

KADG520013432020



Presented on : 05-08-2020

Registered on : 05-08-2020

Decided on : 17-04-2026

Duration : 5 years, 8 months, 12 days

IN THE COURT OF PRL.CIVIL JUDGE AND J.M.F.C, HONNALI.

Present: SRI.DEVADAS H., B.A., LL.B.,

Prl.Civil judge and JMFC, Honnali.

C.C.No.1045/2020

Dated : 17th day of April 2026.

COMPLAINANT: State by Honnali Police,

(By learned APP, Honnali.)

// Versus //

ACCUSED : 1. Ningaraja K.R. S/o Rudrayya

Aged about 22 years

R/o. Shanklipura Village

Harihara Taluk,

Davangere District.

2. Nagappa Daddi (**Abated**)

S/o Hanumanthappa

Aged about 60 Years

R/o: Konanathale Village

Honnali Taluk, Davanagere District.

3. Veeresh K.R. (Plead Guilty)

S/o Rudraiah

Aged about 30 years

R/o. Shanklipura Village, Harihara Taluk,
Davangere District.

4. Halasiddappa S. (Plead Guilty)

S/o Halappa

Aged about 51 Years

R/o. Hirehalivana Village

Harihara Taluk

Davanagere District.

(A1 is Rep. By Sri.KHN., Advocate & A2 is
Abated & A3 & A4 are Plead guilty)

* * * * *

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 1. Date of commission of offence | : | 01.03.2020 |
| 2. Date of report of offence | : | 01.03.2020 |
| 3. Arrest of the Accused | : | |
| a)Date of arrest of the accused | : | |
| b)Date of release on bail | : | Accused are on bail |
| c)The period undergone in custody | : | |
| 4. Name of the complainant | : | Halasiddappa |
| 5. Date of recording evidence | : | 20.12.2025 |
| 6. Date of closing evidence | : | 26.03.2026 |
| 7. Offence complained of | : | U/s. 279, 337 & 304(A) |

of IPC and 181, 180
146(196), 156(196), 177,
3(1), 5 and 192 of IMV Act.

8. Opinion of the Judge : As per the final order.

* * * * *

:: JUDGMENT ::

The Police Inspector of Honnali Police station has submitted a charge sheet against the accused persons for the offences punishable under Section 279, 337 & 304(A) of IPC and 3(1), 5, 181, 156(196), 180, 146(196), 177 and 192 of IMV Act.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case as under :-
That on 01.03.2020 around 11.00 a.m., within the jurisdictional limits of Honnali Police Station, the accused No.1 drove the tractor bearing Reg.No.KA-17-TB-9599 along with two unregistered trailers from Chikkahalivana towards Yakkanahalli village in a rash or negligent manner so as to endanger human life and personal safety of others and out of his control and dashed to the bike bearing Reg.No.KA-27-U-7224, due to which one M.Chandrashekharappa and pillion rider as CW1 were fell down from the bike and CW1 sustained simple injuries and M.Chandrashekharappa was sustained grievous injuries and succumbed to death on the spot. Further the accused No.1 is drove the said tractor of accused No.2 without having valid driving license and the accused No.1 knowing fully that drove said tractor was not covered

insurance and the accused No.1 drove the unregistered trailer and thereby violated the Traffic Rules. Further the accused No.2 and 3 are being the owners of the tractor and trailer and they have given the said tractor and trailer to the accused No.1 knowing fully that the said tractor and trailer were not covered insurance and the said accused No.1 has not having valid driving license. Further the accused No.4 is being the owner of the bike and he knowing fully given the said bike to the deceased that he was not having driving license. Thereby, the accused persons have committed to the alleged offences.

3. With regard to the above accident, the CW1 given the information to the CW17. On the basis of the said information, he has registered First information Report against the accused persons for the alleged offences punishable under Section 279, 337 and 304(A) of Indian Penal Code and same has been transmitted before the Court as well as to his superior officers. Further after completion of the investigation submitted a charge sheet against the accused persons for the alleged offences punishable under Section 279, 337 & 304(A) of IPC and 181, 156(196), 180, 146(196), 177 and 192 of IMV Act.

4. Based on the materials available on record, this Court has taken cognizance for the above said alleged offences and issued summons to the accused persons. In response to summons issued by this Court, the accused No.1 to 4 have appeared through their learned counsel and supplied the

charge-sheet copies in compliance of Section 207 of Cr.P.C., The accused No.1 to 4 are released on bail. During the trial the accused No.2 is reported as dead. Hence case against him as abated. Further the accused No.3 and 4 are pleaded guilty on payment of fine amount. Hence the case against them are closed. Thereafter, plea was recorded, read over and explained to the accused No.1 wherein he has denied the accusation leveled against him and claimed to be tried.

5. In order to prove the guilt of the accused No.1, the prosecution has examined witnesses i.e., PW1 to PW8 and produced 51 documents which have been marked as Ex.P1 to 51. Further the learned APP submit that, CW13 to CW15 are may be given up in view of IMV Report marked as Ex.P47, Wound Certificate of CW1 and PM Report marked as Ex.P49 and Ex.P33. Hence CW13 to CW15 are given up. Further the learned APP Submit that the inquest Mahazar marked as Ex.P26 and Photos marked as Ex.P27 to Ex.P32 and thereby CW9 to CW12 and CW16 are may be given up. Hence CW12 and CW16 are given up. Further with the consent of the leaned counsel for the accused FIR and complaint are marked as Ex.P50 and Ex.P51 and thereby the learned APP prays to may be given up the CW17. Hence CW17 is given up. After completion of the prosecution evidence. Since there is incriminating circumstances appear in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, hence accused No.1 statement under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. has been recorded and wherein the

accused person has denied the incriminating circumstances appears in the evidence and submit that he has no defence evidence.

6. Heard the arguments on both sides.

7. The following points would arise for determination of this Court as under :-

1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on 01.03.2020 around 11.00 a.m., within the jurisdictional limits of Honnali Police Station, the accused No.1 drove the tractor bearing Reg.No.KA-17-TB-9599 along with unregistered trailer from Chikkahalivana towards Yakkanahalli village in a rash or negligent manner so as to endanger human life and personal safety of others and out of his control and dashed to the bike bearing Reg.No.KA-27-U-7224, due to which one M.Chandrashekharappa and pillion rider as CW1 were fell down from the bike. Thereby, accused No.1 has committed an offence punishable U/S 279 of I.P.C.?
2. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on the aforesaid date, time and place, the accused No.1 has drove the said vehicle in the aforesaid manner and caused accident, Due to the impact, CW1 has sustained simple injuries. Thereby, the

accused No.1 has committed an offence punishable U/s 337 of I.P.C.,?

3. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on the aforesaid date, time and place, the accused No.1 has drove the said vehicle in the aforesaid manner and caused accident, Due to the impact, one M.Chandrashekharappa was sustained grievous injuries and succumbed to death on the spot. Thereby, the accused No.1 has committed an offence punishable U/s 304(A) of I.P.C.,?
4. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that, accused No.1 has drove the aforesaid vehicle knowing fully that the said vehicle was not covered insurance. Thereby the accused No.1 has committed an offence punishable U/Sec. 156 (196) of IMV Act.,?
5. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that, accused No.1 has drove the aforesaid vehicle knowing fully that he was not having valid driving license. Thereby the accused No.1 has committed an offence punishable U/Sec.181 of IMV Act.,?
6. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that, the accused No.1 drove the

vehicle along with two trailers and he has violated the traffic rules and thereby the accused No.1 has violated the Traffic Rules. Thereby the accused No.1 has committed an offence punishable U/Sec. 177 of IMV Act?

7. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond all reasonable doubt that, the accused No.1 drove the vehicle along with two trailers without registration number and he has violated the traffic rules and thereby the accused No.1 has violated the traffic rules. Thereby the accused No.1 has committed an offence punishable U/Sec. 192 of IMV Act?

8. What order?

8. This Court has findings on the above said points are as under:-

Points No.1 to 3 : In the Negative

Points No.4 to 7 : In the Affirmative

Point No.8 : As per the final order for
the following:

:: REASONS ::

9. POINTS Nos.1 to 3 :- 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 304-A 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 304-A 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. The prosecution got examined victim as PW1 and eye witnesses as PW2, PW3 and PW6 and they have testified that, about 5 years ago there was an accident took place between tractor and motor cycle and due to this one M.Chandrashekarappa was sustained grievous injuries and succumbed to death on the spot and CW1 was sustained simple injuries, but they did not know how and from whose negligence the accident would be caused and they did not give any statements to the police and they have made signatures on the documents upon the request of the police official and they did not know the contents of the said

documents. The bond pertain to them which are marked as Ex.P1, Ex.P3, Ex.P5 and Ex.P24 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P1(a), Ex.P3(a), Ex.P5(a) and Ex.P24(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.

12. Further the prosecution got examined spot/seizure mahazar witnesses as PW4 and PW5. Further testified that, about 5 years ago 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 in their presence police have not conducted the spot as well as seizure mahazar and not prepared the rough sketch and identified their depict in the photos, but they did not know for what purpose the police have captured the photos and in this regard they have not given the statements to the police. The notice which is marked as Ex.P7 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P7(a) and Ex.P7(b), the spot mahazar which is marked as Ex.P8 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P8(a) and Ex.P8(b), the rough sketch which is marked as Ex.P9 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P9(a) and Ex.P9(b), the photos which are marked as Ex.P10 to Ex.P12, notice which is marked as Ex.P13 and wherein their signatures marked as Ex.P13(a) and Ex.P13(b), the seizure mahazar which is marked as Ex.P14 and wherein their

signatures marked as Ex.P14(a) and Ex.P14(b), the photos which are marked as Ex.P15 to Ex.P20 and CD which is marked as Ex.P21. 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 police official as PW7. He has testified that, on 01.03.2020 he has received the records from CW17 and then proceeded to conduct the investigation and on the same he has visited to the Primary Health Center, Malebennuru and issued notice to CW4 and CW9 and in the presence of CW4, CW9 to CW12 he has conducted the inquest mahazar in between 4.30 to 6.30 p.m., and captured the photos and also recorded the statements of CW9 to CW12. Further testified that, then he has deputed the CW16 in order to supervise the dead body of deceased M.Chandrashekarappa and after completion of the P.M., report, CW16 has handed dead body to deceased relatives. Further testified that, he has recorded the further statement of CW1. Further testified that, on 02.03.2020 he has visited to the place of accident and issued notice to CW5 and CW6 and then conducted the spot mahazar as shown by CW1 in the presence of CW5 and CW6 in between 2.00 to 3.00 p.m., and also prepared the rough sketch and captured the photos. Further testified that, thereafter he has returned to the police station and got issued notice to the CW5 and CW6 and seized

the vehicles in their presence in between 3.30 to 4.30 p.m., and captured the photos and also recorded the statements of CW5 and CW6 and thereafter handed over the records to CW16 for further investigation. The police notice which is marked as Ex.P7 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P7(c), the spot mahazar which is marked as Ex.P8 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P8(c), the rough sketch which is marked as Ex.P9 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P9(c), the notice which is marked as Ex.P13 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P13(c), the seizure mahazar which is marked as Ex.P14 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P14(c), the statement of CW5 and CW6 which are marked as Ex.P22 and Ex.P23 and wherein his signatures marked as Ex.P22(a) and Ex.P23(a), the inquest mahazar which is marked as Ex.P26 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P26(a & b) and the photos which are marked as Ex.P27 to Ex.P32. 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 PW8. He has testified that, on 02.03.2020 he has received the record from CW18 and then proceeded to conduct the investigation and on the same day he has visited to the place of accident and inspected the place and received the 65B certificate from CW16. Further testified that, on 12.03.2020

he has issued notice to the accused No.2 and obtained reply notice from him and wherein specifically stated that, accused No.1 is being drover of the tractor engine and the said vehicle was not covered insurance and same has been mentioned in PF and reported before this Court and also recorded the further statement of CW1 to CW3. Further testified that, on 14.03.02020 he has issued notice to the accused No.1 and obtained reply notice and indemnity bond from him and then got released the bike to him and the accused No.1 has voluntarily appeared before the police station and after completion of the arrest procedure got released him on bail. Further testified that, on 20.03.2020 he has received the IMV report from CW13 and wound certificate of CW1 from CW15 and on 05.05.2020 he has also received the PM report from CW14. Further testified that, on 23.05.2020 he has issued notice to the accused No.3 and obtained reply notice from him and wherein specifically stated that, the trailer was not covered insurance and same has been mentioned in PF and reported before this Court. Further testified that, on 27.06.2020 upon the order of this Court in order to release the tractor, he has issued notice to the CW7 and CW8 and got released the tractor engine under release mahazar in between 12.00 to 1.00 p.m and also captured the photos and after completion of the investigation submitted the final report against the accused persons and also identified the accused No.1 before this Court. The bond pertain to CW1 which is marked as Ex.P1 and wherein his signature marked

as Ex.P1(b), the statement of CW1 which is marked as Ex.P2 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P2(c), the bond pertain to CW2 which is marked as Ex.P3 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P3(b), the statement of CW2 which is marked as Ex.P4 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P4(a), the bond pertain to CW3 which is marked as Ex.P24 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P24(b), the statement of CW3 which is marked as Ex.P25 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P25(a), the PM report which is marked as Ex.P33 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P33(a), notice given to the accused No.2 which is marked as Ex.P34 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P34(a), the reply notice which is marked as Ex.P35 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P35(a), the notice given to accused No.4 which is marked as Ex.P36 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P36(a), the reply notice which is marked as Ex.P37 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P37(a), the notice given to accused No.3 which is marked as Ex.P38 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P38(a), the reply notice which is marked as Ex.P39 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P39(a), the police notice given to CW7 and CW8 which is marked as Ex.P40 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P40(a), the vehicle release mahazar which is marked as Ex.P41 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P41(a), the photos which are marked as Ex.P42 to Ex.P45, the 65B certificate which is marked as Ex.P46 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P46(a), the IMV report which is

marked as Ex.P47 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P47(a), the indemnity bond executed by the accused No.4 which is marked as Ex.P48 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P48(a) and the wound certificate of CW1 which is marked as Ex.P49 and wherein his signature marked as Ex.P49(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.

15. 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.

16. The learned counsel for the accused No.1 strongly argued that the case of prosecution is full of doubts. Further argued that the informant, eye witnesses 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.

17. 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 No.1. The initial burden is always on the prosecution. The specific assertion of the prosecution is that the accused No.1 is being the driver of tractor, drove the same in a rash or negligent manner along with two trailers and dashed to the motor cycle and due to which rider of the bike as M. Chandrashekarappa and pillion rider as CW1 are sustained injuries and M.Chandrashekarappa was succumbed to death on the spot. 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.

18. The PW1 is the victim and PW2 & 3 and PW6 are the eye witnesses and in their evidence they have stated that, they have not seen the accident and they did not know how and from whose negligence the accident would be caused and in this regard they have not given the statements to the police and they have turned hostile and they have not at all supported the prosecution. Further PW4 and PW5 are the spot and seizure mahazar witnesses and in their evidence they have stated that, in their presence the police have not conducted the spot/seizure mahazar and not prepared the rough sketch and they have turned hostile and they have not all supported the prosecution case. Further PW7 and PW8 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 driving of the accused No.1. Therefore, only on the basis of sole testimony of PW7 and PW8 this Court cannot convict the accused No.1.

19. It is pertinent to note that, there is no iota of evidence to prove the rash or negligent driving of the accused No.1. CW1 only with an intention to get the compensation foisted false case against the accused No.1. The prosecution has proved the death of deceased person, but failed to prove the negligent act of the accused No.1. 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 No.1. 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 to 3 in the "Negative."

20. Point No.3 to 6 : It is the specific case of prosecution is that, the accused No.1 drove the said tractor and trailers knowing fully that the said vehicles were not covered insurance and not having valid driving license and the accused No.1 was drove the said vehicles without having valid driving and in this connection on perusal of the Ex.P34 and

Ex.P38 it is reveals that, the police have given notice to accused No.2 and 3 and in response to the police notice, the accused No.2 and 3 has given reply notice as per Ex.P35 and Ex.P38 wherein they have stated that the accused No.1 is being driver of the tractor and trailer at the time of alleged accident and the said vehicles were not covered insurance and the accused No.1 is not having valid license. Further the accused No.1 has drive the aforesaid vehicles along with unregistered trailer and thereby violation of the traffic rules and same has not been disputed by the accused No.1. Hence, the prosecution has successfully proved that at the time of accident the accused No.1 is being the driver of the aforesaid vehicles and drove the said vehicles knowing fully that the said vehicles were not covered insurance and he was not having valid driving license and drove the said vehicle along two trailers and without having valid registration number from the concerned authority thereby the accused No.1 is violation of the traffic rules. Accordingly, this Court answered Point No.4 to 7 in the affirmative.

21. Point No.8:- 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 No.1 is hereby acquitted for the offences punishable U/s.279, 337 and 304(A) of IPC.

Acting U/s.255(2) of Cr.P.C., the accused No.1 is hereby convicted for the offences punishable U/sec.156(196), 181, 192 and 177 of IMV Act.

The accused No.1 is sentence to pay fine of Rs.2000/- for the offence punishable under Section 156(196) of IMV Act. In default of payment of fine he shall undergo S.I. for a period of 1 month.

The accused No.1 is sentence to pay fine of Rs.2000/- for the offence punishable under Section 181 of IMV Act. In default of payment of fine he shall undergo S.I. for a period of 1 month.

The accused No.1 is sentence to pay fine of Rs.2000/- for the offence punishable under Section 192 of IMV Act. In default of payment of fine he shall undergo S.I. for a period of 1 month.

The accused No.1 is sentence to pay fine of Rs.500/- for the offence punishable under Section 177 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 No.1 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 17th day of April, 2026)

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

:: A N N E X U R E ::

1. List of witnesses examined for prosecution:

PW1 : H.G.Lingaraju
PW2 : A.K. Hanumanthappa
PW3 : Sureshappa @ Nagaraja
PW4 : Santosh Kumar
PW5 : Hanumanthappa
PW6 : Revanasiddappa
PW7 : Mustafa
PW8 : Devaraja

2. List of documents marked for prosecution:

Ex.P1 : Bond pertain to PW1
Ex.P1(a & b) : Signatures of PW1 & 8
Ex.P2 : Statement of PW1
Ex.P2(a) : Signature of PW8
Ex.P3 : Bond pertain to PW2
Ex.P3(a & b) : Signatures of PW2 & 8
Ex.P4 : Statement of PW2

- Ex.P4(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P5 : Bond pertain to PW3
- Ex.P5(a) : Signature of PW3
- Ex.P6 : Statement of PW3
- Ex.P7 : Notice to Panchas
- Ex.P7(a to c) : Signatures of PW4, PW5 & PW7
- Ex.P8 : Spot Mahazar
- Ex.P8(a to c) : Signatures of PW4, PW5 & PW7
- Ex.P9 : Rough Sketch
- Ex.P9(a to c) : Signatures of PW4, PW5 & PW7
- Ex.P10 to 12 : Photos
- Ex.P13 : Notice to Panchas
- Ex.P13(a to c) : Signatures of PW4, PW5 & PW7
- Ex.P14 : Vehicle Mahazar
- Ex.P14(a to c) : Signatures of PW4, PW5 & PW7
- Ex.P15 to 20 : Photos
- Ex.P21 : CD
- Ex.P22 : Statement of PW4
- Ex.P22(a) : Signature of PW7
- Ex.P23 : Statement of PW5
- Ex.P23(a) : Signature of PW7
- Ex.P24 : Bond pertain to PW6
- Ex.P24(a & b) : Signatures of PW6 & 8
- Ex.P25 : Statement of PW6
- Ex.P25(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P26 : Inquest Mahazar
- Ex.P26(a & b) : Signatures of PW7
- Ex.P27 to 32 : Photos
- Ex.P33 : PM Report

- Ex.P33(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P34 : Police Notice given to accused No.2
- Ex.P34(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P35 : Reply notice given by accused No.2
- Ex.P35(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P36 : Police Notice given to accused No.4
- Ex.P36(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P37 : Reply notice given by the accused No.4
- Ex.P37(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P38 : Police Notice to accused No.3
- Ex.P38(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P39 : Reply notice given by the accused No.3
- Ex.P39(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P40 : Notice to Panchas
- Ex.P40(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P41 : Vehicle Release Mahazar
- Ex.P41(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P42 to 45 : Photos
- Ex.P46 : 65(B) Certificate
- Ex.P46(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P47 : IMV Report
- Ex.P47(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P48 : Indemnity bond
- Ex.P48(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P49 : Wound Certificate
- Ex.P49(a) : Signature of PW8
- Ex.P50 : FIR
- Ex.P51 : Complaint

3. List of witnesses examined and Documents marked for
Accused: -Nil-

4. List of material objects marked: -Nil-

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