

KADG010004342020



Presented on : 20-02-2020

Registered on : 20-02-2020

Decided on : 01-08-2026

Duration : 6 years 5 months 12 days

**IN THE COURT OF
II ADDL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE DAVANGERE
AT DAVANGERE, DAVANGERE
(Presided Over by KRISHNAMURTHY R. PADASALGI)
B.Sc., LLM HDSE**

SPL.Case(SC/ST)/9/2020

DATED: THIS THE 1st DAY OF AUGUST 2026

COMPLAINANT:

The State of Karnataka by Vidyanagar Police Station,
Dist: Davanagere.

- V/s -

ACCUSED:

Nagaraj K.H., S/o Hanumnthappa K
Age: 48 years,
R/o: No.2198/A-15, 3rd Cross,
Vidyanagar, Davanagere.

=====

State represented through Public Prosecutor

Smt. K.N.U., Advocate appearing for Accused

=====

1.	Date of commission of offence	25.04.2019
2.	Date of report of Occurrence	26.04.2019
3.	Date of commencement of evidence	15.12.2023
4.	Date of closing of Evidence	18.06.2026
5.	Name of the complainant	Dr. Y.Ramappa
6.	Offence complained of	Sec.504, 507, 506 of IPC and Sec.3(1)(r),3(1)(s) and 3(2)(v-a)of SC/ST(POA) Act,
7.	Date of arrest	--
8.	Date of release	07.12.2019
9.	Opinion of the Judge	Offences are not proved
10.	Duration: (from date of commission of offence)	6 years 5 months 12 days
11.	Order of sentence	Accused is acquitted for the offence punishable under Sec. Sec.504, 507, 506 of IPC and Sec.3(1)(r),3(1)(s) and 3(2)(v-a)of SC/ST(POA) Act

J U D G M E N T

1. The accused is facing trial before the court for the offences alleged under Section 504,506 & 507 of IPC and Sec.3(1)(r),3(1)(s) and 3(2)(v-a)of SC/ST(POA) Act., for the charge sheet filed under Vidyanagar Police.

2. The case of the prosecution in brief is that accused on 12.11.2019 formed the group and tried to threaten the complainant and to murder him and intentionally by seeing the complainant and said that “ ಈ ಮುಂದಿನ ಮನೆ ವಡ್ಡ ಸೂಳೇ ಮಗನಾದ ರಾಮನದು ” so that it is heard by the complainant. The complainant contacted the Superintendent of Police who sent the police. The accused is in the habit of intentionally humiliating his caste and on the same day when complainant with his wife was going out with her from his house Accused called from mobile phone 9986259669 belonging to one Manju at about 08.30 p.m. and abused him in a filthy language stating that while the complainant has filed the case against him

and again abused by humiliating the caste and also given threat to the life and thereby created the threat in the minds of complainant.

3. On 25.04.2019, a protest was held against the complainant. The accused stated that “ ವಡ್ಡ ಜಾತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸೂಳೇ ಮಗನೇ ನಿನ್ನನ್ನು ಜೀವ ಸಹಿತ ಸುಟ್ಟು ಹಾಕಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ” and he put a chappal garland and also threatened and humiliated the complainant. He know the caste of complainant. There is Crime No.66/2019 against the said accused in Extension Police Station on 26.04.2019. Hence, the complainant has given the complaint and after registering the complaint, the police have conducted due investigation and filed this charge sheet.

4. After taking cognizance, summons was issued to the accused. Accused appeared and enlarged on bail. Papers of prosecution were furnished to the accused. On hearing the prosecution & defence the charge was framed against the accused, explained to him and he claimed to be tried.

5. The prosecution has examined 15 witnesses as PWs 1 to 49 and got marked documents as Ex.P.1 to P.49. Material objects got marked at M.O.1 to 3.

6. The incriminating circumstances in the evidence of prosecution was explained to the accused under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. The answers given by the accused were recorded.

7. The accused has not chosen to lead any evidence.

8. Heard the learned PP and counsel for the accused.

9. Perused oral and documentary evidence on record.

10. Based on the materials the following points are framed.

1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond all reasonable

doubt that on 12.11.2019, in front of the house of P.W.1, the accused intentionally insulted and provoked P.W.1 by abusing him in filthy language and by referring to his caste in public view, thereby intentionally insulting and humiliating him, knowing that he belongs to the Scheduled Caste, and thereby committed the offences punishable under Section 504 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989?

2. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place,

the accused intentionally threatened P.W.1 with injury to his life and also intentionally insulted and intimidated him by uttering caste-related abusive words in public view, knowing that P.W.1 belongs to the Scheduled Caste, thereby committed the offences punishable under Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(1)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989?

3. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on 12.11.2019 at about 8.30 p.m., the accused made a telephone call to P.W.1 from Mobile No.

9986259669 to Mobile No. 9448053663 and anonymously threatened him with injury, thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 507 of the Indian Penal Code?

4. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that the accused, knowing that P.W.1 belongs to the Scheduled Caste, intentionally committed the offences against him on the ground that he is a member of the Scheduled Caste, thereby committed the offence punishable under Section 3(2)(v-a) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989?

5. *What Order?*

11. The above points are answered as follows.

Point No.1 to 4 : In the Negative.

Point No.5 : As per final order, for the following.

REASONS

12. **Point No.1 to 4** :- The evidence of prosecution has to be appreciated in the backdrop of admissions of complainant. Complainant who happens to be ex-Zilla Panchayath Member and President from Congress Party. He has filed another case against the accused herein bearing SC/ST No. 3/2020 and accused happens to be activist of BJP party.

13. To consider the evidence of P.W.1, it has to be noted here that P.W.1 is not a rustic person. He is highly qualified. He holds Ph.D it seems and he has been member and president of Zilla Panchayath of congress party. The complainant belongs to Bhovi/Vadda

community, which belongs to scheduled caste, for which there cannot be dispute. He stated in the complaint at Exhibit P.1 that, on 12.11.2019, the accused gathered some people with an intention to murder him and humiliated his caste by saying that “ ಈ ಮುಂದಿನ ಮನೆ ವಡ್ಡ ಸೂಳೆ ಮಗನಾದ ರಾಮನದು ” and he has narrated that the complainant called to the Superintendent of Police who sent police to disburse them, later in the evening at about 08.30 p.m. when he was going outside with his wife, the accused again called and talked in such a language, abusing and insulting and humiliating the caste.

14. If his evidence is to be seen as per the visa-vis complaint, he says that on 12.11.2019 the elections of Davanagere Municipal Corporation was scheduled. The accused on that day sat on a chair in front of his house and gathered the public and showed the house of complainant, saying that ನೋಡಿ ಇದೆ ವಡ್ಡ ಸೂಳೆ ಮಗನ ಮನೆ by pointing out. He further deposed that he called the Superintended of Police over the phone and the S.P. sent C.P.I. Thippanna and P. S. I. of Vidyanagar Police

Station, Roopa. They have sent the accused and other persons. So this portion is not at all found in his complaint. The very wordings of the complaint says that the accused formed the group with an intention to murder and threaten the complainant, pointed out his house and humiliated his caste. Which is totally contrary and not in consistency with the complaint. In the chief evidence he has stated that accused sat on a chair.

15. In this connection the digital evidence has to be seen which is collected by the Investigating Officer P.W.15. P.W.15 gave the notice to produce the CCTV footage, which was served on son of the complainant. The notice is at Exhibit P.12. Son of complainant has received it on 25.11.2019 and he produced it to the I.O. and in presence of P.W.7 the Panchanama is drawn at Exhibit P.13. Strangely the I.O. has taken the photograph of the screen at Exhibit P.14 which is inadmissible. The mode in which the CCTV footage is stored in pendrive is concerned stated by P.W.7. However P.W.7 is an interested witness.

16. P.W.7 says that he and C.W.9 were taken to house of C.W.1, wherein P.W.2 was present and he gave the CCTV recording and C.W.13 opened it. He has also seen the recording and they were copied in a pen drive. The said pendrive is at Exhibit P.19. Exhibit P.15 and Exhibit P.16 are said to be the photographs of the screen wherein alleged CCTV recordings were played and in order to show the retrieval Exhibit P.16 photograph is taken.

17. After recording the CCTV footage in a pendrive, P.W.2 has given a 65(B) certificate which is at Exhibit P.18. It is total contrary. The person who is in charge of the CCTV has to give the certificate in order to see it is tamper proof.

18. P.W.2 is working as Junior Engineer in BESCOM. He is not having in charge of the said CC Tv. However, even if considering for a moment, the certificate is valid, when the CCTV footage containing in pendrive at Ex.P.19 is played. Only most of the witnesses have not properly identified the accused. .

But the person who is said to be accused wearing saffron coloured cloth has found roaming and he was not sitting on the chair as stated by P.W.1. Nowhere he has pointed out his finger.

19. Now to consider the further portion of evidence of P.W.1. P.W.1 further deposed that when he was going outside at about 08.30 p.m., the accused made a phone call to number 9448053663 and made a conversation which is recorded in the mobile phone of the complainant. The recording is reproduced in the evidence. Investigating officer has seized the mobile phone, by drawing the Panchanama at Exhibit P.6 in presence of M.C. Shivamurthy and S.R. Shivashankar i.e. P.W.9 and P.W.10. The photographs of alleged seizing a mobile are at Exhibit P.8 and Exhibit P.9. The Panchanama discloses that P.W.2 who is having knowledge of computers with the help of bluetooth have transferred the said call recording and screenshots to the computer of police station which were copied in pendrive.

20. The very strange procedure is adopted by the I.O in seizing the digital evidence. Any how 65(B) certificate is given by P.W.2 which is marked as Exhibit P.7. The said SIM bearing No. 9986259669 is of one Manjunath who is examined as P.W.8. He deposed that he is the owner of the mobile and using it for last 5 to 6 years and he says that when he has kept the mobile accused might have talked and accused happens to be his uncle.

21. There is no dispute about the mobile phone and SIM being in the name of said Manjunath. The connected documents are produced. The SIM card number 9986259669. The customer form is at Exhibit P.26 with documents of said Manjunath at Exhibit P.27. Copy of purchase bill at Exhibit P.29.

22. The Investigating Officer has also collected call records which is marked as Exhibit P.49 and Exhibit P.49 (a) shows that the phone of Manjunath is used to call the phone of complainant bearing No. 9448053663 and conversation is 200 seconds. The Forensic scientific

expert is examined, collected documents and voice sample analysis are marked as Exhibit P.50 to P.52 . The voice sample analysis stated to be not present as per Exhibit P.51.

23. Though scientific officer/P.W.14 has opined that 4 call logs and 4 contacts are present in mobile number 9448053663 in Samsung mobile phone and as per Exhibit P.53 the scientific officer/expert has opined that the voice call record found in pen drive and sent to the FSL and sample voice recorded matches.

24. In this case the sample voice of accused containing the conversation done between himself and accused on the day of incident at 08.30 was taken before the police station, by giving the transcription of contents of voice record and drawing the panchanama. The said Panchanama is at Exhibit P.34, and 35 and 36 are the photos of process recording the said. As per the FSL report, it is proved that the said voice is that of accused himself. But the complainant has not stated how he recorded the conversation, what was the

software, whether phone has the inbuilt feature.I,O also not taken pains in this regard.

25. On bare perusal of the recording and the conversation there is no threat. There is no humiliation of caste over the phone. It discloses some proof is asked,some routine conversation is made for filing the cases. So by scrutiny of the evidence of complainant connecting these evidence does not point out to the culpability of accused.

26. Now to consider the cross examination portion of complainant. Complainant admits in the cross-examination that in Exhibit P.15 there is no mention about accused gathering the persons and humiliating the caste.

27. Ex.P.15 is a photograph, when the CCTV footage was played in the house of complainant when P.W.2 gave the CCTV DVR to the police. The said photographs show no one. The timing stamp shown at the photograph is on 26.11.2019 and 02.58 p.m. A very

strange procedure is adopted as already been observed. The alleged incident has taken place on 12.11.2019. What the IO has did was he has played the contents of DVR on 26.11.2019 or else has seen the live CCTV footage and taken photos.

28. Complainant admits that in CCTV footage, the people gathering and disbursing in normal times is recorded.

29. Now to consider the evidence of P.W.2, who happens to be the son of complainant, it appears that his son has taken active role. He has received the police notice which was given to give the DVR. He copied the DVR to the pen drive. He copied the matter of call recording and screenshots to the Police Department computer through bluetooth. Despite of he being a Junior Engineer in BESCO, it appears that he being in the house at the time of alleged incident is something improbable.

30. However considering that on 12.11.2019

there was Election of Davanagere Municipal Corporation. Naturally this witness P.W.2 will be on duty. He has not stated that he has taken off or leave on that day and was staying in the house. And is working in Bangalore.

31. Now considering his evidence, he deposed that the voting booth was established in the Saint John School, because of election on that day and people of all the parties were sitting in a table and a chair distributing the chits to the eligible voters. He stated that Scorpio and Ford car came occasionally and many people came in front of his house.

32. It is an improvement as compared to the evidence of P.W.1. It is to be noted here that P.W.1 completed his chief examination on 15.12.2023 and PW2 is being examined on 22.05.2024. Five months after the chief evidence of the complainant and he has been examined later date. Therefore there are chances of improvement and exaggerations.

33. P.W.2 has gone to the extent of stating that C.W.2, C.W.3 and C.W.4 who were working in the education institution of his father were standing in front of the gate and having chit chat. This fact is not at all stated by the complainant. It is not in the complaint also. In this regard the evidence of C.W.2, C.W.3 and C.W.4 has to be seen a bit later who are examined as P.W.4 and P.W.5. P.W.2 further deposed that accused came by wearing white shirt and white pant and a saffron shawl at about 11.00 a.m. with a group, he came in front of the house of complainant and he said by pointing his finger at their house, he said 'ವಡ್ಡ ಸೂಳೇ ಮಗ ರಾಮನ ಮನೆಯಿದು, ಕೀಳು ಜಾತಿಯವನು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೇ ಪೊಲೀಸರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತುಂಬಾ ನಿಗುರಾಡುತ್ತ ಇದ್ದಾನೆ. ಈತನನ್ನು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಬಿಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಬೈದಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. '

34. So these are the words never uttered by the complainant either in the complaint or in the evidence. Hence initially it is stated that the evidence of the prosecution and specifically with the complainant has to be appreciated in the background that complainant

is educated person. Therefore, the ruling relied by prosecution in **2015(3) Crimes 14 Allahabad**, that the appreciation of evidence of rustic witnesses coming from poor strata of society should be appreciated as a whole is not applicable here.

35. As observed already every chances of exaggeration, improvement cannot be ruled out in the evidence of P.W.2 and P.W.2 is a resident of Bengaluru. He works in Northern region BESCOM Office. His presence on the date on 12.11.2019 is very unusual. Further he says that, his father later thinking that there should not be any galata in the place of voting, went in a car on double road and later called the S.P of Davanagere. Even then the accused has continued abusing and police have pacified it. This portion of the evidence of P.W.2 is totally exaggerated. Complainant never says that his son was in house on that day. He never says that C.W.2, C.W.3, C.W.4 were standing outside the gate having an occasion to listen to the talks whatever done by the accused. But these are all the further improvements made.

36. Further P.W.2 says that at 08.30 a.m. when his mother and father were going out, accused called over a phone and started to abuse. The transcription of the conversation is recorded in this case. As regard to the transcription, it is already appreciated while appreciating the evidence of P.W1.

37. Now to consider the cross-examination of his witness. P.W.1 admits that 100 metre prohibition will be there in the place where election polling will be held and he denies that within 100 metres the house of complainant is situated. He admits that C.W.2, C.W.3 and C.W.4 are known persons and of same caste and his father has filed two to three more cases against others for humiliating the caste. His evidence is not much helpful for the prosecution. He is only made to depose to support but has failed.

38. Now to consider the evidence of C.W.3 who is examined as P.W.5. He deposed that complainant is running Manjunatheshwara Higher Primary School in Avaragere. P.W.4 i.e. C.W.2 is known to him and he is

attender in that school. He further deposed that he and P.W.4 at 09.00 a.m. went to the house of complainant with respect to talk about group-IV employees and when they were coming out, accused showed his hand and stated that 'ವಡ್ಡ ಸೂಳೇ ಮಗ ರಾಮಪ್ಪನ ಮನೆ'. He also furthered stated that due to the vengeance of Lok Sabha elections he is being elected.

39. Now consider the evidence of C.W.2/P.W.4. He too is an employee of the school which is run by the complainant. He deposed that on a day when they went to the house of complainant i.e. on 12.11.2019 the elections were being held and a table was put in front of the house of complainant. And to distribute the chits and 4 to 5 people have gathered there. By that time accused came and started to say that it is a house of ವಡ್ಡ ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.

40. There is no consonance in the evidence of P.W.4 and P.W.5. Both are interested persons and subordinate of complainant. They are bound to depose. The Investigating Officer has not found any

other person it appears.

41. Even the spot in which the panchanama is done is not the spot which is alleged by the complainant and it is on some other place as it could be seen from Exhibit P.4 and P.5 the photograph. The substantive evidence against the accused is not present. The complainant along with the complaint at Exhibit P.1 have annexed his earlier complaint given to the Police Sub-Inspector, Badavane Police about alleging the crime committed by accused and others. Even in the chief evidence, he says that on 25.04.2019 there was a protest against him and accused has taken prominent role and accused has put chappal garland on the photo of complainant for which he had filed the complaint.

42. So these words and other evidence shows that there is a vengeance in between complainant and accused, which is ongoing leading for filing series of cases.

43. As admitted by the son of complainant about his father filing cases, that complainant being a member of schedule caste but is habituated to file various cases against various persons by misusing his caste.

44. The witnesses who are examined on behalf of prosecution in support of the complaint are none other than the son of the complainant and subordinates of the complainant. They are bound to support. But their version itself is not inconsistent coupled with contradiction, exaggerations and improvements.

45. Evidence of spot panchas is not much helpful. Who is examined P.W.6. P.W.7 is the person who has a pancha when mobile phone is produced.

46. P.W.9 has not supported the case of the prosecution. He doesn't know what were the contents in the mobile phone. So also the fate of P.W.10. When the main substantive evidence itself does not points out to the crime, the evidence of Investigating Officer

and Panchas does not form any substantive evidence to base a conviction.

47. Most casually the Investigating Officer has conducted panchanamma without showing any sensibility and without properly following the procedure in seizure of digital records and has given undue importance to the prominent role of P.W.2 who is the son of complainant in the investigation.

48. The learned prosecutor has relied upon the ruling reported in ***Criminal Appeal No.1182 of 2015, 2016(4) Crimes 121 SC , 2015(4) Crimes 246 SC, 2010 (4) Crimes 325 SC, 2012 Cri L J 621 SC, 2014(2) Crimes 38 SC , 2013(4), Crimes 1 SC , 2018 (1) SCC Crim 452 and 2010 (4) Crimes 325 SC*** . But on facts they are not applicable.

49. So far as the offence under Section 507 of IPC is concerned, the prosecution has failed to establish that the alleged phone call was made anonymously or that the accused had concealed his identity. The

evidence on record shows that the mobile number belonged to P.W.8 Manjunath and not to the accused. Therefore, the essential ingredients of Section 507 of IPC are not attracted, and the said offence is not made out.

50. Hence for all the above, these points are answered in the Negative.

51. **POINT NO.5:** In view of foregoing discussions and findings on points No.1 to 4, following order is passed.

ORDER

Acting under Section 235 (1) of Cr.P.C. the accused by names Nagaraj K.H. S/o Hanumanthappa is acquitted for the offence punishable U/section 504, 507, 506 of IPC and Sec.3(1)(r),3(1)(s) and 3(2)(v-a)of SC/ST(POA) Act

The bail bond and surety bond stand canceled after six months.

Custody of M.O.2 is made absolute.

M.O.1 and M.O.3 are worthless ordered to be

destroyed, after appeal period is over.

[Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by her, transcription corrected and then pronounced by me in open court, dated this the 1st day of August, 2026.]

Sd/-

(KRISHNAMURTHY. R. PADASALAGI)
II ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
DAVANAGERE.

ANNEXURE

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF PROSECUTION:

PW-1	::	Dr. Y.Ramappa
PW-2	::	Vinay
PW-3	::	Yashawanth B
PW-4	::	Jayanna
PW-5	::	Raghu
PW-6	::	Srishaila
PW-7	::	Kumaraswamy
PW-8	::	Manjunath
PW-9	::	Shivamurthy
PW-10	::	S.R.Shivashankar
PW-11	::	Manjunath
PW-12	::	Gopinath
PW-13	::	Roopa Tembad
PW-14	::	Balu M
PW-15	::	U Nagesh Ithal

LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED ON BEHALF OF THE PROSECUTION:

Ex.P-1	:: Complaint
Ex.P-1(a)	:: Signatures
Ex.P-2	:: Copy of complaint in Crime No.66/19
Ex.P-3	:: FIR
Ex.P-4	:: Panchaname
Ex.P-4(a)	:: Signature of P.W.1
Ex.P-5	:: Photograph
Ex.P-6	:: Panchaname
Ex.P-6(a,b)	:: Signature of P.W.1
Ex.P-7	:: 65(B) Certificate
Ex.P-8,9	:: Photo
Ex.P-10	:: Pen Drive
Ex.P-11	:: White cover
Ex.P-12	:: Notice
Ex.P-12(a)	:: Signature of P.W.2
Ex.P-13	:: Panchanama
Ex.P-13(a)	:: Signature
Ex.P-14 to 16	:: Photographs
Ex.P-17&18	:: 65(B) certificates
Ex.P-17(a)&18(a)	:: Signatures
Ex.P-19	:: Pendrive (It is with Property clerk)
Ex.P-20	:: Notice issued to P.W.6
Ex.P-20(a)	:: Signature
Ex.P-21	:: Notice to C.W.7
Ex.P-21(a)	:: Signature
Ex.P-22	:: Notice to P.W.7
Ex.P-22(a)	:: Signature
Ex.P-23	:: Notice to C.W.9
Ex.P-23(a)	:: Signature
Ex.P-24	:: Seizure panchanama

Ex.P-24(a,b,c)	:: Signature
Ex.P-25	:: 65B Certificate
Ex.P-26	:: CAF
Ex.P-27	:: Driving License
Ex.P.28	:: 65B Certificate
Ex.P-28(a,b)	:: Signature of P.W.8 & C.W.12
Ex.P-29	:: Mobile Bill
Ex.P-30	:: Statement of P.W.8
Ex.P-31	:: 65B certificate
Ex.P-32&33	:: Notice
Ex.P-32(a)33(a)	:: Signature of P.W.9
Ex.P.34	:: Panchanama
Ex.P-34(a)(b)	:: Signatures
Ex.P.35	:: Photographs
Ex.P.36	:: Photograph
Ex.P.37	:: Pendrive
Ex.P.38&39	:: Sketch and Covering letter submitted by C.W.24.
Ex.P.40	:: Complaint submitted by C.W.24
Ex.P.41	:: Letter in respect of caste details
Ex.P.42	:: 65(b) I.A. Certificate
Ex.P.43	:: 65(B) I.A. Certificate
Ex.P.44	:: 65(b) Certificate
Ex.P.45	:: FIR
Ex.P.46	:: Memorandum
Ex.P.47	:: Notice
Ex.P.48	:: 65(B) Certificate
Ex.P.49	:: CDR
Ex.P.50	:: FSL report of Mobile phone
Ex.P.51	:: Certificate of examination in respect of phone
Ex.P.52	:: SFSL Test report

Ex.P.53	:: Sample seal
Ex.P.54	:: Order of S.P. Davanagere.
Ex.P.55	:: Correspondence Letter
Ex.P.56	:: Photograph of seizure panchanama
Ex.P.57	:: Acknowledgment

**LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF
DEFENCE:**

NIL

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED ON BEHALF OF THE
DEFENCE:**

NIL

LIST OF MATERIAL OBJECTS MARKED:

M.O.1	:: White cloth
M.O.2	:: Mobile
M.O.3	:: Bag

Sd/-

(KRISHNAMURTHY. R. PADASALAGI)
II ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
DAVANAGERE.