



KAKB220052162021



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
AT ALAND**

PRESENT

SMT.SUMAN CHITARGI.,B.COM.,LL.M.
Prl.CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC
ALAND

DATED THIS THE 15TH DAY OF JULY - 2026

CRIMINAL CASE No.4514/2021

COMPLAINANT:

The State of Karnataka Represented by
Aland Police Station.

(By A.P.P.)

V/s

ACCUSED:

Rahul S/o Padmakumar Vardhamane
Aged: 39 Years, Occ: Driver
R/o H.No.34, LIG, Adarsha Nagar,
Kalaburagi.

(By Sri.R.J.PATIL, Advocate)

Date of offence	16.11.2020
Date of report	16.11.2020
Date of arrest of accused	05.12.2020
Whether in custody	No



Complainant	Shrishail S/o Ramchandra Melinkeri.
Offences alleged	U/Secs.279, 304(A) of Indian Penal Code.
Evidence commenced on	15.02.2025
Evidence closed on	02.05.2026
Judgment pronounced on	15.07.2026
Opinion of Presiding Officer	Accused found not to be guilty.
State by	Learned A.P.P.
Accused by	by Sri.R.J.Patil, Advocate.

**PRL.CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC
ALAND**

J U D G M E N T

The C.P.I. of Aland Circle has filed charge sheet against the accused for the offenses punishable U/Secs.279, 304(A) of Indian Penal Code in Aland P.S. Crime No.189/2020.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are as under:-

It is the case of the prosecution that, on 16.11.2020 at about 6.40 p.m. near the Kodal Hangarga cross, on the State Highway of Ribbanpalli-Wagdhari which comes within the limits of Aland Police station, when the mother of CW.1 was sitting for nature call beside the said place at that time accused being the driver of vehicle bearing registration No.KA-05/MC-0130, drove it



in high speed and in a rash and negligent manner so as to endanger human life of personal safety of others and dashed to the mother of CW-1 AWWAMMA MELINKERI and resulting in caused her multiple grievous injury and ultimately she succumbed to those injuries at the spot, which is not amounting to culpable homicide. On 16.11.2020 when the dead body was shifted to mortuary of Kalaburagi Hospital, MLC was registered. On receipt of message regarding registering of MLC with regard to the Road Traffic Accident, the PSI of Aland P.S. visited the hospital, recorded the statement of CW-1 the son of the deceased, returned to the Police Station has got registered a case in their PS Crime No.189/2020 for the offences U/Sec.279, 304(A) of IPC against the accused. Looking to the nature of the offence he handed over further investigation to the C.W.19, who investigated the case and on conclusion of investigation has filed charge sheet against the accused for the above said offences.

3. On the strength of charge sheet papers as there were sufficient material available against the accused, this court took cognizance against the accused for the above said offence and criminal case registered and issued summons against him. On



service of summons, the accused has appeared before the court through his counsel and got enlarged on bail and Copy of charge sheet was furnished to the accused in compliance of Sec. 207 of Cr.P.C.

4. After hearing the prosecution and accused side, Substance of Accusation was recorded against accused and contents plea was read-over & explained to him, he has pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5. In order to substantiate the above said accusation, the prosecution got examined ten witnesses as PW1 to PW10 and got marked 12 documents as Ex.P1 to Ex.P12 along-with sub-markings and consent markings. In the instant case, the CW2 to CW4 and CW13 to 17 were given up and closed its side.

6. The statement of accused under Sec.313 Cr.P.C. was recorded wherein, accused totally denied all the incriminating circumstances appearing against him, in the evidence of prosecution witnesses as false and he did not choose to lead any defence evidence on his behalf.



7. I have heard arguments on both sides. Perused the entire records.

8. The points that would arise for my consideration are:

1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on 16.11.2020 at about 6.40 p.m. near the Kodal Hangarga cross, on the State Highway of Ribbanpalli-Wagdhari which comes within the limits of Aland Police station, when the mother of CW.1 was sitting for nature call besides the said place at that time accused being the driver of vehicle bearing registration No.KA-05/MC-0130, drove it in high speed and in a rash and negligent manner so as to endanger human life of personal safety of others and caused accident and thereby committed an offence punishable U/Sec.279 of Indian Penal Code?

2. Whether the prosecution proves beyond all reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, the accused being the driver of the above said offending vehicle drove it in high speed and in a rash and negligent manner so as to endanger human



life or personal safety of others and dashed to the the mother of CW-1 AWWAMMA MELINKERI and resulting in caused her multiple grievous injury and ultimately she succumbed to those injuries at the spot, which is not amounting to culpable homicide and thereby committed an offence punishable U/Sec.279 of Indian Penal Code?

3. What order?

9. My findings to the above points are as under.

POINT NO.1 : In the Negative

POINT NO.2 : In the Negative

POINT NO.3 : As per final order for the following:

REASONS

10. **POINTS NO.1 AND 2:-**Both these points are inter-connected to each other and having common appreciation of facts and evidence. Hence, in order to avoid repetition of facts, I have taken these points together for common discussion.

11. To substantiate the guilt of the accused, prosecution got examined PW1 to PW10 witnesses and got exhibited Ex.P1 to Ex.P12 with sub-markings and also consent markings.



12. In order to bring home the guilt of the accused prosecution got examined C.W.1 Shrishail S/o Ramachandra as P.W.1. He has deposed that deceased Avvamma W/o Ramachandra Melinkeri is his mother. Prior to his arrival at the spot of occurrence, the accident had already occurred . He does not know who caused accident and how it occurred. The fact of accident was intimated to him by CW-7. He identified complaint as Ex. P.1 and his signature on it as Ex.P1(a). The learned APP treated him as hostile witness and cross-examined with permission of court. It is elicited that when his mother had been to attend nature call at that time driver of car bearing Reg. No.KA-05/MC-0130 came in high speed and negligent manner and dashed to his mother. In the accident his mother sustained bleeding injury to left ear forehead and fracture to the left knee. He further admitted about death of his mother at the spot. He further admitted about filing of his complaint.

13. The learned defence counsel has cross examined. During the course of cross-examination it is elicited that at the time of accident he was at the home. The Aland- Gulbarga road is State Highway and number of vehicles move on the said highway. The



Kodal Hangarga village is situated on both sides of the road. It is further elicited that near Kodal Hangarga there were road humps. It is also elicited that “ಸದರಿ ರಸ್ತೆಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಲಾಗಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ತಡೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಾಹನಗಳು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಕೊಡಲ ಹಂಗರಗಾ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಬಸ್ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣದಿಂದ ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆದ ಸ್ಥಳ ಸುಮಾರು 50-60 ಫೀಟ್ ಅಂತರ ಇದೆ.” It is further elicited that the factum of accident was intimated the police by the villagers and they have filed petition for compensation. The said portion reads that "ಪೊಲೀಸರಿಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಉರಿನ ಜನ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೇಳಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ ". He denied rest of suggestions made by the defence counsel as false.

14. The PW-7 Datta S/o Shrimanth Melinakeri got examined as PW-2. He deposed that when mother of CW-1 sitting for attending the nature call at that time one car over-rolled on her and she died on the spot. He informed the said fact to the CW-1. At the time of accident number of peoples were gathered and police have shifted the dead body for post mortem to the hospital. At this stage learned APP treated him as partial hostile witness and cross examined him with permission of court. During the course of cross examination he has admitted to the suggestions made by the learned APP as true.



15. The learned defence counsel has cross examined this witness. It is elicited that the deceased Avvamma was sitting 15 feet away from the road to attend the nature call. He further admitted that there were humps and ditches by the side of the road. He also admitted that " ಕೊಡಲ ಹಂಗರಗಾ ಬಸ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣದ ಬಳಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜನದಟ್ಟಣೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಗೆ ರಸ್ತೆ ತಡೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ವಾಹನಗಳು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಮೃತ ಅವ್ವಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಊರಿನವರೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ದೂರದ ಸಂಬಂಧಿ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ". He denied rest of suggestions made to him by the defence counsel as false.

16. CW-8 Shivaraj S/o Huchanna Nadageri got examined as PW-3. He deposed in the chief examination that when deceased Avvamma sitting for attending the nature call accident occurred. The driver of car came and caused accident near road humps. They rushed to the spot and noticed that Avvamma died on the spot. Hence, they intimated about the accident to her family members. At this stage learned APP treated him as partial hostile witness and cross examined him with permission of court. During the course of cross examination he has admitted to the suggestions made by the learned APP as true.



17. The learned defence counsel has cross examined this witness. During the course of cross-examination it is elicited that deceased is his sister in law. She sat 15 feet away from the road to attend nature call. It is further elicited that by the side of road there were ditches and humps. He too admitted that there were road humps on the road near Kodai Hangaraga and the bus stand always busiest place. It is elicited that “ಕೊಡಲ ಹಂಗರಗಾ ಬಸ್ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣದ ಬಳಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜನದಟ್ಟಣೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಗೆ ರಸ್ತೆ ತಡೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ವಾಹನಗಳು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ”. He too denied rest of suggestions made by the defence counsel has false.

18. CW-6 Surendra Kumar S/o Shankarrao Sulepeth who is the owner of offending vehicle got examined PW-4. He has deposed that he does not know anything about the present case and has not given any statement before the police. He being the owner of the vehicle got released it as interim custody. Hence, learned APP treated him as hostile witness and cross examined with permission of court. But, inspite of cross-examination, fails to elicit that the IO has recorded his statement during the course of investigation as per Ex.P.4.



19. CW-9 Chittappa S/o Revanappa got examined as PW-5. He deposed that deceased Avvamma is his sister, She died in the accident. The accident was occurred when she was sitting for attending nature call by the side of road at that time one car came and caused accident to her and at the time accident they are in the house and rushed to the spot and noticed that she was died at the spot. The dead body was shifted to the hospital. At this stage learned APP treated him as partial hostile witness and cross examined him with permission of court. During the course of cross examination he has admitted to the suggestions in part as true and denied some of suggestions as false.

20. Learned defence counsel has cross examined this witness. It is elicited that at the time of accident he was in the house and by seeing creation of crowd, he rushed to the place. There was a bus stand to the Kodal Hangarga and hotels are there. The said place is busiest is place. The said bus stand is containing of road humps on both sides. He further admitted that all the vehicles used to go in slow manner. He further admitted that the relatives of deceased have filed petition for compensation. He denied rest of suggestions as false.



21. CW-10 Arun Kumar S/o Ramachandra got examined as PW-6. He deposed that CW-1 is his brother CW-2 is his sister and deceased Avvamma is his mother, who died in the accident. On 16.11.2020 when he was in the house CW-1 intimated over phone about the accident and immediately he rushed to the spot and noticed about death of his mother at the spot and car was present at the spot. At this stage learned APP treated him as partial hostile witness and cross examined him with permission of court. During the course of cross examination he has admitted to the suggestions made by the learned APP as true.

22. The learned defence counsel has cross examined this witness. It is elicited that near Kodala Hangara cross there were shops and it is the busiest place. The said road is having road humps on both sides due to which all the vehicles are moving in slow manner. There were ditches and humps by the side of the road. He cant say distance from road to spot. It is further elicited that he does know the manner of accident.

23. CW-11 Vidyasagar S/o Annarao Nadageri got examined PW-7, and CW-12 Siddaling S/o Ladappa got examined as PW-8. They



have deposed that they do not know any information about present incident in question. They further deposed that they do not know who caused accident and in which manner. They also do not know on whose fault accident occurred and denied about giving their statements to the police. At this stage learned APP treated them as hostile witnesses and cross examined them with permission of court. But fails to elicit that they have given their statements before the IO as per Ex. P.5 and P.6 during the course of investigation.

24. CW-19 Manjunath S/o Narayanappa (PI/IO) got examined as PW-9. He has deposed that on 17.11.2020 he took further investigation of the case file CW-18, verified the investigation papers. On the same day by visiting to the Govt. Hospital conducted Inquest panchanama to the dead body as per Ex. P.2. On the same day in the presence of CW-4 and 5 conducted panchanama of the spot as showed by CW-7. He seized lorry bearing No.KA-05/MC-0130 retain with him for RTO Inspection on the same day he recorded statements of CW-8 to 13. On the same day he submitted FIR to the court through CW-16 and collected report from him which is identified as Ex. P.8. he also



collected report of CW-17 as per Ex. P.9. on 05.12.2020 got released the vehicle in favour of its owner on execution of indemnity bond as per Ex. P.10. He also collected report of CW-16 with regard to production of vehicle document as per Ex. P.11. On 06.12.2020 arrested the accused by following arrest procedure and released him on furnishing surety. On conclusion of investigation submitted charge sheet against the accused.

25. The learned defence counsel has cross examined him. During the course of cross-examination it is elicited that Aland-Gulbarga road is State Highway. There is a bus stand near the spot of occurrence. There are shops by the sides of bus stand there are road humps on both sides of the bus stand. Due to road humps/ speed breakers, all the vehicles are moving slowly. It is further elicited that he has not mentioned distance of place of occurrence in the map. He denied rest of suggestions made to him as false.

26. CW-18 Mahantesh S/o Gurubhim Patil (PSI/IO) got examined as PW-10. He has deposed that on 16.11.2020 on receipt of MLC he visited Aland Govt. hospital recorded



statements of CW-1 and registered case in crime No.189/2020. He submitted FIR to the court. He identified his signature appearing on Ex. P.1. He identified FIR as Ex. P.12 and his signature appearing on it as Ex. P.12(a). He handed over further investigation to the CW-19. The defence counsel has fully cross examined him and the cross-examination of this witness is nothing but mere denial.

27. Now let me consider the other aspects of allegation made by the prosecution in respect of rashness and negligence. There is a distinction between rash act and the negligent act. In the case of rash act, the criminality lies in running the risk of doing such an act with recklessness of indifference as to the consequence. Criminal negligence is the gross and culpable neglect or failure to exercise that reasonable and proper care and precaution to guard against injury either to the public generally or to an individual in particular, which having regard to all the circumstances out of which the charge has arisen, which was the imperative duty of the accused person to have adopted. The negligence is an omission to do something which a reasonable man, guided upon considerations which ordinarily regulate the conduct of human



affairs would do, or doing something which a prudent and reasonable man would not do. A culpable rashness is acting with the consciousness that, the mischievous and illegal consequences may follow, but with the hope that they will not, and often with the belief that, the actor has taken sufficient precautions to prevent their happening. **the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Balchandra Waman Pathe V/s State of Maharashtra -1968 MAH.LJ 423 and also in AIR 2008 SC 3062 (Kuldip Singh V/s State of Himanchal Pradesh).** Held, rashness and negligence to be punishable in terms of Section 304-A must be attributed to a state of mind wherein the criminality arise because of no error in judgement, but of a deliberation in the mind risking the crime as well as the life of the person may lose his life as a result of the crime. Hence, the criminality under Section 279/304-A of Indian Penal Code may be that apart from any mens rea where there is no any motive or intention, still a person may venture or practice such a rashness or negligence which may endanger the human life. The word 'negligence' denotes and should be used only to denote such blameworthy inadvertence. There is no criminal liability for harm caused by mere inadvertence. It may amount to civil negligence and the aggrieved party can sue for damages as



tort.

28. The prosecution papers merely attribute lack of care on the part of the accused. To constitute an offence punishable under Section 304-A of Indian Penal Code, there must be gross negligence on the accused. Prosecution witnesses have not at all attributed gross culpable negligence on the part of the accused. **In the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India reported in (2005) 6 SCC 1 (Jacob Mathew v/s State of Punjab and another),** it has been held that: “ The work ‘gross’ has not been used in Section 304 A of Indian Penal Code, to be so held, must be such a high degree as to be ‘gross’. The expression ‘rash or negligent act’ as occurring in Section 304 A of the Indian Penal Code has to be read as qualified by the word ‘grossly’.” Hence, it is well-settled law that in order to attribute culpable rashness or negligence, the accused must have committed gross negligence. To impose criminal liability under Section 304-A Indian Penal Code, it is necessary that the death should have been direct result of rash and negligent act of the accused. Culpability may attach to the consequence of an error in circumstances where substandard antecedent conduct has been deliberate, and has contributed to



the generation of the error or to its outcome. In case of errors, the only failure is a failure defined in terms of the normative standard of what should have been done. There is a tendency to confuse the reasonable person with the error-free person. While nobody can avoid errors on the basis of simply choosing not to make them, people can choose not to commit violations. A violation is culpable.

29. It is to be noted that a death/injury may be caused in a road traffic accident either by the fault of the victim or by the condition of the road or by the act of God. **The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in (1980) 1 SCC 30 (Syed Akbar V/s State of Karnataka)**, has held that the error in Judgement during the driving also does not amount to culpable negligence of or rashness as required under Section 279/304-A of Indian Penal Code. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that an error of Judgement is an error which comes to light only on post accident reflection and could not be foreseen by the driver in that fragmented moment.

30. The prosecution papers attribute that, accused was driving the vehicle in question in a high speed. It is also trite that, mere



high speed is not a criterion to fasten the criminal liability regarding culpable rashness or culpable negligence. In this connection it is beneficial to refer the decision **of Hon'ble Supreme court of India with profit report in (1998) 8 SCC 493 (State of Karnataka V/s Satish) , which reads as under:** "(4) 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" 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 court 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.



31. In order to bring home the rash and negligent driving of the vehicle, there is no any evidence of independent witnesses available on record. None of the witnesses examined by the prosecution could give any indication, even approximately, as to what they meant by "High speed". The other eyewitnesses i.e., PW-7 Vidyasagar S/o Annarao Nadager and PW-8 Siddaling S/o Ladappa both have not supported the case of prosecution and thereby turned hostile. Though the learned APP cross examined them with permission of court, but fails to elicit that these witnesses have given their statements before the IO as per Ex. P.5 and 6 during the course of investigation.

32. In the instant case though the prosecution has examined the complainant as PW-1 but he has not fully supported the case in his chief-examination. But, during the course of cross-examination made by the learned APP has admitted some of the suggestions as true but he has specifically stated that ಅರೋಪಿಯ ಮುಖ ಪರಿಚಯ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಆದರೆ ರಾಹುಲ್ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು. Further more when the defence counsel has cross-examined this witness has specifically admitted that there were road breakers on both the sides of the Kodal Hangarga and due to which all the vehicles are



move in slow manner. It is further admitted that he has not personally witnessed the incident and he came to know the incident through C.W.7. The prosecution has also examined another son by name Data as P.W.2. But this witness has also identified about existence of road breakers both the sides of the Kodai Hangarga village and due to which all the vehicles are moving in slow manner. He further admitted that the deceased is his distant relative. Almost all the supported witnesses have admitted about existence of road breakers both the sides of Kodai Hangarga village. Due to the existence of road breakers or humps, makes it unlikely that the offending vehicle was moving in high speed. Both the P.W.2 and 3 have specifically admitted that " ಕೊಡಲ ಹಂಗರಗಾ ಬಸ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣದ ಬಳಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜನದಟ್ಟಣೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಎರಡೂ ಕಡೆಗೆ ರಸ್ತೆ ತಡೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ವಾಹನಗಳು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಮೃತ ಅವ್ವಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಊರಿನವರೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ದೂರದ ಸಂಬಂಧಿ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ". In addition to these admissions given by the distant relatives and blood relatives goes to show that the place of incident is a busiest place and by the sides of bus stand there are shops and always presence of number of people. Under facts and circumstances of the case it is difficult to accept that the deceased Avvamma would have gone t near to the public place to attend nature call appears to be unnatural does not



inspire confidence. Moreover the IO has not mentioned the distance of place of occurrence from road in the map drawn at the time of conducting of spot panchanama.

33. It is wonder to note that the P.W.9 investigation officer in his chief examination has deposed the ಪಂಚನಾಮೆ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪಘಾತಪಡಿಸಿದ ಲಾರಿ ನಂ: ಕೆಎ-05/ಎಂಸಿ- 0130 ನ್ನು ಆರ್ ಟಿ ಓ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಾಗಿ ತಡೆ ಹಿಡಿದೆನು. But in the instant case, there is no any such lorry involved. Hence, the evidence of investigation officer about seizure lorry is seriously fatal to the case of prosecution. Further this witness in his cross-examination has admitted that ಬಸ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣದ ಇರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಎರಡು ಬದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ತಡೆಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ತಡೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ವಾಹನಗಳು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಚಲಿಸುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ.

34. On over all careful scrutiny of the oral as well as documentary evidence this court is of the considered view that, it is not clear that on whose fault accident in question occurred. In the absence of cogent and corroborative and clinching evidence, the mere evidence of the official witnesses will not come to the aid of prosecution in proving the guilt of the accused. Hence, prosecution has miserably fails to prove guilt of the accused



beyond reasonable doubt about the rash and negligent act. Hence, by extending benefit of doubt towards the accused, he is entitled acquittal. **Accordingly the points No.1 and 2 is answered in Negative.**

35. **POINT NO.3:-** In view of my findings on the aforesaid point No.1 and 2, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Acting under Section 255[1] of Criminal Procedure Code accused is acquitted of the offences punishable U/Sec.279, 304-A of Indian Penal Code.

Bail bond and surety bond of accused shall be continued for the period of 6 months as per Section 437(A) of Cr.P.C.

(Dictated to the Stenographer on Computer directly, typed by him, Judgment corrected and signed by me, then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the **15th day of July - 2026**)

(SUMAN CHITARGI)
PRL.CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC
ALAND

<><><>

**ANNEXURE****Witnesses examined for the prosecution:**

- PW1 : Shrishail S/o Ramachandra.
PW2 : Datta S/o Shrimant Melinkeri.
PW3 : Shivaraj S/o Hucchanna Nadageri.
PW4 : Surendrakumar S/o Shankarrao Sulepet.
PW5 : Chittappa S/o Revanappa.
PW6 : Arunkumar S/o Ramachandra.
PW7 : Vidyasagar S/o Annarao Nadageri.
PW8 : Siddaling S/o Ladappa.
PW9 : Manjunath S/o Narayanappa.
PW10: Mahantesh S/o Gurubhim Patil.

Ex.documents marked for the prosecution:

- Ex.P1 : Complaint.
Ex.P1(a & b): Signatures.
Ex.P2 : Inquest panchanama of Avvamma.
Ex.P2(a) : Signature.
Ex.P3 : Spot panchanama.
Ex.P3(a) : Signature.
Ex.P4 : Statement of PW4.
Ex.P5 : PM Report(**Marked with Consent**).
Ex.P5(a) : Signature.
Ex.P6 : Signature of PW7.
Ex.P7 : Statement of PW8.
Ex.P8 & Ex.P9 : Reports.
Ex.P8(a) & Ex.P9(a): Signatures.
Ex.P10 : Indemnity Bond.



Ex.P10(a) : Signature.

Ex.P11 : Motor Vehicles Accident Report.

Ex.P11(a) : Signature.

Ex.P12 : FIR.

Ex.P12(a) : Signature.

List of the MOs marked on behalf of the prosecution:

-Nil-

Witness/Ex.Documents marked for the accused:

-Nil-

Date: 15.07.2026.

**(SUMAN CHITARGI)
PRL.CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC
ALAND**

Dictated on : 15.07.2026.

Checked on : 15.07.2026.

Signed on :15.07.2026.

**(SUMAN CHITARGI)
PRL.CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC
ALAND**