

KADW200002022022



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AND JMFC, HUBBALLI**

Present:

Sri. Yamanappa Karehanumanthappa,
Prl. Senior Civil Judge & JMFC, Hubballi.

C.C. No. 22/2022

Dated this the 04th day of April - 2026

Complainant : State, through Police Inspector,
East Traffic Police Station,
Hubballi.

[By Learned A.P.P.]

.Vs.

Accused

1. Mahebubsaheb Fayaz Ahammad
Naganur, Age: 22 years,
Occ: Labourer, R/o. Hallikeri, Hubballi,
Dharwad.
2. Imamsab Maktumsab Ansari,
Age: 49 years, Occ: Businessman,
R/o Hallikeri, Annigeri, Hubballi.
Dharwad.

[By Sri. A.V.B., Advocate]

Date of offence : 28.09.2021

Date of report of offence : 22.12.2021

Date of arrest/appearance of accused. : 30.09.2021

Name of the complainant : Prakash Erototi

Date of commencement of recording of evidence : 03.07.2025

Date of closing of evidence : 25.02.2026

Offences complained of : Section 279, 304(A), 337, 181, 203 of IPC and Sec. 5 R/w 180 and 196 of MV Act.

Opinion of the Judge : Accused No. 1 and 2 not found guilty for the offences U/s. 279, 304(A), 337, 181, 203 of IPC and Sec. 5 R/w 180 and 196 of MV Act.

State represented by : Assistant Public Prosecutor

Accused defence by : Sri. A.V.B., Advocate

J U D G M E N T

Police Inspector, East Traffic Police Station, Hubballi, filed chargesheet against accused No.1 for the offences punishable U/Sec. 279, 304(A), 337, 181, 203 of IPC and accused No.2 for the offences punishable U/Sec. 5 R/w 180 and 196 of MV Act. The case against accused No.3 is abated and accused No.4 is convicted for the offences punishable U/Sec. 5 R/w 180 of MV Act.

2. The case of the prosecution in brief is as under:

It is alleged that on 28.09.2021 at about 14.30 a.m. on Gadag Hubballi road near railway under bridge on public road, the accused No.1 being the driver of tipper bearing No. KA-25/AA-3504 drove the same without holding valid DL from Hubballi Pinto circle towards Gadag road railway under bridge in high speed, rash or negligent manner and caused accident to the motor cycle bearing No. KA-25/EL-1788 from behind as a result the rider of the said motor cycle sustained grievous injuries and succumbed to the said injuries on 28.09.2021 at about 20.15 hours and thereby committed offence punishable U/s. 279, 337, 304(A), 203 of IPC and Sec. 3 R/w 181 of MV Act.

3. Further the accused No.2 being the RC owner of Tipper vehicle bearing No. KA-25/AA-3504 allowed his uninsured Tipper vehicle No. KA-25/AA-3504 to be driven by the accused No.1 who did not have have a proper driving license and thereby committed offence punishable U/Sec. 5 R/w 180, 196 of MV Act.

4. On perusing the chargesheet this Court took cognizance for the offences punishable U/s. 279, 304(A), 337, 181, 203 of IPC and Sec. 5 R/w 180 and 196 of MV Act. Act and issued summons to the accused No.1 and 2. On service of summons, accused No.1 and 2 appeared and was released on bail. Chargesheet and other materials are supplied to accused No.1 and 2 as required U/s.207 of

Cr.P.C. The plea was recorded, he denied it and claimed trial.

5. In order to prove the case, prosecution has got examined PW.1 to 12 and got marked Ex.P.1 to 26.

6. The statement of the accused No.1 and 2 as required U/s.313 of Cr.P.C. was recorded. They denied the incriminating evidence and not chosen to led their defence evidence.

7. I have heard the learned APP and learned counsel for the defence. The following points arise for my consideration:

1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on 28.09.2021 at about 14.30 a.m. on Gadag Hubballi road near railway under bridge on public road, the accused No.1 being the driver of tipper bearing No. KA-25/AA-3504 drove the same without holding valid DL from Hubballi Pinto circle towards Gadag road railway under bridge in high speed, rash or negligent manner and caused accident to the motor cycle bearing No. KA-25/EL-1788 from behind as a result the rider of the said motor cycle sustained grievous injuries and succumbed to the said injuries on 28.09.2021 at about 20.15 hours and thereby committed offence punishable U/Sec. 279, 337, 304(A), 203 of IPC and Sec. 3 R/w 181 of MV Act ?

2. Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place and in the accident the accused No.2 being the RC owner of Tipper vehicle bearing No. KA-25/AA-3504 allowed his uninsured Tipper vehicle No. KA-25/AA-3504 to be driven by the accused No.1 who did not have have a proper driving license and thereby committed offence punishable U/Sec. 5 R/w 180, 196 of MV Act?
3. What order?
8. My answers to the above points are as under:
Point No.1 and 2 : In the Negative.
**Point No.3 : As per final order,
for the following**

REASONS

9. **Point No.1 and 2:** According to prosecution on 28.09.2021 at about 14.30 a.m. on Gadag Hubballi road near railway under bridge on public road, the accused No.1 being the driver of tipper bearing No. KA-25/AA-3504 drove the same without holding valid DL from Hubballi Pinto circle towards Gadag road railway under bridge in high speed, rash or negligent manner and caused accident to the motor cycle bearing No. KA-25/EL-1788 from behind as a result the rider of the said motor cycle sustained grievous injuries and succumbed to the said injuries on 28.09.2021 at about 20.15 hours and thereby committed offence punishable U/s. 279, 337, 304(A), 203 of IPC and Sec. 3 R/w 181 of MV Act and further the accused No.2 being the RC owner of Tipper vehicle bearing No. KA-25/AA-3504 allowed his uninsured

Tipper vehicle No. KA-25/AA-3504 to be driven by the accused No.1 who did not have a valid driving license and thereby committed offence punishable U/Sec. 5 R/w 180, 196 of MV Act.

10. Accused No.1 and 2 have not disputed the accident and they have not disputed that accused No.1 was driving the vehicle when the accident took place. But they have denied the rash or negligent driving. So, the prosecution need not prove the accident, but has to prove that the said accident occurred due to rash or negligent act of the accused. In order to discharge the said burden it relied upon evidence of PW.1 to 12 and got marked Ex.P.1 to 26.

11. Ex.P.1 is the Complaint. Ex.P.2 is the Photograph. Ex.P.3 is the Spot panchanama. Ex.P.4 and 5 are the Photographs. Ex.P.6 is the seizure panchanama. Ex.P.7 is the Photograph. Ex.P.8 is the Inquest panchanama. Ex.P.9 is the Vishra panchanama. Ex.P.10 is the Statement. Ex.P.11 is the Further statement. Ex.P.12 is the Statement. Ex.P.13 is the Further statement. Ex.P.14 is the Wound certificate. Ex.P.15 is the Acknowledgment. Ex.P.16 is the Lab report. Ex.P.17 is the P.M.Report. Ex.P.18 is the Doctor's opinion. Ex.P.19 is the IMV report. Ex.P.20 is the portion of statement. Ex.P.21 is the FIR. Ex.P.22 is the Yadi. Ex.P.23 is the Study certificate. Ex.P.24 and 25 are the Notices. Ex.P.26 is the Indemnity bond.

12. PW.1 is the complainant in this case deposed that, in 2021 September month at about 2.15 pm., he received the message with regard to accident. Thereafter, he went to the spot and saw the incident on Gadag – Hubballi road near railway under bridge. In the spot the deceased Matho sustained grievous injuries on his left leg with bleeding injuries and himself and public together sent the injured to KIMS Hospital, Hubballi for treatment, he enquired the injured Matho and he said that, when he was coming from Pinto circle the Tipper came from his behind and dashed to him and he has seen the accident place and vehicle involved in this accident. The police shown the accused by name Mahaboob Naganur and he has lodged the complaint as per Ex.P.1 at about 4.30 pm. During cross-examination he has admitted that, the width of the road is 110 feet at spot and tipper going towards left side and there is a signal in Pinto circle. The vehicle was moving 22 to 30 kms.

13. PW.2 in his evidence has stated that, about 4 years back the police have conducted panchanama in his presence as per Ex.P.3 and taken photograph as per Ex.P.4 and 5 and very next day the police have conducted the seized panchanama as per Ex.P.6. During cross-examination he has stated that, he do not know contents of panchanama and as per instruction of police, he has put his signature.

14. PW.3 in his evidence has stated that, on 28.09.2021 at about 5.30 pm., to 6.30 pm., the police conducted the panchanama on Gadag-Hubballi road railway under bridge as per Ex.P.3 and taken photograph as per Ex.P.4 and 5 and very next day the police have conducted the seized panchanama as per Ex.P.6. During cross-examination he has stated that, he do not know contents of panchanama and as per instruction of police, he has put his signature.

15. PW.4 who is the eye witness to the alleged incident stated that, on 28.09.2021 at about 2.30 pm., when he was standing near the railway bridge, at that time the deceased Matho and his son came in their bike. At that time the Tipper came from behind in rash and negligent manner dashed to the motor cycle of Matho and on account of which the said Matho sustained fracture to his leg and his son son sustained simple injuries. He came to know that, the driver fo the Tipper by name Mohammad. Further he has stated that, during treatment the said Matho was died. During cross-examination he has stated that, in Pinto circle so many vehicles are moving in a slow manner and rest of suggestion made by defence counsel was denied.

16. PW.5, 6 and 10 who are eye witnesses to the alleged incident stated that, they did not saw the accident

and not given statement to the police. These witnesses are treated as hostile witnesses by the prosecution. During cross-examination nothing has been elucidated from their mouth by the learned APP with regard to the accident.

17. PW.7 who is another eye witness to the alleged incident stated that, in the year 2021 when he was going on Hubballi-Gadag road towards Channamma circle near railway bridge the said Matho and his son going towards CBT on their bike. At that time the Tipper driver driven in rash and negligent manner dashed to the bike and on account was which the said Matho was sustained grievous injuries on his head and back. The son of Matho sustained simple injuries. He informed the brother of Matho and himself and public sent the Matho to the KIMS Hospital, Hubballi for treatment. During cross-examination he admitted that, in an accident place, the vehicle was moving in slow manner.

18. PW.8 in his evidence stated that, on 28.09.2021 he was deputed to traffic duty. At about 1.30 pm., to 2.00 pm., the driver of the tipper lorry KA-25/AA-3504 came from Ambedkar circle in a rash and negligent manner dashed to the bike bearing KA-25/EL-1788. On account of which the rider of the bike Matho sustained fracture injuries on his leg. The driver of the truck by name Mohammad Unus Ansari he has taken into custody of offending vehicle and vehicle

brought to the station. During cross-examination he was admitted that, in Pinto circle the vehicle move in slow manner. The rider of the bike taken his bike towards right side. The tipper moving towards Gadag road.

19. PW.9 who is circumstantial witness in this case has stated that, on 28.09.2021 at about 2.30 pm., he got instruction from SHO with regard to accident and clear of traffic. As per the instruction of SHO he went to the spot and in the spot so many people were gathered and injured was sustained grievous injuries and he was not in a position to speak. When he enquired CW.13, he came to know that, the driver of Tipper driven in rash and negligent manner dashed to the injured and his son Jayson. He has instructed the driver of the tipper to bring the vehicle to the Police Station. On the same day the injured Matho was died. Further he came to know that, on 30.09.2021 the accused has falsely stated his name actual name is Mahaboobsab Naganur and as per instruction of Investigating Officer he has prepared the spot panchanama as per Ex.P.3 and he has identified Ex.P.4 and 5 and he further stated that, as per instruction of Investigating Officer he has drafted Ex.P.6 and 8. During cross-examination he has admitted that, he did not seen the accident.

20. PW.11 who is Investigating Officer has stated that, on 28.09.2021 at about 6.45 pm., when he was on duty

CW.1 came to Police Station and lodged the complaint and he received the complaint and registered the case in Cr.No.41/2021 and sent the FIR to the Court. Thereafter he went to the spot in the presence of CW.2 and 3 he conducted the spot panchanama at about 7.30 pm., to 8.30 pm., and taken the photocopies and recorded the statement of CW.9 to 12. Further he has written the letter to the hospital that, whether the accused Mahaboobsab S/o Fayazahmed Naganur has consumed the alcohol and recorded the further statement of CW.1 and sent the requisition to the Court to add certain Sections in the FIR. Further he stated that, he has conducted the inquest panchanama in mortuary at 8.30 pm., to 9.30 pm., in the presence of CW.4 and 5 as per Ex.P.8 and on the same day at about 11.00 am., to 12.00 am., he conducted the seizure panchanama as per Ex.P.6 and seized two vehicles involved in this case. He has given notice to the accused and accused appeared before the Court and he was taken into custody and released on bail. Further he has recorded the statement of accused and taken the documents and IMV report and he has given notice U/Sec. 133 of MV Act to the owner of the vehicle. Further he handed over the further investigation the CW.22.

21. PW.12 who is Investigating Officer in this case stated that, on 05.10.2021 CW.16 produced the vishra from KIMS Hospital, Hubballi in the presence of CW.4 and 5 at

about 4.00 pm., to 5.00 pm., he conducted seizure panchanama with regard to vishra and sent to RFSL. On the same day the owner of the bike bearing No. KA-25/EL-1755 produced the documents and executed the indemnity bond and he taken indemnity bond and released the bike. On 12.10.2021 he received IMV report from CW.20 and wound certificate of Jayson Matho. On 01.12.2021 the owner of the lorry bearing No. KA-25/AA3504 produced and submitted the Court order. In the presence of CW. 6 and 7 he conducted the panchanama and released the vehicle. Further he received RFSL report from CW.19. On 22.12.2021 he has received PM report and submitted the final report.

22. Admittedly, as on the date of accident the accused is the driver of the offending vehicle and as per Ex.P.14 the Master Jayson Mathew has sustained injuries and there is no dispute that, the accident is not occurred on mechanical defects as per Ex.P.19. Further not disputed that, the deceased was died in road accident as per Ex.P.8, 16, 17 and 18.

23. The dispute is that, on account of negligent act of the accused No.1 the accident is occurred or not.

24. The Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh in

2025 CRI. L. J. 862 in between **State of Himachal Pradesh Vs. Hans Raj** in Para No. 23 held as follows:

Merely because the truck was being driven at a "high speed" does not bespeak either "negligence" or "rashness" by itself. None of the witnesses examined by the prosecution could give any indication, even approximately as to what they meant by "high speed", "High speed" is a relative term. It was for the prosecution to bring on record material to establish as to what it meant by "high speed" in the facts and circumstances of the case. In a criminal trial, the burden of providing everything essential to the establishment of the charge against an accused always rests on the prosecution and there is a presumption of innocence in favour of the accused until the contrary is proved. Criminality is not to be presumed, subject of course to some statutory exceptions. There is no such statutory exception pleaded in the present case. In the absence of any material on the record, no presumption of "rashness" or "negligence" could be drawn by invoking the maxim "res ipsa loquitur". There is evidence to show that immediately before the truck turned turtle, there was a big jerk. It is not explained as to whether the jerk was because of the uneven road or mechanical failure."

24. This Court took a similar view in *State of H.P. v. Amar Nath*, Latest HLJ 2018 (HP) Suppl. 763: (AIROnline 2018 HP 902), and held as under: -

"18 It would be noticed that the instant is a case where apart from the bare statement of PW-1 that the vehicle was being driven by the petitioner at a high speed, there was no attempt made to establish that there was any rash and negligent act on the part of the driver of the vehicle. "High speed" is an expression which is relative and subjective. Therefore, merely because the vehicle was being driven at a high speed does not mean that the driver was driving rashly and negligently."

25. A similar view was taken in Yash Pal Rana v. State of Himachal Pradesh Latest HLJ 2019 (HP) (Suppl.) 171, wherein it was observed:-

"9. Leaving everything aside, this Court finds no specific evidence led on record by the prosecution to prove rash and negligent driving by the petitioner-accused. As has been taken note of above, PW-1 in a very casual manner has only stated that the offending vehicle was being driven at high speed, but high speed cannot be a criteria to conclude rash and negligent driving, rather to prove guilt, if any, under Section 279, IPC, it is/was incumbent upon the prosecution to prove act of rashness and negligent so as to endanger the human life. But in the case at hand, the prosecution has not been able to place on record specific evidence, if any, with regard to rash and negligent acts, if any of the accused, which endangered human life.

26. Thus, no advantage can be derived from the use of the term high speed by the witnesses.

27. In any case, the prosecution's version that the accident was caused due to the high speed of the vehicle was not proved. It was admitted by the prosecution witnesses that the vehicle was loaded; therefore it could not have a very high speed. The witnesses stated that the vehicle was being driven at a normal speed which appears to be probable keeping in view the fact that the vehicle was loaded and the articles loaded in the vehicle were handed over the Ramesh.

28. Amita Nanda (PW-5) stated that the accused was intoxicated which is not the case of the prosecution. It shows that she is trying to implicate the accused by going to any extent and this would make her testimony suspect. It was held by this Court in *Gurcharan Singh v. State of Himachal Pradesh*, 1989 SCC OnLine HP 18: 1990 ACJ 598: 1991 Cri LJ 771 (HP): (1990) 2 TAC 261 that the witnesses are thoroughly prejudicial in accident cases and the Court has to be careful while evaluating their testimonies. It was observed at page 599:

25. The maxim "res ipsa loquitur" is not applicable to criminal cases. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sayyed Akbar - vs- State of Karnataka, 1979 AIR 1848**, held that " coming to the second question, it may be observed that res ipsa

loquitur, (thing speaks for itself) is a principle which, in reality, belongs to the law of torts. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Jacob Mathew -vs- State of Punjab and another, (2005) 6 SCC 1**, held that “res ipsa loquitur is a rule of evidence which in reality belongs to the law of torts. Inference as to negligence may be drawn from proved circumstances by applying the rule if the cause of the accident is unknown and no reasonable explanation as to the cause is coming forth from the defendant. In criminal proceedings the burden of proving negligence as an essential ingredient of the offence lies on the prosecution. Such ingredient cannot be said to have been proved or made out by resorting to the said rule.”

26. It is cardinal principles of criminal jurisprudence that, there is presumption of innocence in favour of accused unless proven guilty. In the present case, the complainant in Ex.P.1 stated that, the accused has driven the Tipper in rash and negligent manner on Gadag-Hubballi road near railway under bridge and dashed to the deceased bike of Mathew bearing No.KA-22/EL-1788 and on account of which the deceased Mathew sustained grievous injuries on the various parts of the body and his son Master Jayson sustained simple injuries. The complainant is examined as PW.1 and in his evidence he stated that, the driver of the Tipper driven in rash and negligent manner dashed to the deceased bike and due to same the deceased sustained grievous injuries. During his cross-examination he stated that, he did not stated the contents of the complaint and as per instruction of

police he has put his signature. PW.1 who is complainant is not eye witness to the alleged incident. His evidence is not helpful to the case of prosecution because as per say of police he has put his signature on Ex.P.1.

27. PW.4, 7 and 8 who are eye witnesses to the incident. These witnesses stated that, on 28.09.2021 at about 2.30 pm., the accused driven his Tipper in rash and negligent manner and dashed to the deceased bike and on account of which the deceased Mathew sustained grievous injuries and died during treatment. During cross-examination they have stated that, there is a heavy traffic at Pinto circle and vehicles move in slow manner. The testimony of PW.4, 7 and 8 with regard to rash and negligent manner driving of the accused No.1 is doubtful.

28. PW.2 and 3 are the panchas in this case. They have stated that, in their presence as per Ex.P.3, the police have conducted panchanama. PW.5 and 6 are the eye witnesses to the incident. They have not supported the case of prosecution. In spite of cross-examination by the learned APP nothing elucidated from their mouth with regard to alleged incident.

29. PW.11 and 12 who are Investigating Officers deposed with regard to discharging their duty. When there is no believable evidence of prosecution, the evidence of IO is

not helpful and not sufficient to hold that, the accused has committed guilty. The word 'high speed' is the relative term. It was for the prosecution to bring on record the material to establish as to what it meant by high speed. I rely upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court reported in **(1998) 8 SCC 493, between State of Karnataka -vs- Satish**, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court in para No.4 held as under:

“Merely because the truck was being driven at a 'high speed' does not bespeak of either “negligence” or “rashness” by itself. None of the witnesses examined by the prosecution could give any indication, even approximately, as to what they meant by “high speed”. “High speed” is a relative term. It was for the prosecution to bring on record material to establish as to what it meant by “high speed” in the acts and circumstances of the case. In a criminal trial, the burden of providing everything essential to the establishment of the charge against an accused always rests on the prosecution and there is a presumption of innocence in favour of the accused until the contrary is proved. Criminality is not to be presumed, subject of course to some statutory exceptions. There is no such statutory exception pleaded in the present case. In the absence of any material on the record, no presumption of “rashness” or “negligence” could

be drawn by invoking the maxim “res ipsa loquitur”. There is evidence to show that immediately before the truck turned turtle, there was a big jerk. It is not explained as to whether the jerk was because of the uneven road or mechanical failure. The Motor Vehicle Inspector who inspected the vehicle had submitted his report. That report is not forthcoming from the record and the Inspector was not examined for reasons best known to the prosecution. There is a serious infirmity and lacuna in the prosecution case.”

30. So, by applying the above said judgments of Hon'ble Apex Court and also by considering the evidence on record, I hold that the prosecution has not at all proved its case beyond reasonable doubt. Hence, accused No.1 cannot be convicted for the offences U/s. 279, 304(A), 337, 181, 203 of IPC and accused No.2 for the offences punishable Sec. 5 R/w 180 and 196 of MV Act.. Hence, I answer point No.1 in **Negative**.

31. **Point No.6:** In view of my answer to above points as stated above, I proceed to pass the following;

ORDER

Acting U/s.255(1) of Cr.P.C. accused No.1 is acquitted of the offences punishable U/ Sec. 279, 304(A), 337, 181, 203 of IPC and

accused No.2 for the offences punishable Sec.
5 R/w 180 and 196 of MV Act

The bail bond of the accused No.1 and 2
and their surety stands canceled after appeal
period is over.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and computerized by her, script corrected directly on
computer and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 04th day of April -2026)

Sd/-
(Yamanappa Karehanumanthappa)
Pri. Senior Civil Judge and JMFC,
Hubballi.

ANNEXURE

1.List of witnesses examined on behalf of Prosecution:

PW.1 : Prakash Yaratoti.
PW.2 : Ramesh Talari.
PW.3 : Ravi Kumar.
PW.4 : Ravi Narasimha Rao.
PW.5 : Makabul. J. Basti.
PW.6 : Mahaboob Ali Sayed Modinsab.
PW.7 : Naveen Dhara.
PW.8 : Yusufkhan. M. Killedar.
PW.9 : Siddalingappa Dharwad.
PW.10 : Mahammad Yunus Anasari.
PW.11 : Sharangouda Sanganagouda Patil.
PW.12 : Nagayya Chandrashekar Kadadevara.

2.List of documents exhibited on behalf of Prosecution:

Ex.P.1 : Complaint.
Ex.P.1(a & b) : Signatures.
Ex.P.2 : Photograph.
Ex.P.3 : Spot panchanama.
Ex.P.3(a to c) : Signatures.
Ex.P.4 and 5 : Photographs.
Ex.P.6 : seizure panchanama.
Ex.P.6(a) : Signatures.

Ex.P.7	: Photograph.
Ex.P.8	: Inquest panchanama.
Ex.P.8(a)	: Signature.
Ex.P.9	: Vishra panchanama.
Ex.P.10	: Statement.
Ex.P.11	: Further statement.
Ex.P.12	: Statement.
Ex.P.13	: Further statement.
Ex.P.14	: Wound certificate.
Ex.P.15	: Acknowledgement.
Ex.P.16	: Lab report.
Ex.P.17	: P.M.Report.
Ex.P.18	: Doctor's opinion.
Ex.P.19	: IMV report.
Ex.P.19(a)	: Signature.
Ex.P.20	: portion of statement.
Ex.P.21	: FIR.
Ex.P.21(a)	: Signature.
Ex.P.22	: Yadi.
Ex.P.22(a)	: Signature.
Ex.P.23	: Study certificate.
Ex.P.23(a)	: Signature.
Ex.P.24 and 25	: Notices.
Ex.P.26	: Indemnity bond.
Ex.P.26(a)	: Signature.

3.List of witnesses examined on behalf of Accused:

-NIL-

4.List of documents exhibited on behalf of Accused:

-NIL-

Sd/-

**Pri. Senior Civil Judge and JMFC,
Hubballi.**