

ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಥಮ ದರ್ಜೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಿಕ ದಂಡಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳವರ
ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ, ಹೊನ್ನಾಳಿ.

ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ನಂ. 325/2021

ಪಿರ್ಯಾದುದಾರರು : ಹೊನ್ನಾಳಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ
ವಿರುದ್ಧ

ಆರೋಪಿ : ಶೇಖರಪ್ಪ ಎಚ್ ಎಸ್ ಬಿನ್ ಹೊನ್ನಪ್ಪ, 47 ವರ್ಷ
ವಾಸ: ಬಿದರಗಡ್ಡೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ
ಹೊನ್ನಾಳಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.

ಭಾ. ದಂ. ಪ್ರ. ಸಂ. ಕಲಂ. 313 ರನ್ವಯ ಆರೋಪಿಯ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 1: ಅಭಿಯೋಜನೆಯ ಪರ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು
ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

ಉತ್ತರ :

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 2:ಪ್ರಾಸಾ.8 ಬಿ ವಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ರವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ದಿಃ
06.01.2021 ರಂದು ರಾತ್ರಿ 8.00 ಗಂಟೆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಸಾ-1 ರವರು ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ
ಗಣಕೀಕೃತ ದೂರನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ತಾನು ಸದರಿ ದೂರನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ, ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನು ದಾಖಲಿಸಿ,
ಪ್ರಥಮ ವರ್ತಮಾನ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಮೇಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ
ನಿವೇದಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ದಿಃ 07.01.2021 ರಂದು ಅಪಘಾತ ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಟಿ ನೀಡಿ ಚಾಸಾ2 ಮತ್ತು 3
ರವರಿಗೆ ನೋಟಿಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿ ನಂತರ ಚಾಸಾ-1 ರವರು ಸ್ಥಳ ತೋರಿಸಿದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಸ್ಥಳ
ಮಹಜರ್ ಅನ್ನು ಮದ್ಯಾಹ್ನ 11-00 ರಿಂದ 12-00 ಗಂಟೆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಸಾ1 ರಿಂದ 3
ರವರ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಮಹಜರ್ ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸಿ, ಕಚ್ಚಿ ನಕಾಶೆಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ, ಛಾಯಾಚಿತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು
ತೆಗೆದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯ ನುಡಿದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿವೇನು ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಉತ್ತರ :

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 3:ಪ್ರಾಸಾ.8 ರವರು ಮುಂದುವರೆದು ನಂತರ ಅದೇ ದಿನ ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಬಂದು ಹೊನ್ನಾಳಿ

ತಾಣೆಯ ವಸತಿ ಗೃಹದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅಪಘಾತಕ್ಕೀಡಾದ ವಾಹನಗಳನ್ನು ಚಾಸಾ2 ಮತ್ತು 3 ರವರ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಮದ್ಯಾಹ್ನ 1-00 ರಿಂದ 2.00 ಗಂಟೆ ವರೆಗೆ ಅಮಾನತ್ತು ಮಹಜರ್ ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸಿ, ವಾಹನವನ್ನು ಅಮಾನತ್ತು ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಛಾಯಾಚಿತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಸಿ, ದಿ: 11.01.2021 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿಗೆ ನೋಟಿಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಂದು ಉತ್ತರ ಪಡೆದು ಸದರಿ ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ, ಆರೋಪಿಯು ಚಾಲನ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಕಾರಣ ವಾಹನವನ್ನು ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ನಿವೇದಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯ ನುಡಿದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿವೇನು ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಉತ್ತರ :

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 4:ಪ್ರಾಸಾ.8 ರವರು ಮುಂದುವರೆದು ಆರೋಪಿಯು ತಾಣೆಗೆ ಸ್ವಇಚ್ಛೆಯಿಂದ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದು ನಂತರ ದಸ್ತಗಿರಿ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ತಾಣಾ ಜಾಮೀನಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆ ಮಾಡಿ , ದಿ: 15.01.2021 ರಂದು ಚಾಸಾ4 ರವರಿಗೆ ನೋಟಿಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೈಕಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಜರುಪಡಿಸುವಂತೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಚಾಸಾ4 ರವರಿಂದ ಪ್ರತ್ಯುತ್ತರ , ನಷ್ಟಭರ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ವಾಹನವನ್ನು ಅವರ ವಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನಂತರ ಚಾಸಾ4 ರಿಂದ 7 ರವರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ದಿ: 20.01.2021 ರಂದು ಚಾಸಾ9 ರವರಿಗೆ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಂದ ಚಾಸಾ1 ರವರ ಗಾಯದ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ದಿ: 11.01.2021 ರಂದು ಚಾಸಾ8 ರವರಿಗೆ ಐ ಎಂ ವಿ ವರದಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮನವಿ ನೀಡಿದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯ ನುಡಿದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿವೇನು ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಉತ್ತರ :

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 5:ಪ್ರಾಸಾ.8 ರವರು ಮುಂದುವರೆದು ನಂತರ ದಿ: 04.02.2021 ರಂದು ಸದರಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಚಾಸಾ8 ರವರಿಂದ ಪಡೆದು ಚಾಸಾ2 ಮತ್ತು 3 ರವರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಚಾಸಾ2 ರವರ ಮರುಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ದಿ: 07.01.2021 ರಂದು ಚಾಸಾ10 ರವರಿಂದ 65 ಬಿ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿಯಾದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಆರೋಪ ಸಾಭೀತಾಗಿದ್ದರಿಂದ, ದೋಷರೋಪಣಾ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯ ನುಡಿದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿವೇನು ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಉತ್ತರ :

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 6: ನೀವು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಏನಾದರೂ ಇದೆಯೇ ?

ಉತ್ತರ :

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ 7: ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪರ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಿರಾ ?

ಉತ್ತರ :

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ದೃಢೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ .

ಸ್ಥಳ : ಹೊನ್ನಾಳಿ

ದಿನಾಂಕ : 21.04.2026.

(ದೇವದಾಸ್ ಹೆಚ್.)

ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಜೆ.ಎಂ.ಎಫ್.ಸಿ
ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು, ಹೊನ್ನಾಳಿ.

Case called out, accused is present and his counsel filed an application under Sec.437(A) of Cr.P.C. Heard and perused the application and same is hereby allowed. Accused is directed to execute bond of Rs.20,000/- with one surety for like sum.

The Accused offer surety.

Surety by name T, Hanumanthappa S/o Honnappa, 55 years, R/o: Bidaragadde village, Honnali taluk, Davanagere district, is present and offers himself stand as surety to accused. He filed surety affidavit, declaration along with RTC extract bearing Sy.No.46 measuring to an extent of 2 acre and notarized copy of Aadhaar card .

Enquired the surety. Surety held sufficient. Hence, accepted. Office to take bond.

Statement of the accused U/s.313 of Cr.P.C. is recorded, the accused . has denied the incriminating evidence. There is no defence evidence call on for arguments by:

PCJ.,Honnali

:: REASONS ::

9. POINTS Nos.1 and 2 :- Since these points are interconnected with each other and arising out of same incident. Hence taken together for common discussion for the purpose of brevity and convenience and to avoid the repetition of evidence.

10. In order to bring home the guilt of the accused for the offence punishable under Section 279 IPC., prosecution must prove that he was driving a vehicle on public way in a rash or negligent manner endangering to human life or is likely to cause hurt or injury to any other person. In order to prove charge for the offence punishable under Section 338 IPC., prosecution must prove that the death of a person was caused due to rash or negligent act of the accused not amounting to culpable homicide. Once the offence under Section 279 is proved, penal consequences under Section 338 of IPC., may follow, subject to proof of other facts-in-issue. Therefore, at the first instance, it is incumbent upon the prosecution to prove charge under Section 279 of IPC.,

11. Further the prosecution got examined complainant as PW1. He has testified that, about 5 years ago he and CW4 were went in the bike, he did not know how and from whose negligence the accident caused and upon the request of the police officials he has made signatures on the documents, but he did not know the contents of the documents and the police have not conducted the spot as well as seizure mahazar in his presence and also identified the photos wherein depicted him, but he did not know for what purpose the police have captured and he has not given any complaint to the

police. Complaint which is marked as Ex.P1 and wherein his signature is marked as Ex.P1(a), spot mahazar which is marked as Ex.P2 and wherein his signature is marked as Ex.P2(a), rough sketch which is marked as Ex.P3 and wherein his signature is marked as Ex.P3(a), photos which are marked as Ex.P4 and 5, seizure mahazar which is marked as Ex.P4 and wherein his signature is marked as Ex.P4(a), ***** The learned APP treated them as hostile and during their cross-examination denied the suggestions made by the learned APP and nothing has been elicited from their mouth in order to prove the prosecution case.

spot/seizure mahazar witnesses as PW1 and PW7. Further testified that, about 3 years ago they went to the police station for their personal work and upon the request of the police officials they have made signatures on the documents, but they did not know the contents of the documents and the police have not conducted the spot as well as seizure mahazar in their presence and also identified the photos wherein depicted them, but they did not know for what purpose the police have captured and they have not given any statements. The police notice which is marked as Ex.P1 and wherein their signatures are marked as Ex.P1(a) and Ex.P1(c), the spot mahazar which is marked as Ex.P2 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P2(a) and Ex.P2(d), the rough sketch which is marked as Ex.P3 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P3(a) & Ex.P3(c), the photos which are marked as Ex.P4 to Ex.P6, the police notice which is marked as Ex.P7 and wherein their signature marked as Ex.P7(a) & 7(c), the seizure mahazar which is marked as Ex.P8 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P8(a) and Ex.P8(d), the photos which are marked as Ex.P9 and Ex.P10 and CD which is marked as Ex.P11. The learned APP treated them as hostile and

during their cross-examination denied the suggestions made by the learned APP and nothing has been elicited from their mouth in order to prove the prosecution case.

12. The prosecution got examined eye witnesses as PW2 and PW3. They have testified that, they did not see the accident and they did not know how and from whose negligence the accident caused and about 3 years ago they went to the police station for their personal work and upon the request of the police officials they have made signatures on the documents, but they did not know the contents of the documents and they did not give any statement to the police. Further PW2 has testified that, the police have not conducted the spot as well as seizure mahazar in his presence and also identified the photos wherein depicted him, but he did not know for what purpose the police have captured the photos. The spot mahazar which is marked as Ex.P2 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P2(b), the rough sketch which is marked as Ex.P3 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P3(b), the photos which are marked as Ex.P4 to Ex.P6, the seizure mahazar which is marked as Ex.P8 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P8(b), the photos which are marked as Ex.P9 and Ex.P10, the bond pertain to PW2 which is marked as Ex.P12 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P12(a) and the bond pertain to PW3 which is marked as Ex.P14 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P14(a). The learned APP treated them as hostile and during their cross-examination denied the suggestions made by the learned APP and nothing has been elicited from their mouth in order to prove the prosecution case.

13. The prosecution got examined the police official as PW4. He has testified that, on 09.02.2022 around 6.00 p.m., he had

received the information from CW1 and based on the information registered the FIR and same has been transmitted to the Court as well as to his superior officers and thereafter handed over the records to CW16 for further investigation. The complaint which is marked as Ex.P16 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P16(a), the FIR which is marked as Ex.P17 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P17(a). During the course of cross-examination he has denied suggestions made by the learned counsel for the accused and nothing has been elicited from his mouth in order to disprove the prosecution case.

14. The prosecution got examined police official as PW5. He has testified that, on 09.02.2022 as per the oral instruction of CW16 he has visited to the Harihara Government Hospital and got issued notice to the CW2 and CW3 and then conducted the inquest mahazar in the presence of CW2 to CW6 in between 8.00 to 10.00 P.M., and also recorded the statements of CW4 to CW6. Further testified that, then handover the dead body to the CW12 for the purpose of conduct the P.M., report and after completion of the P.M., report, CW13 has handed over the dead body to the deceased relatives and in this regard he had received the acknowledgment from him and then handed over the records to the CW16 for further investigation. The inquest mahazar which is marked as Ex.P18 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P18(a & b) and the four photos which are marked as Ex.P19 to Ex.P22. During the course of cross-examination denied the suggestions made by the learned counsel for the accused and nothing has been elicited from his mouth in order to disprove the prosecution case.

15. The prosecution got examined police official as PW6. He has

testified that, on 10.02.2022 he has received the records from CW15 and then proceeded to conduct the investigation and on the same day he has visited to the place of accident and got issued notice to CW7 and CW8 and then conducted the spot mahazar as shown by CW9 in the presence of CW7 and CW8 in between 10.00 to 11.00 p.m., and also prepared the rough sketch and captured the photos. Further testified that, on the same day he has got issued police notice to CW7 and CW8 and then conducted the seizure mahazar in the presence of CW7 to CW9 and seized the vehicle under seizure mahazar and captured the photos and then recorded the statement of CW9 and CW10 and also obtained the bond from them. Further testified that, on 10.02.2022 he has received the P.M., report from CW12 and on the same day he has recorded the re-statement of CW1 and on the same day, he has received the certificate from CW13 with regard the photos captured while conducting the mahazar. Further testified that, on 01.04.2022 he has got issued notice to the accused and obtained the reply notice from him and wherein the accused person stated that, the said vehicle was not covered the insurance and thereby, the said vehicle was mentioned in the P.F., and same has been reported before this Court. Further testified that, after completion of the arrest procedure, he has got released the accused person and on 19.04.2022 he has received the IMV report from CW11 and after completion of the investigation submitted the final report against the accused. The police notice issued to CW7 and CW8 which is marked as Ex.P1 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P1(b), the spot mahazar which is marked as Ex.P2 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P2(c), the rough sketch which is marked as Ex.P3 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P3(c), the photos which are marked as Ex.P4 to Ex.P6, the police notice issued to CW7 and CW8 which is marked as Ex.P7 and

wherein his signature marked as Ex.P7(b), the seizure mahazar which is marked as Ex.P8 wherein his signature marked as Ex.P8(c), photos which are marked as Ex.P9 and Ex.P10, the bond pertain to CW9 which is marked as Ex.P12 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P12(b), the statement of CW9 which is marked as Ex.P13 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P13(a), the bond pertain to CW10 which is marked as Ex.P14 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P14(b), the statement of CW10 which is marked as Ex.P15 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P15(a), the PM., report which is marked as Ex.P23 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P23(a), the police notice given to accused which is marked as Ex.P24 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P24(a), the reply notice given by the accused which is marked as Ex.P25 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P25(a), the IMV report which is marked as Ex.P26 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P26(a), the further statement of CW1 which is marked as Ex.P27 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P27(a), the 65B certificate which is marked as Ex.P28 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P28(a). During the course of cross-examination denied the suggestions made by the learned counsel for the accused and nothing has been elicited from his mouth in order to disprove the prosecution case.

16. In the light of the above material available on record, the learned APP argued that, informant and the independent witnesses have supported the case of prosecution. So also the evidence of the independent witnesses has been corroborated by the official witnesses. No doubt there are some minor discrepancies in the case but the same are not fatal to disbelieve the case of prosecution. Therefore, the learned APP prayed to convict the accused persons.

17. The learned counsel for the accused strongly argued that the case of prosecution is full of doubts. Further argued that the informant, eye witness and all the material witnesses are turned hostile. Further argued that all the witnesses are related to each other and also the evidence is not corroborative to each other. So also the case is not worth to be believed. Therefore, he prayed to acquittal the case.

18. On Marshaling entire evidence and on meticulous perusal of the documentary proof it is crystal clear that the prosecution has failed to place the cogent, corroborative and reliable evidence to prove the guilt of the accused. The initial burden is always on the prosecution. The specific assertion of the prosecution is that the accused is being the rider of bike, ride the same in a rash or negligent manner and out of his control suddenly put to break, in this regard the pillion rider as Rafiulla was fell down from the bike and sustained grievous injuries and succumbed to death while going to the hospital. Due to his negligence the alleged accident was occurred. On perusal of the case set up by the prosecution it is worth to know whose negligence the accident was occurred.

19. Further PW1 and PW7 are the spot as well as seizure mahazar witnesses and PW2 and PW3 are the eye witnesses and they are material witnesses and they have turned hostile and they did not supported the prosecution case. Hence their evidence is not helpful to the prosecution to prove its case. Further PW4 to PW6 are the police officials and they have deposed their evidence in their official capacity what they have done and they have not witnessed the rash or negligent riding of the accused. Therefore, only on the basis of sole testimony of PW4 to PW6 this Court cannot convict the accused.

20. It is pertinent to note that, there is no iota of evidence to prove the rash or negligent driving of the accused. CW1 only with an intention to get the compensation foisted false case against the accused. The prosecution has proved the death of deceased person, but failed to prove the negligent act of the accused. Thus, the evidence made available by the prosecution falls short of legal evidence to establish the accusations leveled against the accused. Thus, under the above circumstances, this Court is of the clear opinion that, the prosecution has failed to bring home the guilt of accused. Hence, this Court is of the firm opinion that, this is a fit case wherein benefit of doubt can be given to the accused. Accordingly, this Court has answered Point Nos.1 and 2 in the "Negative."

21. Point No.3 : It is the specific case of prosecution is that, the accused person has ride said bike knowing fully that the said vehicle was not covered insurance. In this connection on perusal of the Ex.P24 it is reveals that, the police have given notice to accused and in response to the police notice, he has given reply as per Ex.P25 wherein he has stated that he being the rider of the bike at the time of alleged accident and the said bike was not covered insurance and same has not been disputed by the accused person. Hence, the prosecution has successfully proved that at the time of accident the accused was ride the vehicle without covered the insurance. Accordingly, this Court answered Point No.3 in the affirmative.

22. Point No.4:- In view of discussion on the aforesaid points, this Court has proceed to pass the following:

:: ORDER ::

Acting U/s. 255(1) of Cr.P.C., the accused is hereby acquitted for the offences punishable U/s. 279 and 304(A) of IPC.

Acting U/s.255(2) of Cr.P.C., the accused is hereby convicted for the offences punishable U/sec.146(196) of IMV Act.,

The accused sentence to pay fine of Rs.2000/- for the offence punishable under Section 146(196) of IMV Act., In default of payment of fine he shall undergo S.I. for a period of 1 month.

Acting under section 437(A) of Cr.P.C., it is order that the bail bond executed by the Accused shall be in force for six (6) months.

(Dictated to the stenographer directly on computer, corrected by me and then pronounced in the open Court today the 9th day of April, 2026)

(Devadas H.)
Prl.Civil Judge & JMFC,
Honnali.

