eyewitness, has been examined as PW.1. CW.1, Sri Devaraj, the complainant, has been examined as PW.2. CW.4, Smt. Lakkamma, an eyewitness, has been examined as PW.3. CW.5, Sri Raghu, an eyewitness, has been examined as PW.4. CW.6, Sri Satheesha, another eyewitness, has been examined as PW.5. CW.10 Sri. Krishnappa, the panch witness to the spot and seizure mahazar, has been examined as PW.6. CW.7, Smt. Rathnamma, a circumstantial witness, has been examined as PW.7. CW.8, Smt. Bindu, another circumstantial witness, has been examined as PW.8. CW.14 Sri. Somashekarappa the Investigating Officer, has been examined as PW.9. CW.13 Dr. Ravikumar S.C, the Medical Officer who examined the injured and issued the wound certificates, has been



examined as PW.10. CW.9 Sri. Suresh, another panch witness to the spot and seizure mahazar, has been examined as PW.11.

19. It is pertinent to note that during the pendency of the trial, CW.2, who was the injured victim, died due to reasons not connected with the present case. Consequently, the prosecution could not examine him before this Court. Thus, the testimony of the injured witness, which would have constituted the primary evidence regarding the occurrence, is unavailable.

20. The prosecution has also relied upon Exhibits P.1 to P.11. Exhibit P.1 is the statement of CW.1 recorded under Section 161(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Exhibit P.2 is the complaint lodged by CW.1. Exhibit P.3 is the spot and seizure mahazar. Exhibits P.4 and P.5 are the photographs of the scene of occurrence. Exhibit P.6 is the statement of PW.3 recorded under Section 161(3) Cr.P.C. Exhibit P.7 is the statement of PW.4 recorded under Section



161(3) Cr.P.C. Exhibit P.8 is the statement of PW.5 recorded under Section 161(3) Cr.P.C. Exhibit P.9 is the First Information Report. Exhibits P.10 and P.11 are the wound certificates relating to CW.2 issued by the Medical Officer.

21. PW.1, in his examination-in-chief, has stated that the accused persons are his relatives and that CW.1 is the husband of his sister. He has deposed that about four years prior to his deposition, at around 7.00 p.m., while he was proceeding on the road leading towards Swarnamba Wines, he noticed that several people had gathered and that the accused persons were quarrelling with CW.2. Since he knew both the accused and CW.2, he pacified the quarrel and thereafter informed CW.7, who is the husband of CW.2, about the same. He has further stated that he did not give any statement to the police and has not identified the beer bottle and mud block before the Court.

22. As PW.1 did not support the prosecution case, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor treated him as hostile



and subjected him to a lengthy cross-examination. However, nothing was elicited from his mouth in support of the prosecution case. During the course of his cross-examination by the learned counsel for accused No.1, PW.1 admitted that at about 7.00 p.m., it was dark.

23. PW.2, the complainant, has deposed that CW.2 is the husband of his sister. He has stated that the distance between his house and the place of the incident is about half a kilometre. According to him, about five years prior to his deposition, at about 12.30 p.m., he received information that CW.2 had been assaulted. On receiving the said information, he immediately went to the spot and found CW.2 lying behind Thimmappa Hotel with injuries on his head and chest.

24. PW.2 has further deposed that CW.2 informed him that Yogendra and his brother had assaulted him by using a bottle and a mud block. Thereafter, he shifted CW.2 to the Government Hospital at Birur and subsequently to Meggan



Hospital, Shivamogga, for further treatment. Thereafter, he lodged the complaint before the Birur Police Station, which has been marked as Exhibit P2.

25. He has further stated that about three days after the registration of the case, the police took him to the place of the incident and drew the spot and seizure mahazar as per Exhibit P3 at the place shown by CW.5, in the presence of CWs.9 and 10. According to him, CW.5 produced a mud block and a broken bottle before the police, which were seized under the said mahazar. However, he has stated that he signed Exhibit P3 at the police station and that he was not aware of its contents. He has also identified the photographs taken during the mahazar proceedings, which are marked as Exhibits P4 and P5. Thereafter, at the request of the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, the further examination-in-chief of PW.2 was deferred for want of further briefing.



26. PWs.3 to 5, though cited by the prosecution as eyewitnesses to the incident, have turned completely hostile to the case of the prosecution. In their examination-in-chief, they have stated that they did not witness any quarrel between the accused and CW.2 and that they do not know anything about the material objects produced before the Court. They have further deposed that they did not give any statement to the police during the course of investigation.

27. As they did not support the prosecution case, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor treated them as hostile witnesses and subjected them to lengthy cross-examination. However, nothing was elicited from their evidence in support of the prosecution case.

28. PW.6, who is a panch witness to the spot and seizure mahazar, has identified his signature on **Exhibit P3**. He has stated that he does not know for what purpose he signed the said mahazar. He has further deposed that CW.9 also signed **Exhibit P3** along with him and that he does not



know the contents of the said mahazar. He has identified his signatures on **M.O.1** and **M.O.2**, namely the mud block and the broken glass bottle, but has stated that he does not know for what purpose the police seized the said material objects.

29. PW.11, the other panch witness to the spot and seizure mahazar, has turned completely hostile to the case of the prosecution. He has denied that the police drew the mahazar in his presence or seized the material objects under the said mahazar.

30. PW.7, who is cited as a circumstantial witness, has deposed that CW.1 is his brother, CW.2 is her husband, and CW.8 is her daughter. She has stated that about eight years prior to her deposition, CW.2 was due to pay a sum of Rupees 20 to accused No.1. When accused No.1 demanded the said amount, CW.2 informed him that he did not have change and told him that he would pay the amount after five minutes. Thereafter, accused No.2 allegedly took CW.2



behind Thimmana's Hotel and assaulted him on his chest and back with a beer bottle.

31. She has further deposed that while she was at her house, CW.1 informed her about the assault. Thereafter, she and CW.8 went to the spot and found CW.2 sitting there with a piece of a broken beer bottle lodged in his chest. They immediately shifted CW.2 to the hospital, and thereafter he was referred to McGann Hospital, Shivamogga, for higher treatment.

32. PW.8, who is the daughter of CW.2 and PW.7, has deposed in consonance with the evidence of PW.7. She has substantially reiterated the version deposed to by PW.7 regarding the events that transpired after receiving information about the alleged assault.

33. PW.10, Dr. Ravikumar S.C., the Medical Officer, has deposed that on 21.06.2017 at about 9.30 p.m., CW.2 was brought to the hospital with a history of assault. Upon examination, he found a lacerated wound over the left side



of the chest, tenderness over the back portion of the head, and a fracture of the bone of the left little finger. He has stated that he issued the wound certificate in respect of the injuries sustained by CW.2, which has been marked as Exhibit P11. During the course of his cross-examination, PW.10 has stated that if a person falls on the road while under the influence of alcohol, the injuries referred to in the wound certificate could also be caused.

34. PW.9, the Investigating Officer, has deposed that on 23.06.2017, while he was discharging his duties as the Station House Officer, he received a written complaint from CW.1 at about 6.00 p.m. Based on the said complaint, he registered a case in Crime No.112/2017 and submitted the First Information Report, which is marked as Exhibit P9.

35. He has further stated that on the same day, at about 5.00 p.m., he visited the place of occurrence as shown by CW.1 and, in the presence of CWs.9 and 10, drew the spot and seizure mahazar, which has been marked as



Exhibit P3. During the mahazar proceedings, photographs of the scene of occurrence were taken, which are marked as Exhibits P4 and P5, and M.O.1 and M.O.2 were seized.

36. He has further deposed that on 24.06.2017, he recorded the statements of CWs.3 to 8. The statements of PWs.3 to 5 recorded during the course of investigation are marked as Exhibits P6 to P8. He has also stated that he received the wound certificates relating to CW.2 from CWs.11 and 12, which are marked as Exhibits P10 and P11. After completing the investigation, he filed the charge sheet against accused Nos.1 and 2 before this Court.

37. Upon careful appreciation of the entire oral and documentary evidence placed on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that the prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt.

38. At the outset, it is pertinent to note that the entire prosecution case revolves around the alleged assault on



CW.2. Unfortunately, during the pendency of the proceedings, CW.2 expired due to reasons unconnected with the present incident. Consequently, the prosecution lost the benefit of examining the injured witness, who was the star witness to the occurrence. The testimony of the injured witness would have been the best evidence regarding the manner of assault, the identity of the assailants and the specific overt acts attributed to each accused. In the absence of such primary evidence, the prosecution was required to establish its case through independent, cogent and reliable evidence.

39. PW.1, who was cited as an eyewitness, has not supported the prosecution case. Though he admitted that he noticed a quarrel between the accused and CW.2, he has categorically denied witnessing any assault and has further denied giving any statement before the police. Nothing useful has been elicited during his cross-examination by the prosecution.



40. Likewise, PWs.3, 4 and 5, who were cited as independent eyewitnesses, have completely turned hostile. They have denied witnessing the incident and have also denied making any statements before the Investigating Officer. Though they were extensively cross-examined by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, nothing has been elicited to support the prosecution version. Thus, the prosecution has lost the support of all the independent eyewitnesses.

41. The evidence of PW.2, the complainant, is also not of much assistance to the prosecution. Admittedly, he is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. His evidence only discloses that after receiving information, he rushed to the spot and found CW.2 lying with injuries. According to him, CW.2 informed him that accused Nos.1 and 2 had assaulted him. Such evidence is purely hearsay in nature and cannot be treated as substantive evidence to prove the occurrence,



particularly when the maker of the statement, namely CW.2, is no longer available for examination before the Court.

42. Another significant circumstance which creates a serious doubt regarding the prosecution case is the unexplained delay in setting the criminal law into motion. According to the prosecution, the alleged incident took place on 21.06.2017 at about 5.30 p.m., whereas the complaint came to be lodged only on 23.06.2017 at about 6.00 p.m., nearly two days after the occurrence. PW.2 himself has admitted that he came to know about the incident on the very same day and immediately shifted the injured to the Government Hospital at Birur and thereafter to Meggan Hospital, Shivamogga. Thus, admittedly, PW.2 had knowledge of the incident from its inception. Despite having sufficient opportunity, neither PW.2 nor any of the relatives approached the jurisdictional police immediately. The prosecution has not placed any satisfactory material explaining such inordinate delay. Though delay in lodging



the FIR is not by itself fatal to the prosecution, where the prosecution evidence is otherwise weak and unreliable, such unexplained delay assumes considerable importance as it creates room for deliberation, embellishment and false implication. In the present case, where the injured witness could not be examined and all the alleged eyewitnesses have turned hostile, the unexplained delay of nearly two days in lodging the complaint becomes an additional circumstance creating a serious doubt regarding the genuineness of the prosecution version.

43. The evidence relating to the seizure of the alleged weapons also does not inspire confidence. According to the prosecution, M.O.1 and M.O.2, namely the mud block and broken beer bottle, were seized under Exhibit P3. However, PW.6, one of the panch witnesses, has categorically stated that he signed the mahazar without knowing its contents and was unaware of the purpose for which the material objects were seized. PW.11, the other panch witness, has



completely denied the mahazar proceedings. Even PW.2 has admitted that he signed Exhibit P3 at the police station and was unaware of its contents. Consequently, the prosecution has failed to prove the seizure of the alleged weapons in accordance with law.

44. The evidence of PW.7 and PW.8 is also of little assistance. Both these witnesses admittedly reached the place of occurrence only after receiving information from PW.2. They are not eyewitnesses to the actual assault. Their evidence merely establishes the condition in which they found CW.2 after the incident and, therefore, remains hearsay regarding the actual occurrence.

45. The medical evidence of PW.10 undoubtedly establishes that CW.2 had sustained one grievous injury on his left little finger besides simple injuries on the chest and head. However, medical evidence is only corroborative in nature and cannot, by itself, establish the identity of the assailants. More importantly, during his cross-examination,



PW.10 has admitted that the injuries mentioned in the wound certificate could also be caused if a person falls on the road while under the influence of alcohol. This admission assumes significance because there is no reliable ocular evidence connecting the accused with the injuries sustained by CW.2.

46. The evidence of PW.9, the Investigating Officer, is only formal in nature. His testimony merely establishes the steps taken during the course of investigation. It is well settled that the evidence of the Investigating Officer cannot fill up the lacunae in the prosecution case or substitute substantive evidence regarding the occurrence.

47. The prosecution has also failed to prove the ingredients of the offences alleged. There is no reliable evidence to establish that the accused intentionally insulted CW.2 so as to attract Section 504 of the Indian Penal Code. Likewise, there is absolutely no trustworthy evidence regarding the alleged criminal intimidation so as to



constitute an offence under Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code. Since the prosecution has failed to prove the participation of the accused in the alleged assault itself, the question of invoking Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code does not arise.

48. Thus, the prosecution case suffers from several material infirmities, namely, the non-examination of the injured witness due to his death, the hostility of all independent eyewitnesses, the complainant being merely a hearsay witness, the unexplained delay of nearly two days in lodging the complaint, the failure to prove the seizure mahazar, and the medical evidence not conclusively connecting the accused with the alleged assault. These circumstances, when considered cumulatively, create serious and reasonable doubt regarding the prosecution version.

49. It is a settled principle of criminal law that however strong the suspicion may be, it cannot take the



place of legal proof. The prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of accused Nos.1 and 2 beyond all reasonable doubt. Consequently, the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt. Accordingly, **Point Nos.1 to 4 are answered in the Negative.**

50. POINT NO.5 : In view of the above, I proceed to pass following;

ORDER

Acting under Section 248(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, accused No.1 and accused No.2 are hereby acquitted of the offences punishable under Sections 504, 324, 326 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, as the prosecution has failed to prove the charges against them beyond all reasonable doubt.

The bail bonds and surety bonds executed by accused No.1 and accused No.2



shall remain in force for another period of 6 months in compliance with Section 437-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

Material Object No.1 (mud block),
Material Object No.2 (broken glass bottle), being of no value, shall be destroyed after the expiry of the appeal period.

[Dictated to the Stenographer on computer, corrected and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the **30th day of June 2026**]

(THAHAKALEEL K.A.)
III Addl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Kadur. Chikkamagalur.

ANNEXURE

List of witnesses examined on behalf of Prosecution:-

PW.1 : Sri.Murthappa
PW.2 : Sri. Devaraj
PW.3 : Smt. Lakkamma
PW.4 : Sri. Raghu
PW.5 : Sri. Satheesha
PW.6 : Sri. Krishnappa



PW.7 : Smt. Rathnamma
PW.8 : Smt. Bindu
PW.9 : Sri. Somashekarappa,
PW.10 : Dr. Ravikumar S.C.,
PW.11 : Sri. Suresh

2. List of Documents Exhibited on behalf of the Prosecution:

Ex.P.1 : Statement of CW.1 recorded under Section
161(3) Cr.P.C.
Ex.P.2 : Complaint
Ex.P.3 : Spot-cum-Seizure Mahazar
Ex.P.4 : Photograph of the scene of occurrence
Ex.P.5 : Photograph of the scene of occurrence
Ex.P.6 : Statement of PW.3 recorded under Section
161(3) Cr.P.C.
Ex.P.7 : Statement of PW.4 recorded under Section
161(3) Cr.P.C.
Ex.P.8 : Statement of PW.5 recorded under Section
161(3) Cr.P.C.



Ex.P.9 : First Information Report

Ex.P.10 : Wound Certificate

Ex.P.11 : Wound Certificate

3. List of Material Objects Marked on behalf of the Prosecution:

M.O.1 : Mud Block,

M.O.2 : Broken Glass Bottle

4. List of Witnesses Examined on behalf of the Defence:-

NIL-

5. List of Documents Exhibited on behalf of the Defence:

-NIL-

6. List of Material Objects Marked on behalf of the Defence:

-NIL-

**(THAHAKALEEL K.A.)
III Addl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Kadur. Chikkamagalur.**