



**IN THE COURT OF THE CIVIL JUDGE AND J.M.F.C.,
NAVALGUND**

Present : **Sri. Naveen F. Dsouza**
B.B.A., L.L.B., (Spl).,
Civil Judge and JMFC., Navalgund.

C.C.NO.518/2019
Dated this the 8th day of April 2026

Complainant	:	The State Represented by Annigeri Police Station.
-- Versus --		
Accused	1.	Sri. Basappa S/o Irappa Bhavikatti Age: 31 years, Occ: Driver R/o Shalavadi, Taluk: Navalgund.
Date of commission of offence	:	09.04.2019
Date of FIR	:	09.04.2019
Date of Charge Sheet	:	14.05.2019
Complainant	:	Channappa M. Banagar
Date of Cognizance	:	21.08.2019
Date of framing of Charge/plea	:	24.08.2021
Date of commencement of trial	:	18.06.2024
Date of closing of trial	:	20.01.2026
Statement of Accused	:	24.02.2026

Offences complained of	:	U/Sec.279, 304(A) of IPC
Date of Judgment	:	08.04.2026
Opinion of the Judge	:	Accused is Acquitted.
State R/ by	:	Asst. Public Prosecutor
Defence by	:	Sri.SSA-Advocate.
Duration	:	Year/s Month/s Day/s -06- -07- -17-

(Naveen F. Dsouza)
Civil Judge and J.M.F.C.,
Navalgund.

Rank of the accused	Date of arrest	Date of release on bail	Offences charged with	Acquitted or convicted	Sentence	Period of detention
1.	10.04.2019	10.04.2019	U/Sec.279, 304(A) of IPC	Acquitted	-	-

PROSECUTION WITNESSES

PW	CW	Name	Nature of evidence
1	1	Chennappa Mahadevappa Banakar	Complainant
2	3	Kotresh Devappa Palled	Spot mahazar witness
3	7	Irayya Irabasayya Jangimath	Eye witness
4	6	Iranna Kotrappa Gurikar	Eye witness
5	10	Mustafali Allabax Tidagundi	Eye witness
6	9	Mallikarjun Naganagouda Menasagi	Hearsay witness
7	11	Satyanarayan Venkappa Giraddi	Witness
8	12	Mallikarjun Veerabhadrappe Kaparad	Motor Vehicle Inspector
9.	15	Ranganath Neelammanavar	I.O.
10	14	Yallappa Laxman Shigihalli	I.O.

DEFENCE WITNESS

The accused is examined to enable him personally to explain the incriminating circumstances appearing in the

evidence against him in the course of trial and upon examination the accused has refuted all the incriminating materials and he has conveyed his intention to not to lead evidence in his defence but he has tendered a written statement which is taken on record, wherein it is stated that the deceased was picking up rice grains while the bus was parked and there was no chance for the accused to know the presence of the victim and it was all her negligence that caused the accident and that an petition MVC No.237/2020 seeking insurance claim has been moved before the Hon'ble MACT and the present proceedings are only to coerce the accused for accommodating the claim also accused conveyed his intention to not to lead evidence in his defence.

PROSECUTION EXHIBITS

Sl .No.	Exhibit No.	Description
1.	Ex.P.1	First information
2	Ex.P.2	Spot mahazar
3	Ex.P.3 & 4	Photographs
4	Ex.P.5	Restatement of the informant
5	Ex.P.6	Restatement of CW7
6	Ex.P.7	Restatement of CW7.
7	Ex.P.8	Restatement of CW6.
8	Ex.P.9	Restatement of CW6.
9	Ex.P.10	Statement of CW10.
10	Ex.P.11	Indemnity bond.
11	Ex.P.12	Certificate issued by CW11.
12	Ex.P.13	Fitness Certificate and registration certificate of the vehicle.
13	Ex.P.14	Document pertaining to the offending vehicle.
14	Ex.P.15	Log sheet.
15	Ex.P.16	Pay slip of the accused.
16	Ex.P.17	Statement of CW11.
17	Ex.P.18	Vehicle inspection report.
18	Ex.P.19	Inquest mahazar.

19	Ex.P.20 to 22	Inquest photographs
20	Ex.P.23	Acknowledgment of the body.
21	Ex.P.24	Statement of CW8.
22	Ex.P.25	Statement of CW9.
23	Ex.P.26	P.M. Report.
24	Ex.P.27	FIR.
25	Ex.P.27	Final report

JUDGMENT

The case being a summons case instituted upon a police report submitted by the PI of Navalgund, is coming for disposal before this court wherein the accused is facing the charges for the offences punishable under section 279 & 304A of IPC and this court has passed the final order accordingly.

SYNOPSIS:

2. The final report is submitted against the accused accusing that on 09.04.2019 the victim a 35-year-old woman named Shantavva Suresh Bannigoll, while she was collecting spilled rice grains at the Annigeri bus stand, the accused driver of the bus bearing No. KA 23/F764 stationed at the Navalgund block reversed it rashly & negligently and crushed the victim under the rear wheels, who later succumbed to her injuries.

3. Thus after the incident the Cw1 has reported it to the police and lodged the formal information which has come to be registered as Annigeri PS Cr. No. 32/2019 for the offence punishable 279, 337 & 338 of IPC against Accused. Upon the receipt of the FIR, the accused has been taken into custody and released on police bail. In the due course the victim having expired, after the investigation the I.O has submitted his final report against the Accused for the offences punishable 279 & 304A of IPC.

4. Upon receipt of the final report this court has taken cognizance of the offence and summoned the accused, wherein he has cast his appearance before this court through his learned counsel and has secured his presence by the order of bail passed by this court. Upon having furnished the copy of prosecution materials and upon a brief hearing the accused having made out no grounds for discharge, his plea of not guilty having been recorded he was set for trial.

BRIEF FACTS

5. It is alleged that on the morning of 09.04.2019, the informant an auto driver parked at the Annigeri bus stand saw a woman accidentally spill a bag of rice. While she bent over to pick up the grains, a bus driven by the accused suddenly moved in a rash and negligent manner, crushing her under its rear wheels. The informant and several bystanders rushed to help, finding the lady with a shattered right thigh and severe bleeding. She identified herself as Shantavva Suresh Bannigoll, 35 years age, resident of Basapattana, Gangavathi and was accompanied by her daughter Divya, 6 years old. She was immediately transported to the hospital.

6. On further inspection the bus number was found to be KA 23/F764 driven by the accused named Basappa Erappa Bhavikatti. At the time of the incident it was almost 10.30 in the morning whereafter informant appeared before the police and lodged the first information, which has come to be registered as Annigeri P. S. Crime No. 32/2019 for the offences punishable under Section 279, 337, 338 of IPC.

7. That on the very same day after lodging of the information, the informant rectified his information citing that

the bus was stationed at the Navalgund block of Annigeri bus stand and struck the victim while reversing negligently and not while entering the bus stand. Further on 10.04.2019 the informant apprised the police that while the lady was under treatment she has succumbed to her injuries and the first information was given by Basappa Banagar.

8. Upon having heard both the sides and on perusal of all the materials placed on record this court has narrowed down the dispute to definite points and they have been answered accordingly for the underlying reasons;

Sl. No	Points	Answer
1.	<i>Does the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on 09.04.2019 the victim a 35-year-old woman named Shantavva Suresh Bannigoll, while she was collecting spilled rice grains at the Annigeri bus stand, the accused driver of the KSRTC bus bearing No. KA 23/F764 stationed at the Navalgund block reversed it rashly & negligently and crushed the victim under the rear wheels, who later succumbed to her injuries and thereby committed the offence punishable 279 & 304A of IPC?</i>	<i>In the negative</i>
2.	What order?	<i>As per the final order for the following;</i>

REASONS

9. **POINT NO.1:** As the facts germane for the prosecution to bring home the guilt upon the Accused are elaborated they are not recapitulated. The charge levelled against the accused is of rash and negligent act. The prosecution to substantiate the charge against the Accused has to satisfy the ingredient of the rash and negligence. The prosecution has

introduced as many as 15 witnesses wherein the CW1 is the informant and direct witness along with the Cw6, 7 & 10. CW2 to 5, 8 & 9 are the circumstantial and the mahazar witnesses. Cw11 is the reporting authority of the accused. CW13 is the Medical expert, Cw12 is the Motor vehicle expert. CW14 and CW15 are the IO witnesses.

10. Upon a brief scrutiny of the testimony and materials placed on record also when the defence of the accused is taken into consideration, the accident, death and the accused being the driver of the offending vehicle is undisputed, the Exhibit and the materials pertaining to the death i.e. the Post mortem report, the log sheet, the documents pertaining to the offending vehicle are deemed to be admitted and they are undisputed. The only thing this court has to ascertain is whether the negligence is attributed towards the accused. For the accused the negligence is attributed to the victim herself and the proceeding is stated to be instituted to coerce the Accused to tender compensation.

11. As per Exhibit P1 the first information the informant alleges that the bus entered the Annigeri bus station in a rash and negligent manner and hit the victim towards the right side and crushed her under the wheels. But as per Exhibit P 5 the informant has tendered his re-statement wherein it is mentioned that the bus in fact did not enter from the gate of the bus stand perhaps it was parked in the bus stand and the accused reversed it rashly and negligently and crushed the victim. The initial story of the prosecution began with this information. Thereafter, owing to the re-statement of the informant, the story changed wherein it was alleged that the accused reversed the bus negligently while it was stationed at the Annigeri bus station.

12. One pertinent fact to take into consideration is that the victim who was at the bus stand was picking up the rice grain that had spilled on the ground. This fact is undisputed by the rival sides. Coming back to the first information, it is stated that the bus crushed the victim under the rear wheels of the bus. The Exhibit P5 is the re-statement. The prosecution has examined the CW1 who has testified that he has been working as an auto driver for the past 20 years and in the year 2019 while he was stationed at the Annigeri bus stand at the auto stand he saw a lady who was picking up the spilled rice grains at the bus stand and he heard she got crushed by the bus at the rear wheels and she broke her leg and was all bleeding. Thereafter he has lodged the first information and also has appeared in the mahazar on the following day.

13. One another direct witness is the CW10, who is also the travel conductor of the offending vehicle. He has testified that in the year 2019 he was the travel conductor for the bus driven by the accused and while the bus was stationed at Annigeri bus stand to be moved towards Navalgund, there were many passengers and he was tendering tickets to the said passengers and there was a tumult in the bus. However he heard a jolt to the bus but ignored it to be for the jolt of bus hitting the platform as usual and continued tendering ticket. Thereafter he heard certain commotion outside the bus and when immediately he got down from the bus he saw a lady injured on the bus platform.

14. The only direct and substantial witnesses to the case of the prosecution are the CW1, CW6, CW7 and CW10. Among these, only the CW1 and CW10 have tendered their statement

and testimony as to the incident. The CW6 and CW7 have denied witnessing the incident. The CW1 and CW10 have only testified about the aftermath of the incident and not the negligence of the accused. From the testimony of these witnesses what is forthcoming is that the victim was picking up rice grain spilled on the bus stand and the bus reversed. The prosecution has cross examined the CW1, stating that on 09.04.2019 he was stationed besides the Annigeri bus stand at about 10.00 a.m. he saw the victim picking up rice grain spilled at the bus stand and The KSRTC bus number KA 23 F764 mauled her while it reversed negligently driven by the accused. But the same has been denied by the CW1.

15. The CW6 has been cross examined wherein he has totally denied witnessing of the incident. Even with the CW10 who is the travel conductor and is likely to testify about the incident, the prosecution has cross examined him, stating that while his bus was stationed at Annigeri bus stand, the driver of the bus without inspecting the surroundings and without intimation of the conductor, reversed the bus negligently and caused the accident wherein it moved and crushed the lady who was picking grains at the bus stand. The prosecution has tried to ascertain that from the testimony of the travel conductor he was tendering tickets and he was supposed to inform the driver about the movement of the bus and without his movement the bus driver reversed it negligently and caused the incident, but same has come to be denied.

16. In the given facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of negligence that is sought to be attributed against the accused is one wherein the accused has reversed his bus

negligently without inspecting his surroundings and caused the incident. The prosecution has introduced the mahazar, which is Exhibit P2. The place of incident has been recorded in the said mahazar. On perusal of Exhibit P2, the place of incident is the bus station of Annigiri, wherein the bus and the place where the alleged incident took place is made out. The Exhibit P2E is the hand sketch annexed with the Mahazar. The Exhibit P3 and Exhibit P4 are the photographs wherein the blood stains & rice grains on the ground is forthcoming.

17. The place of incident is stated to be around 56 Feet westwards from the platform of the Annigeri bus stand. The mahazar witness CW3 has turned hostile to the case of the prosecution. He has denied the contents of the mahazar. However, he has only admitted his signature, wherein he has stated that he has signed at the instance of the police. In the course of cross-examination, he has admitted that he has witnessed the drawing-up of the mahazar at the place of incident at Annigeri bus stand from about 12.00 p.m. to 12.30 p.m. But he has denied as to the contents of the same.

18. The CW11 is introduced by the prosecution as a direct witness and also reporting authority of the accused. He is stated to be the controller of the bus station. He has testified before this court citing that on 09.04.2019, while the CW11 was as the controller of the Annigeri bus station, the bus number KA23 F764 which was stationed at the Annigeri bus station, supposed to move towards Navalgund, reversed the same and crushed one lady who was picking up rice grains at the bus station. Thereafter the CW11 along with the accused and others

carried the victim to the hospital and later has come to know that the victim has succumbed to her injuries.

19. That at the instance and the notice of the IO he has tendered the documents pertaining to the offending vehicle as well as the accused being on the duty. However the witness has only testified as to the incident and not about the negligence of the accused. The incident is undisputed. The negligence is to be established by the prosecution. When the mahazar is taken into consideration, although the mahazar witness has turned hostile, the IO has testified about the drawing up of the mahazar. However, the place of incident is described as 56 feet westwards away from the platform, which the learned prosecution has argued that is sufficient enough for a parked bus and the driver to inspect the surroundings and move the vehicle.

20. In this regard the learned defence counsel has captured the attention of the court to the motor vehicle inspection report wherein it is stated that the accident has not occurred due to any technical defect. The CW12 is the motor vehicle examiner. He has been examined before this court virtually. In his testimony he has stated that on 10.04.2019 At the instance of the IO, he has inspected the vehicle bearing number KA23F764 and on inspection he has found that the bus is fit to be plied on road and has no mechanical defect and that the accident could not have occurred due to any technical defect.

21. However, in the course of cross examination of this CW12, the attention is invited to the suggestion that the bus had no parking sensors. The learned defence counsel argues that the passengers who come to the bus stand are not supposed to enter the area where the bus usually plies. The passengers are to

board and deboard the bus only when the bus is stationary at the platform. In the present case, it is stated that the victim was negligently moving in the area wherein the accused had a blind spot and the bus was not equipped with modern sensors wherein it could alert the accused of the victim or any person.

22. It is stated that the accused reversed the bus after having inspected the surroundings in the rear mirror because the accused had inspected the rear mirrors and having found no one, the bus was reversed. But the victim was in the blind spot and the accused had no chance to inspect the surroundings and the accused and the accident could not have been attributed to the negligence of the accused but it is the sheer negligence of the victim herself. One pertinent fact to be taken into consideration is that the prosecution has through the testimony of the IO stated the incident to be rash and negligent driving of the accused. It is stated that the accused drove the bus rashly and negligently and speedily. Here the question of speed is not a determinant factor for the ascertainment of negligence.

23. The prosecution has examined the IO CW 14 and 15. The CW 14 has testified about the drawing-up of mahazar and also about the recording of the statements. The CW 15 to the contrary has been examined wherein he has testified about the recording of the mahazar, also the examination of the vehicle and filing of the final report. The CW14 in the course of his cross-examination has been suggested that there are speed breakers erected at the bus stand and the vehicle could not have been driven rashly. The same is admitted by the witness. The CW15 is also suggested the same wherein it is stated that the vehicles or the buses entering the bus stand cannot be driven

speedily. This Court is not in a position to comprehend that the allegation levelled against the accused are of negligently reversing the bus and not of plying it speedily.

24. Suffice that it is also ascertained from the investigating officer whether he has attempted to ascertain the bus being equipped with modern equipment of rear sensors or parking sensors. The IO has denied the same. The other witnesses examined before this Court have only testified as to the occurrence of the incident, which is undisputed. The CW9 is a hearsay witness and the relative of the victim. He has testified that his sister had met with an accident at Annigeri and he was called to the hospital. His knowledge of the incident is stated to be from one Fakirgowda who is not a witness.

25. This court has taken the testimony of the Cw10 the conductor of the bus, he has testified that while the bus was moving he heard a jolt and he thought it to be the collision of the bus with the platform which occurs usually and continued tendering the tickets to the passengers. In a common course of events the travel conductor owes the duty to direct the bus driver who is reversing the bus. The travel conductor is under obligation to get down from the bus and blow the whistle to the driver assisting to reverse the bus. These aspects are not ascertained by the defence from the witnesses.

26. However the court has to take this in judicial notice that the KRTC buses are not equipped with modern equipment so as to enable the drivers of the buses while reversing a huge vehicle. The motor vehicle inspector has testified that the offending vehicle is a heavyweight passenger bus and there are always blind spots available for the bus. The driver is always

obliged to inspect his surroundings before reversing the bus. Also it is obligatory on the part of the passengers not to venture out on the blind spots of the heavyweight vehicles and also not to venture out on the places where the bus moves in the bus stand and they are supposed to be in the platform of the bus stand.

27. As already discussed the statement and testimony of the conductor is very negligent of his duties. He has testified that while he was inside the bus the bus moved and he was tendering tickets. It is to be noted that the bus had reversed and it had not moved in a face-front direction because if at all the bus was moving in a straight direction the driver ought to have been vigilant enough. But when the bus is stated to be reversing, then the travel conductor ought to have been more alert and ought to have got down from the bus and directed the accused. But he has failed to discharge his duties and he has negligently testified before this court stating that while the bus moved he was tendering tickets, there was tumult in the bus and he heard a jolt, only after the people gathered he could come out and intercept that there was an incident.

28. The prosecution is obliged to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the driver of the offending vehicle had all the opportunities and obligation to inspect his surroundings before moving his vehicle and that he failed to do so and owing to discharge this obligation, the accident occurred and the negligence can be attributed against the accused. In the present case, no such ingredients are forthcoming. While the information and the initial charge sheet would disclose that the accident occurred only when the bus was reversing and not otherwise,

the prosecution would insist to the witness and suggest to the witness that the driver drove rashly and negligently.

29. The investigation of the officers is as to the death of the victim. This fact is undisputed. It is the assertion of the prosecution that the place of incident is very wide, which is made out in Exhibit P2 mahazar as well as hand sketch. He would assert that the station being wide enough when corroborated with undisputed facts, would demonstrate the negligence of the offending vehicle in reversing without inspecting the surroundings and thus the negligence of the accused is sought to be inferred. The prosecution has also asserted that the mahazar would be more important to infer the circumstances that are alleged to have been caused the road traffic accident.

30. This court has given its careful consideration to the testimony of the witnesses. The CW1 in his testimony would state that he appeared only when he heard the commotion at the bus stand and then he rushed to the place. Other than the testimony of CW1 there is no other testimony to attribute the negligence of the accused. The photograph Exhibit P3 and Exhibit P4 would demonstrate the place as an open space but as rightly submitted by the learned defence that the victim was present at a prohibited zone and was not aware of the surroundings.

31. There are no direct witnesses who would testify the negligence of the accused. Merely because the accident is not denied, the court cannot come to the conclusion that the accident has occurred owing to the negligence of the accused. With the materials placed on record the prosecution intends to

prove the guilt of the accused as to his negligent act beyond reasonable doubt. The negligence of the accused beyond the reasonable doubt is not proved. The place of the incident is not in dispute the mahazar would not contribute to ascertain the negligence of the accused. The IO has certainly brought in the materials, but the direct witnesses have failed to substantiate the negligence of the accused. Certainly the court cannot always insist upon the production of eye witnesses for the proof of negligence.

32. It is imperative that rash and negligent driving has to be examined in the light of not merely stray testimonies and statements made by the witnesses. The prosecution has tried to ascertain the facts from the witnesses and their statement before the police was confronted but the same got denied. To the contrast, the rash and negligent act has to be examined in the light of the facts and circumstance of the given case and it may be seen and examined in isolation when there are attending circumstances, material evidence and witnesses statements to determine the rash and negligent driving of the driver of offending vehicle.

33. The testimony of the witness should be of negligence that the person who was obliged to do some act had disregarded it and thus it resulted in a mishap. 'Negligence' means omission to do something which a reasonable and a prudent person guided by the considerations which ordinarily regulate human affairs would do or doing something which a prudent and reasonable person guided by similar considerations would not do. 'Negligence' is not an absolute term, but is a relative one; it is

rather a comparative term. In a given case, even not doing what one was ought to do can constitute negligence.

34. It is very unfortunate that a very young life is lost right in front of her daughter. The accused and the good samaritans have taken up their responsibility and given the requisite treatment to the victim to no avail. The assertions that the prosecution is for the sake of claim of insurance or to accommodate monetary relief to the deceased cannot be accepted, because given the civic sense of the people in the village it is always expected for the driver of the bus to inspect the surroundings before moving the bus. Further it is the bounden duty of the travel conductor to inspect the same because it is the scope of his duty.

35. If the negligence is to be strictly inferred then this court has to infer the negligence of the state for not providing the necessary sensors for the state run bus, the controller of the bus stand for not inspecting the surroundings of the bus stand and letting the passengers scout free in the prohibited zones, the travel conductor failing to provide the necessary assistance to the driver and the common people who witnessed the victim in the prohibited zone picking rice and failed to alert her. The rice that feeds the stomach became the cause of loss of life and this court is not in a position to attribute the negligence to the perpetrator. It is very unfortunate the families have suffered.

36. The present case mandates the demonstration of 'Criminal Negligence'. It is the failure to exercise duty with reasonable and proper care and precaution guarding against injury to the public generally or to any individual in particular. Owing to the absence of direct witnesses the case of the

prosecution has settled upon the circumstantial evidence. The prosecution has to elucidate the chain of circumstances that lead to a sole conclusion of the negligence of the accused. The absence of the direct witnesses makes the fact difficult to establish.

37. The absence of direct witnesses has turned the case of the prosecution to be dependent upon the circumstantial witnesses and evidence. The burden is upon the prosecution. In the present case the direct and substantial witnesses have failed to demonstrate negligence of the accused. It is trite that a mere allegation of high speed or steering in reverse would not tantamount to rashness or negligence. In the present case also, the accusation that the offending vehicle reversed negligently and the accused acted in a manner which could be regarded as rash or negligent is not made out. This court has to assess whether the ordinary facts which are relevant for the matter in dispute are forthcoming coming or not.

38. The prosecution has to establish the chain of facts or events of the case in a manner that they become reasonable and sufficient to back the claim put up by the informant and suggest only the inference of the guilt of the accused. In the present case though the accident is not in dispute the fact of rash and negligence of the accused is not established. Although the accused has not denied the accident, perhaps the burden is substantially upon the prosecution. It is not the accident that is punishable, but it is a cause for the accident which is punishable and in the present case, there is no convincing material collected by the prosecution to establish that the accused was negligent.

39. Thus the materials and testimony placed on record are insufficient to attract the ingredients of the charges that are framed against the accused, and the prosecution having failed to satisfy the ingredients of the offences and to bring home the guilt upon the accused likewise has failed to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the accused has committed the said offence. The fact of the accident due to the rash and negligent riding of the accused is not proved beyond the reasonable doubt. As the accused has admitted the accident and as to the failure of the prosecution, the charge against the Accused is not proved and the accused deserves a benefit of doubt, accordingly the Point No. 1 is answered in the **Negated**.

40. **Point No.2:-** For the forgoing reasons, this court proceed to pass the following;

ORDER

Acting under Section 255(1) of Cr.P.C., the accused is found not guilty for the offence punishable under Section 279 & 304A of IPC and he is acquitted and set at liberty.

The bail bonds of accused and his surety bonds stands discharged.

The bonds executed by the accused in compliance of Section 437A shall stand discharged after expiry of appeal period.

(Typed and transcript revised by me, formatted by the steno, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this **08.04.2026**).

(Naveen F. Dsouza)
Civil Judge and J.M.F.C.,
Navalgund.

ANNEXURE**1. Witnesses examined on behalf of the prosecution:**

- P.W.1 : Chennappa Mahadevappa Banakar
P.W.2 : Kotresh Devappa Palled
P.W.3 : Irayya Irabasayya Jangimath
P.W.4 : Iranna Kotrappa Gurikar
P.W.5 : Mustafali Allabax Tidagundi
P.W.6 : Mallikarjun Naganagouda Menasagi
P.W.7 : Satyanarayan Venkappa Giraddi
P.W.8 : Mallikarjun Veerabhadrappe Kaparad
P.W.9 : Ranganath Neelammanavar
P.W.10 : Yallappa Laxman Shigihalli

2. Documents exhibited on behalf of the prosecution:

- Ex.P.1 : First information
Ex.P.2 : Spot mahazar
Ex.P.3 & 4 : Photographs
Ex.P.5 : Restatement of the informant
Ex.P.6 : Restatement of CW7
Ex.P.7 : Restatement of CW7.
Ex.P.8 : Restatement of CW6.
Ex.P.9 : Restatement of CW6.
Ex.P.10 : Statement of CW10.
Ex.P.11 : Indemnity bond.
Ex.P.12 : Certificate issued by CW11.
Ex.P.13 : Fitness Certificate and registration certificate of the vehicle.
Ex.P.14 : Document pertaining to the offending vehicle.
Ex.P.15 : Log sheet.
Ex.P.16 : Pay slip of the accused.
Ex.P.17 : Statement of CW11.
Ex.P.18 : Vehicle inspection report.

- Ex.P.19 : Inquest mahazar.
Ex.P.20 to : Inquest photographs
22
Ex.P.23 : Acknowledgment of the body.
Ex.P.24 : Statement of CW8.
Ex.P.25 : Statement of CW9.
Ex.P.26 : P.M. Report.
Ex.P.27 : FIR.
Ex.P.27 : Final report

3. Witness examined on behalf of the accused:

: - N I L -

4. Documents exhibited on behalf of the accused:

: - N I L -

5. Material object marked on behalf of the prosecution:

: N I L.

(Naveen F. Dsouza)
Civil Judge and J.M.F.C.,
Navalgund.
