

KAMS010036992020



SC/137/2020

**IN THE COURT OF THE IV ADDL. DISTRICT &
SESSIONS JUDGE: MYSURU.**

::PRESENT::

Sri Anantha H. B.Sc., LL.B., PGDCL & IPR.,

Dated this the 31st day of July 2026

SC/137/2020

Complainant : The State by
Lakshmipuram Police Station,
Mysuru City.

(By Public Prosecutor)

V/s

Respondent: Sri. Rehaman Sharif
S/o Gouse Sharif,
Aged about 28 years
Residing at
No.167/1, 1st Cross,
Haleem Nagara,
Bannimantap,
Mysuru city.

(By Sri M.K.N.,-Adv)

Date of offence	:	23.03.2019
Date of report of offence	:	21.08.2019
Date of arrest of accused	:	27.03.2019
Date of release of Accused on bail	:	17.01.2020
Name of the Complainant	:	Smt.Prabha
Date of commencement of recording of evidence	:	15.04.2021
Date of closing of recording evidence	:	02.03.2026
Offence/s complained of	:	U/Sec.392, 450 and 302 of IPC.
Opinion of the Judge :		Accused person is Acquitted.

(Anantha H)

IV Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Mysuru.

J U D G M E N T

This is the case in which the Police Inspector of Lakshmipuram Police Station has filed the Charge-

Sheet against the Accused for the offences punishable U/Sec.392, 450 and 302 of IPC.

2. The brief facts of the case of the prosecution are as hereunder:

It is the case of the prosecution that on 21.08.2019 at 7.30 a.m., within the jurisdiction of the Lakshmipuram Police Station, when deceased Smt. Nagarathna was alone in the house, brushing her teeth in the bathroom, the accused trespassed into the house, came behind her, held her hands tightly, stuffed a cloth into her mouth and snatched 7 gold bangles weighing 100 grams from her hands. The said bangles were hidden in a place adjacent to the compound on the pedestrian road of Manuvan Park on Narasaraja Road, the said accused had forcibly stuffed a cloth into the mouth of Smt.Nagarathna, and since then she had been suffering from breathing problems. On 23.08.2019 at 7.30 pm, she had breathing problems and asked for

pills, by the time CW1 brought the pills, she collapsed and died. As per opinion of medical report, the death of the said deceased was due to breathing problems due to the accused stuffing a cloth tightly into her mouth, therefore accused has committed the offences punishable U/Sec.392, 450 and 302 of IPC.

3. After the investigation, the Charge-Sheet came to be filed against the Accused, the Jurisdictional Magistrate has taken cognizance U/Sec.392, 450 and 302 of IPC and registered a case in C.C.No.6241/2019 on the file of the learned VIII *Addl.I Civil* Judge and JMFC., Mysuru and accused is on bail, and as per Sec.209 of Cr.P.C., the case was committed to Prl.District and Sessions Judge, Mysuru and same has been made over to this Court for Trial.

4. All the prosecution papers supplied to the Accused as contemplated under Section 207 of Cr.P.C.

5. My predecessor framed the charges against the Accused U/Sec.392, 450 and 302 of IPC read over and explained to the Accused in the language known to him, the Accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried, therefore, the Trial is conducted.

6. To prove the guilt of the Accused, the prosecution examined 16 witnesses as PW.1 to 16 and got marked the documents at Exs.P1 to Exs.P27 and material objects as Mo-1 on its behalf. After closure of the prosecution evidence, the Accused was examined under Sec.313 of Cr.P.C., for the charges leveled against him and the incriminating prosecution evidence, the Accused has answered in denial form and he has not produced any evidence on his behalf.

7. Heard arguments, perused the materials on record.

8. On the basis of the above facts, the following points have arisen for my determination :-

1. Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that, on 21.08.2019 at 7.30 a.m., committed house trespass by entering into house No.1079, situated at Chamarajapuram on Narasaraj Road, unlawfully, being the residential house in possession of complainant and her deceased mother to commit the offence of robbery and thereby committed an offence punishable U/Sec. 450 of I.P.C.?
2. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond reasonable doubt that, on the above said date, time and place, by committing criminal trespass into the house of CW1 complainant, committed robbery of 7 golden bangles weighing 100 gms worn by deceased Nagarathna by filling cloth in her mouth and thereby committed an offence punishable under Sec.392 R/w Sec.511 of IPC?
3. Whether the prosecution further proves beyond reasonable doubt that, on the above said date, time and place, because of robbing of Nagarathna's bangles worn by her by filling cloth in her mouth suffered breathing problem, breathed her last breath on 23.08.2019 at 7.30 p.m., and caused her murder and thereby

committed an offence punishable
under Section 302 of IPC ?

4. What Order?

9. My answers to the above points are as
hereunder:

Point No.1 : In the **Negative**

Point No.2 : In the **Negative**

Point No.3 : In the **Negative**

Point No.4 As per final order,
for the following:

:: R E A S O N S ::

10. Point Nos.1 to 3 : Since all these points are
interconnected same are taken up together for
discussion to avoid repetition of facts.

11. During arguments learned Public Prosecutor
has argued contending that though prosecution case
is based on circumstantial evidence the prosecution
has produced sufficient evidence to show that on
21.08.2019 at 7.30 a.m., within the jurisdiction of
the Lakshmipuram Police Station, when the deceased
Smt.Nagarathna was alone in the house, was
brushing her teeth in the bathroom, the accused

trespassed into the said house, came her behind, held her hands tightly, stuffed a cloth into her mouth and snatched 7 gold bangles weighing 100 grams from her hands and the Accused hidden said bangles in a place adjacent to the park compound at the place situated near the pedestrian road of Manuvan Park Compound on Narasaraja Road, and further argued that the accused had forcibly stuffed a cloth into the mouth of deceased Smt. Nagarathna, and since then she suffered from breathing problems, and she had not taken any treatment. On 23.08.2019 at 7.30 pm, deceased had breathing problems and asked for pills, by the time CW1 brought the pills, she collapsed and died. The cause of death in the medical report reveals that the death of the deceased was due to breathing problems as the accused stuffed a cloth tightly into her mouth. Therefore, all the witnesses of the prosecution have supported the prosecution case and there are no

material contradictions in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses. Hence, prosecution has produced sufficient material to show that the accused has committed the offences punishable under Sections 392, 450 and 302 of IPC. Hence, accused is liable for conviction for the said offences.

12. On the other hand, learned counsel for the accused has argued stating that there is no any mens-rea to the accused to cause murder of the deceased and there are many contradictions in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses and in the case of circumstantial evidence prosecution has to produce evidence without any break in the chain of circumstances, but in the present case prosecution has failed to produce evidence connecting all the links in the chain of circumstances, only on the basis of the evidence regarding mahazers and motive involvement of accused cannot be inferred. Therefore, evidence produced by the prosecution is not

sufficient to show that the accused has committed the offence alleged against him. It is further submitted that the postmortem report reveals that the death of deceased is due to **cardiac arrest** as a result of coronary artery insufficiency consequent to coronary artery decreased. Hence, prayed for acquittal of the accused.

13. On perusal of the evidence produced by prosecution it appears that out of the 24 witnesses examined by the prosecution PW.1- Dr.Dayanand R, who conducted postmortem on deceased Nagarathna, aged about 84 years, on receipt of requisition from Police Inspector, Lakshmipuram Police Station on 24.08.2019 conducted the postmortem between 12.00 noon to 1.00 p.m. postmortem stain present on the back of the dead body and fixed rigor martius present all over the body, eyes closed, pupils dilated and fixed, mouth closed, dentures present in both jaws, lips, gums,

tongue and oralmucose intact, fecal stains present around anus, buttocks and perineum. The external injuries are contusion measuring 1 x 1 cms on the right cheek; situated 1 cm outer to left angel of mouth; Contusion measuring 2 x 1.8 cms on the outer aspect of left elbow. On internal examination scalp and skull intact, membrane intact and spinal cord, edemavoul and congested, on examination thorax, chest walls, ribs and sternum intact, pleura and cavity intact, laryns and trachia intact, right an left lungs congested, edemavoul, cut section exudus forthy blood, pericardium hard and large vessels heard weights 350 gms, epicardial fat increased, left ventrical-1.2 cms and right rentacle 0.5 cms. All coronary arties thicken and calcified with left interior descending more than 90 % occulded, left circumflem more thjan 70-80% occluded, right coronary – 60-70% occluded, reddish discoloration present in left ventricular wall in interior wall.

Laternal was and interior wall over an are of 6 x 8 cms. Abdomen-wall intact, territonium intact, mouth tharynx and oesophages intact, liver congested, spleen congested, genito urinary system, both kidneys congested bladder intact and empty, all injuries anti mortem, and continuous contusions are bluish in colour, on investigation blood and viscera collected and sent to RFSL for chemical analysis through concerned police and piece of brain, each lung, dissected heart, spleen, half of each kidney, uterus with adneca collected and sent for histopathologist and cloths handed over to the concerned police in a sealed cover with sample seal and issued postmortem report as per Ex.P1 and on 28.10.2019 received the RFSL and HP report, opined that death of the deceased **is due to cardiac arrest** as a result of **coronary artery insufficiency consequent to coronary artery decreased** and there are contusions present over right cheek and left

elbow, it is also mentioned there is possibility of **cardiac arrest due to stress caused by assault cannot be ruled out** and deposed that aforesaid contusions are possible if a person is gagged the mouth by cloth by using force and because of this stress and shock may be the reason for cardiac arrest.

14. In the cross-examination the PW1 has admitted that his over all opinion with regard to the death of the deceased is due to cardiac arrest and also admits that infirmities in the body of the deceased might have been caused due to her age as it is mentioned as 84 years and heart diseases may be due to age factor and external **injuries might have been caused due to blood force or some other reason and deposed that as per question posed by the Investigating Officer he answered the injuries might have been caused by using force, and he also admits that due to age factor**

victim Nagarathna might have suffered heart attack and died and he also admits that the word used by him as “assault” in the report is mentioned by him as per the information furnished by the Investigating Officer.

15. PW.2 namely Prabhavathi who speaks about complaint and place of incident, who is daughter of the deceased and wife of CW7 and she knows the Accused from his childhood and he is selling fruits on pushcart and used to park said cart in the vacant place next to her house at about 8.00 p.m. and take same at 8.00 a.m., about two years back she used to reside with her husband, and mother who is aged about 83 years and on 21.08.2019 when she went to walk by 7.00 a.m and returned by 8.15 a.m., at that time her husband and mother were in the home and her mother informed her that **when she was brushing her teeth by opening door a person came by wearing helmet**

and gagged her mouth with cloth and threatened her and snatched her 7 gold bangles and her husband was taking rest as he underwent eye surgery and his mother underwent waist surgery(ಸೊಂಟದ ಮೂಳೆ), **her mother was as usual, she** went to Police Station between 8.30-9.00 p.m., before she lodge complaint Ex.P4 her brother lodged complaint, therefore, police came to her house and conducted mahazar and went off and then again conducted mahazar Ex.P5 between 10.00-11.00 a.m., and police seized the cloth from bathroom which used to close her mother's mouth which is underwear marked as per MO-1. **The said bangles were purchased by her sister which stands in her name, once she purchased 4 bangles and then 3 bangles and gave to her mother and Priyanka is her daughter, deposed that her daughter had not given bangles to her mother.** She came to know that on the same day Accused came to their house

and committed theft of her mother's bangles as the said incident was recorded in CCTV fixed at Omkar motors and **she identified the accused on the basis of his walking styles and cloths and on the same day the police seized the bangles from the possession of the Accused** and they were in Police Station and they took the possession of said bangles and she identified the bangles appearing in photographs which are marked as Ex.P6 and 7, Ex.P8 photo is her house, Ex.P9 is photo of her mother showing the place of incident **and after two days of incident her mother died due to chest pain and due to alleged incident her mother suffered from chest pain and then she took her to Hospital, in the Hospital her mother died.** She further deposed that she informed the said matter on 24th to police which is marked at Ex.P10, **after the incident her mother was speaking as usual for one day,** on second day of incident she faced some problem, she

deposed that there are two main doors to their house, i.e. one door towards road/garage and another door is backside and the Accused entered the house from door situated near garage and next to their house there was CCTV at Omkar motors and in **the said CCTV footage she noticed a person got opened the door through her mother in the morning hours and got removed her mother's golden bangles** and police shown the said CCT V footages to her and Ex.P12 CD played before the witness through laptop, she identified footages, said CD is marked as Ex.P18 **the person seen in CCTV footage is the Accused present before the Court, she knew the Accused since he was 9 year old** and Accused was doing fruit selling business and used to park his pushcart in the vacant place next to her house and she further stated that she had given further statement before the police and witness identified the photos of golden bangles in Ex.P6 and 7.

16. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined the witness in which she admitted that the accused father used to do fruit business, as his father was suffering from leg pain his son i.e. his son was continued the same and he used to put water to plants in her house when they were not in the home and she admits that the Accused used to sell the fruits from 9.00 am to 6.00 pm, and admits that the incident took place on **19.08.2019, on that day she went for a walk during morning hours, again she deposed that the incident was not took place 19.08.2019 as she admits, but the incident took place on 21.08.2019 and she went to walk at 7.00 a.m. in the morning to the park in front of their house and returned between 7.45 am and 8.00 am**, at that time her husband was at home, he had undergone an eye surgery, hence he was taking rest and her mother was there and she also admits that due to old age of her mother she fell down in the year

2019 in the month of July or August and sustained injury to waist and she under went to surgery at JSS Hospital and she used to walk with the help of walker and she pleaded ignorance as she was not there that when the Accused came the gate was opened and her husband was walking inside the compound and before she came to home her brother lodged complaint as he is residing behind their house and **as her mother went to his home** and informed the same and she has not given the complaint but her brother gave complaint, and police came at 12.00 noon and conducted mahazar and she admits that at the time of spot mahazar herself and her mother were there and admits that as per the bills produced **before the Court her daughter purchased 7 bangles** and admits that she admits that police enquired where is CCTV nearby, then she replied as Omkar motors and police shown CCTV footages at 12 noon and the boys working at Omkar motors shown

her CCTV footages and in the said CCTV footage she noticed coming by opening gate, then went to passage and then went to garage and then trespassed into house and she also admits that she is unable to identify the person who came inside as he was wearing helmet and she admits that from his voice her mother identified the Accused, but in the CCTV footage voice is not clear and when he came inside and through his voice her mother identified the Accused. **She admits that she saw the CCTV footages of morning 21.08.2019. She admits that as the person who came inside was wearing helmet she was unable to identify the person and she also admits that they did not know who snatched the bangles when they lodged complaint and in the evening police informed that they found the thief and also gold bangle. She further admits that her mother died after two days. She also admits that as her mother was fine she did**

not admit her to Hospital and she also admits that before incident also her health was good. She also admits that after 2 days of alleged incident her mother suffered from chest pain and she died due to alleged incident, then they took her to Hospital, there she died. She also admits that she has given complaint as per Ex.P 10 and she went to medical stores to bring calcium tablet, as the accused gagged the cloth inside her mother's mouth she was suffering from ulcer and her mother was shocked and admits that at the time of giving complaint they were not aware who snatched the gold bangles, but by evening police informed that they found thief and secured the gold bangles and she also admits that her mother died after two days of the incident and after the incident her mother was alright therefore she has not taken her mother to Hospital. She admits that after two days of alleged incident her mother

suffered chest pain, then they took her to Hospital, due to the alleged incident she sustained heart attack, then they took her to Hospital but the Doctors declared as dead and she gave complaint as per Ex.P10. She further admits **that she went to Lakshmidevi medicals to bring calcium tablets by walk alone as Accused gagged cloths into her mother was mouth she suffered from ulsar** and she has not provided treatment for the same and her mother was under shock, hence heart attack was occurred, she also admits that there is a developers office on the first floor of their house which was given on rent and to go to said 1st floor stair case is inside the compound, and has to enter first floor immediately after opening the gate. She admits that the police informed that gold bangles are found she also admits that the place where the Accused parked the pushcart put in pit, that is public place, she denies that a person wearing

helmet came inside the gate and claimed stairs and she denies she is unable to say the said person is only the Accused person and denies that in the CCTV footage date and time is appearing i.e. 20.08.2019 timings 18.41 hours which is of previous day and also denied in the CCTV footage date and time is appearing 20.08.2019 at 6.41 p.m.

17. PW3 Maheshwara deposed that she knows CW1 and 2 and CW1 is residing at Chamarajapuram, on 21.08.2019 at about 7.00 a.m., police conducted a mahazar near CW1's house for one hour and took his signature on the said mahazar regarding committing theft of seven gold bangles from CW1's mother in that house and CW3 also signed the same and he further admits that the police have not seized any material in the spot, The witness identified the underwear MO-1 and admits that the police seized MO-1 underwear which was fallen on the spot and police obtained the CCTV camera footage from

Omkar Car showroom and drawn panchanama Ex.P 11 and in the CCTV footage there was record of one person went to CW-1's house and identified the accused is appearing in the CCTV footage and identified the CD as per Ex.P12 and identified the person appeared in the CCTV is the Accused present before the Court and took the same on 22.08.2019 evening 3-4 p.m., and he signed the Ex.P 7 mahazar and identified the Ex.P9 photo taken at the time of mahazar and deposed that if CD played in the court he can identify the person. CD is played through computer in the Court and witness identified the footages.

18. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner cross-examined the witness. In the cross-examination the witness admits that when he had been to walk, he met police and they called him to come to Police Station and he went to Police Station he further admits that police took him to show the

CCTV footages and admits that Police have shown CCTV footages to him and he has forgotten the date displayed which displayed on the CCTV footage.

19. PW4 Srikanth who is working at Omkareshwara Car showroom next to house of CW1 and he came to know that one person trespassed into CW1's house and snatched the seven gold bangles by gagging cloth into the mouth of CW1's mother and police came near the house of CW1 at about 9.00-9.30 a.m., and conducted mahazar and took his signature and CW2 also signed along with him and at the time of mahazar CW1 and her mother were present and he deposed that police have not seized any material object from the spot and he has not identified MO-1 underwear. At this stage, learned Public Prosecutor cross-examined him after treating him as hostile witness with the permission of the Court, during the course of cross-examination he admitted that the police seized MO-1 underwear at

the time of mahazar and he came to know from CW1 that the said cloth was gagged into CW1's mother's mouth and as he did not enter the said house he do not know the cloth, MO-1 was shown outside.

20. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined and elicited **that he knew CW1 and police informed him about theft committed in CW1's house. PW4 admits that in Ex.P9 photo himself and PW3 are not appearing and he admitted** that the police obtained his signature on the spot mahazar when he was standing outside the house of CW1 and police shown MO-1 cloth outside the house and he pleaded ignorance about the person who gave MO-1 to police and police seized the said cloth and he pleaded ignorance about what police did inside the house and he admits that he was not present at the time of conducting mahazar and he denied that he is deposing falsely about the theft of bangles from the house of CW1.

21. PW5 Chandrashekar deposed that he know the Accused and he is working as driver in Omkar Car showroom and opposite the said show room he was doing fruit selling business and CW1's house is next to showroom and CW5 is also working in the showroom, then on 22.08.2019 between 3.30-4.40 p.m, mahazar was drawn near Accused handcart opposite to house of PW1 and Accused hidden the bangles in a pit and accused produced the same before the police and police seized the said bangles and drawn panchanama Ex.P13 and took his signature and identified the bangles in Ex.P6 and 7 and deposed that CW5 also signed Ex.P13 and identified the photo Ex.P14 was taken at the time of mahazar and identified photo of himself and CW5.

22. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined the witness and he admits that in his office CCTV is in working condition all the time and admits that mahazar was conducted on 22nd and he went to

the spot where mahazar was conducted and CW5 accompanied him and he pleaded ignorance about name of the police persons and admits that Accused fruit stall was next to public road and Accused hidden bangles in pit and there were other fruit stalls also and police took the Accused along with bangles and he denied the Accused was not present at the spot and police seized bangles as produced by the Accused and police have not written any mahazar and he admits Ex.P14 photo there are public and gold bangles are not appearing in Ex.P14 and deposed that bangles were beneath the stone and he admits that pit is not appearing in the photo and also no fruit stall is appearing in the photo. The learned Public Prosecutor cross-examined him in which he denied he do not remember the date of mahazar whether it is 21.08.2019 or 22.08.2019 and he deposed he do not remember the date hence he deposed date as 22.08.2019.

23. PW6 Manoj deposed that he knows the Accused and deposed that he is selling fruits in pushcart in front of Court and he is also selling tea in pushcart and he deposed that Accused used to do business from 9.00 a.m. to 3.30 or 4.00p.m and he used to do business between 9.00 a.m to 5.30 p.m and the Accused used to park the pushcart in the compound of a house situated next to Omkar motors and car shop and the Accused used to take pushcart at 9.00 a.m. and park the same at 3.30-4.00 p.m. and next to Accused pushcart, his brother was also selling fruits in pushcart and in the house where the Accused was parking the pushcart grandmother and her daughter were living and he came to know about 3 years back that the Accused committed theft of golden bangles of old woman from the house where he used to park the pushcart.

24. Learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined the witness and he admits that he do not

know the name of the house owner and the Accused used to park the pushcart in the compound of said the house and from his shop the house of aged woman is also appearing and also the people who go and come also visible and he deposed that he applied holiday on previous day, next and day of incident, then he opened his tea stall after two days and a boy namely Karthik who is working in Car showroom called him over phone and informed that bangles of old woman were stolen and then he visited the said place at 3.00 to 3.30 p.m., then he returned to house and Keerthi kumar informed that Accused committed theft of old woman's bangles, **but he do not know the date and said Keerthi kumar informed the same at 12.00 noon and denied there is ill-will between himself and the Accused and deposing falsely to get convict the Accused.**

25. **PW7** Mahadevu deposed that CW9 is his brother and he is doing cut fruit selling business

infront of Manu park since 18 years from 10.00 a.m to 6.00 p.m., and CW9 Praksash shop is next to his shop and Accused also doing fruit selling business and used to park his pushcart in the compound of a house and he knew the persons who are in the house and police informed him on 20.08.2019 that theft has committed in the house inside the compound and he do not know the names of persons who are in the house and he has given the statement before the police and he came to know that Accused has committed theft.

26. The learned Public Prosecutor cross-examined him after obtaining permission from the Court to treat him as partly hostile witness in which he admits that he came to know that on 21.08.2019 at about 7.30 a.m., when Nagarathna was alone in the house Accused trespassed into the house and snatched 7 gold bangles by gagging cloth to her mouth.

27. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined the witness he admits **that on 20.08.2019 the incident taken place and on that day also he opened his shop at 10.00 a.m.,** and Nagarathnamma used to be alone and he pleaded ignorance that on the day of incident also she was alone and he admits that on the day of incident he did not go near her house and on the date of incident police came near his shop and he gave statement there and he **admits that he deposed as per say of police and he admits that he has not witnessed the incident.**

28. PW8 Prakash deposed that PW7 is his brother and he is doing cut fruit business every day from 10.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m., in front of old court in front of Manuvana park since 18-20 years. CW8 Mahadevu is also doing same business and Accused is also doing fruit business and Accused used to park his pushcart next to park in the compound of

Nagarathna's house. He came to know from police on 21.08.2019 that in Nagarathna's house theft is committed and he gave statement before the police and he came to know that Accused committed theft.

29. The learned Counsel for the Accused has cross-examined the witness in which he admits that himself, Mahadevu and Accused were doing fruit business, on 21.08.2019 incident took place, on that day also he came at 10.00 a.m near shop and he do not know Nagarathna, he came to know her through police, he came to know that the Accused has committed theft through neighbors and police and at the time of incident he was not present at the spot, on the day of incident itself police took his statement between 11.00 to 12.00 p.m., and CW8 **signed at Police Station and he also signed in the typed matter and as he do not know reading and writing he do not know the contents in it.**

30. PW9 Smt.Priyanka deposed that deceased Nagarathna is her grandmother, on 21.08.2019 at about 8.30 a.m., when her grandmother Nagarathana was in house No.1079 situated near Chamarajapuram Court, one person who was wearing helmet trespassed into home and gagged cloth into her mouth and snatched bangles from her hand, on that day in the afternoon her grandmother only informed the same, at that time she was at Bengaluru, she did not come to Mysuru, then on 23.08.2019 her grand mother Nagarathna died in the Hospital and then she came to Mysuru and as the person who was wearing helmet gagged cloth to her mouth due to respiratory problem her grandmother was admitted to Hospital and she died there. On the day of indent her mother and grandmother were living together, at the time of incident she came to know that her mother had been to walk, after the death of her grandmother she saw the dead body at

JSS Hospital, then inquest panchanama was conducted at K.R.Hospital, Mysuru, at that time herself, Ramya, Srikanth and Harish were present and she gave the statement, and Doctor informed that as the cloth was gagged there was throat infection, hence she died and on the date of incident itself she came to know that accused snatched the bangles by gagging cloth to her grandmother's mouth, now Ramya and Srikanth are at foreign and Harish is at Bengaluru and herself, Ramya and Srikanth signed the inquest mahazar Ex.P15 and she identified the signature of Srikanth and Ramya.

31. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined and the witnesses admitted that on the day of incident her grandmother and her mother informed her about the incident and her grandmother is aged about 85-86 years and she was not facing any health issues and after grandmother's death she went to JSS Hospital and came to know

the matter and her grandmother has not undergone any treatment before this incident and her statement was recorded in K.R.Hospital, Mysuru and she admits that there is no sign in Ex.P15 and on 24.08.2019 after noon took her signature for identification of dead body and on 23.08.2019 her grandmother was dead and on the same day she came to Mysuru. She admits that her mother and grandmother **informed that Accused committed theft, but did not say how they came to know he is the persons who committed the theft. She admits that there is a property dispute between her mother and her brother.**

32. PW10 Vipul Shah, who is owner of Car showroom deposed that his shop is opposite Maduvana park and he has installed CCTV camer inside as well as outside the shop in the year 2018 and Meher Ahmed installed the same to his shop. In the year 2019 as theft was committed in the next

house asked CCTV footage and at that time he asked Mehar Ahmed to get CCTV footage, at that time in the presence of police copied the CCTV footage to CD and gave CD to police and the police wrote the same and took his signature i.e. Ex.P11 and he admits that in the CCTV footage he noticed some unknown person entering into next house by wearing helmet and said CD is Ex.P12.

33. The learned Counsel for Accused cross-examined the witness in which he admits that he returned from mumbai on 21.08.2019 at 12.00 noon, on the same day between 8.30 to 9.00 a.m he received the information over phone, police called him over phone and asked for CCTV footage, since 2006 he is running shop, Mehar Ahamed copied the CCTV footage and he only installed the CCTV camera, but there is no bill in that regard and admits that they closed the shop in the year 2022. On 21.08.2019 at about 12.00 noon he watched the

CCTV footage, in that footage one person passed by wearing helmet and he do not remember what kind of cloths worn by him and there is no specific mark to identify Ex.P12, he admits that company CD is available in shops, and admits nothing is written on Ex.P12, he pleaded ignorance about identification of Ex.P12 as there is no specific mark and he do not know the name of the deceased and he admits that there were 3 persons living in the said house, but he do not know their names. He admits that on the first floor of the building builder was residing, on the said floor owner of Sindur enterprises was living and admits that he was doing real estate business. He pleaded ignorance that often people were coming to Sindur enterprises and admits he do not know any other persons except person who was wearing helmet in Ex.P12.

34. PW11 Mehar Ahamed, CCTV technician deposed in his evidence that he know the shop which

is under the ownership of Vipul Shah of Chamarajanapuram and doing business in the name and style of Omkar motors, he know Omkar motors since 6 years and about 4-5 years back one day Vipul shah called him to shop and asked to get CCTV footage in CD, at that time he copied CCTV footage to CD i.e. CCTV footage of 21.08.2019 and he identified Ex.P16 i.e. 65B certificate and he admits that he saw in CCTV footage one person who was wearing jerkin or jacket went inside the house of alleged incident as he was very far not able to identify whether the dress is jerkin or jacket and said mahazar is identified as Ex.P 11 and CD as Ex.P 12.

35. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined in which he stated that he is doing work of installing CCTV and he has no licence in that regard. He admits that he sell and install the CCTV and his shop name is SS electrical and it is at Alanahalli, since 3 years he is running said shop and he use to

issue the bill for installing CCTV, but he has no bill regarding installation of CCTV at CW6 shop. He came to know about the death on the next day, but he do not know the date, CW6 Vipul shah called him and informed about the case and asked to get the CCTV footage, he called between 11.00-12.00 p.m., after lapse of one hour he went to the spot and copied CCTV-footages to pen-drive, then to CD, then copied to DVD and admits that he do not remember date on which he copied the CCTV footages to DVD and he admits that he handed over the DVD to police on 22.08.2019 near Vipul shah's Showroom, at that time took his signature and he admits that in the CCTV footage a person who was wearing helmet entered inside the house and he admits that he is unable to identify the person who was wearing helmet and no other person in the CCTV footage and **Vipul Shah called him on 22.08.2019 and**

informed about the incident and he admits that he obtained the CCTV footage dated 21.08.2019.

36. PW12 Sri Rajesh, Jewerly business deposed in his evidence that he is running Jewelry business in the name and style as Mani Jewelers at K.G.Koppal and about 4-5 years back Mysuru Court Judge called him and asked him to weigh 7 golden bangles and to test purity of gold and he examined golden bangles appearing in Ex.P6 and 7 and gave report as per Ex.P17 and his signature is Ex.P 17(a).

37. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined him in which he admits that the sealed bangles which he examined were opened before the Judge and admits that he has no licence to weighing machine and he further admits that which ever thing will be given he will weigh the same and he pleaded ignorance about date of testing the purity of gold bangles.

38. PW13 Sri Sudeep Kumar- police Constable deposed in his evidence that Investigating Officer deputed himself and CW22 for tracing of accused on 21.08.2019 in Cr.No. 50/2019 and they searched him near Chamaraja Mohalla, Chamarajapuram and Krishnamurthy puram and found the Accused at Ballal Circle and produced before the Investigating Officer with report as per Ex.P22 and identified the Accused before the Court.

39. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined the witness and witness admits that on 21.08.2019 at about 9.30 a.m., himself and CW22 went on two wheeler and saw the Accused near Ballal circle and he was roaming suspiciously and on seeing them started to run and hence they caught hold of him at about 1.00 p.m., and enquired him and took the Accused in their vehicle only and he denied that when Accused was unloading watermelon from Appe auto their 4 staff took him in

their jeep and he had that he denied not been to spot and caught hold of the Accused.

40. PW14 Sri N G Srihari, deposed in his evidence that deceased is his mother-in-law and on 23.08.2019 at about 7.00 p.m., he received phone call that his mother-in-law died, immediately himself, his wife, son and his daughter in law came to Mysuru at about 9.30 p.m., and came to know that one Rehaman attacked deceased Nagarathna, due to said attack she was shocked and died and inquest panchanama Ex.P15 was conducted at Mysuru JSS Hospital and he was present there and put his signature as per Ex.P15(c) and conducted mahazar at 9.30 a.m.

41. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner cross-examined wherein he admits that initially the dead body was at JSS Hospital then shifted to K.R.Hospital, Mysuru and he was present at that time and he denied that his mother-in-law was suffering

from age old diseases. He admits that his mother-in-law was walking herself with the help of walker and he also admits that he was not personally aware about the incident whatever PW2 informed and admits he has not seen the Accused earlier.

42. PW15 Gangadhara S, Police Inspector deposed in his evidence that on 21.08.2019 at about 8.45 p.m., complainant Prabha came to Police Station and produced typed complaint and received the same and registered case in Cr.No.50/2019 U/Sec. 392 of IPC and sent the FIR marked as Ex.P19 and complaint marked as Ex.P4 to the Court and his higher authorities and identified his signatures. He further deposed that he went to spot with panchas Maheshwara and Srikant in the spot shown by the complainant and conducted the mahazar Ex.P 5 between 9.00 a.m to 9.30 a.m., and seized one coffee colour Ramraj nikker type underwear marked as MO-1 and subjected the seized

material to PF No.48-A/2019 and recorded the statement of the panchanama witnesses and recorded the statement of Mohan Kumar, Mahadev, Prakash, Manoj and victim Nagarathna and deputed the staff namely Umesh and Sudeep to trace the Accused and they traced the Accused Rehaman Sharif and produced before him at about 1.30 p.m., and produced report as per Ex.P20 and identified his signature Ex.P20(a) and recorded the voluntary statement of the Accused in which he admitted that he snatched 7 gold bangles from the deceased and hidden the same by keeping same in cover and he will show the same and the voluntary statement is at Ex.P21 and his signature as per Ex.P21(a) and as per the say of Accused took panchas Chandrashekar and Abhishek to the spot which was shown by the Accused which was hidden in cover kept beneath tiles next to fruit pushcart on the footpath attached to compound situated on Narasaraja Road near Manuvana park produced 7 gold bangles from the said cover which was hidden and seized the same

under seizure mahazar between 3.45 to 4.30 p.m.,, marked as Ex.P13 and identified the photographs of 7 gold bangles marked as Ex.P6 and 7 and then subjected the seized materials under PF No.49/19 and produced before the Court and handed over the Accused for judicial custody. He further deposed that on 22.08.2019 checked the CCTV Footage fixed at Omkar Seconds Car show room in which there is record of Accused going to spot via Omkar Seconds Car showroom situated next to place of incident and in the said CCTV camera footage there is record regarding Accused walking and secured panchas Mahesh and Vipul and technician of Omkar Show room namely Mehar Ahmed copied the CCTV footage CD and he conducted the seizure panchanama and Mehar Ahamed gave 65B certificate and said CD is of Sony company and it is marked as per Ex.P12 and 18 and witness identified the photo as per Ex.P8 and subjected the seized materials under PF No.58/2019 and on the same day recorded the statement of panchas and Mehar Ahamed and identified 65B certificate as per Ex.P

16. Then on 24.08.2019 at about 8.45 a.m., complainant Prabha informed about the death of Nagarathnamma in written complaint and received the same added Sec.302 I.P.C., and requested the court to carry out investigation by adding/insulting Sec.302 of I.P.C. in the FIR and identified the written complaint as per Ex.P10 and requisition as per Ex.P 22 and on the same day went to Mysuru Medical College and secured panchas Harish, Ramya and Srikanth and conducted inquest panchanama between 9.30 to 11.30 a.m and identified the inquest panchanama as per Ex.P 15 and recorded the statement of blood relatives i.e. Priyanka, Pooja and Sukanya and gave requisition to Medical officer to conduct postmortm and then handed over the dead body to the heirs of the deceased. Then on 26.08.2019 gave requisition to PWD officer to prepare sketch of place of incident and subjected the materials seized from the deceased under PF No.54/2019 and gave requisition to Court, then sent the seized articles to RFSL for chemical examination and identified the post mortem

report as per Ex.P1 and on 16.10.2019 received the RFSL report marked as per Ex.P 3. He further deposed that on 17.10.2019 Asst.Executive Engineer produced the spot sketch marked as per Ex.P2 and further deposed that on 12.11.2019 sent the Medical officer final report regarding death of the victim to RFSL and obtained the final report as per Ex.P1. He further deposed that when he went to the spot documents pertaining to ornaments were produced i.e. 4 bills relating to 7 bangles and insurance copy which are marked as Ex.P 23 to 27 and got weighed the said bangles with the assistance of appraiser namely Rajesh and the said report is at Ex.P 17 and recorded the statement of Chandrashekar and Abhishek. As there were sufficient material against the Accused filed the charge-sheet against the Accused U/Sec. 392, 450 and 302 of I.P.C., before the Court and he also identified the Accused before the Court.

43. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined the witness in which the witness pleaded ignorance about the property dispute in deceased

Nagarathna's family and admits that in that regard he tried to collect the information but he was failed. He admits that the Accused might be doing fruit vending business in front of the court and pleaded ignorance about the Accused doing fruit vending business in the shop of deceased Nagarathna and paying Rs.70/- rent per day and he denies he has not enquired about the same and he denied that Accused doing fruit business in the shop of deceased Nagarathana and Nagarathna family members forced the Accused to vacate the said place as they are doing partition for which the Accused asked time to vacate and denies he has not enquired about the same. He deposed that after he received the complaint he enquired about the health condition of the victim and suggested to admit her to Hospital and when he enquired about the same complainant revealed that victim was under treatment at JSS Hospital and he has not obtained the documents regarding the same and admits that the victim Nagarathna may be aged more than 80 years and he denied that she was suffering from age

old ailments and he admits that he has not taken any document regarding health condition of deceased as they told her health condition was good and he admits that the postmortem report **reveals that the victim died due to heart attack**. He admits that he obtained the final opinion of Medical officer after getting FSL Report regarding the cause of death which reveals that the death of the victim is “**due to stress caused by assault**”. He denied that deceased Nagarathna died before going to JSS Hospital and he admits that Doctors obtained discharge summary of JSS Hospital before conducting postmortem. He admits that he has not produced any document relating to victim regarding undergoing treatment at JSS Hospital. He denied that as victim was not taken any treatment he has not produced any document regarding her treatment and he denied that deceased died due to old age diseases not due to assault. He denied that he has not conducted investigation properly therefore he do not know the facts. He admits that he has secured the bills standing in the name of

Puspa and Priyanka Mohan who are relatives of deceased Nagarathna. AT the time of investigation he came to know deceased was in possession of said bangles as she took them from her relatives and he admits that in that regard he has not recorded any statement. He admits that he has not recorded statement in that regard but during enquiry they revealed the same. He admits that **there weight differs as mentioned in Ex.P23 to 26**. He denied that he has not seized the bangles through mahazar and he also denied that deceased family members only produced the bangles for the purpose of case and Accused has not snatched any bangles from the deceased. **He admits that there is difference regarding time and date shown in the CCTV footage and alleged date of incident.** He pleaded ignorance about the Accused parking the pushcart in the house of Nagarathnamma and he admits that at the time of incident the husband of the complainant was present at the house and he enquired about the same, when he enquired husband of the complainant revealed that **he**

went to walk and he do not know the time when he returned to home and he denied that he has not investigated the case properly and he conducted the investigation only on the basis of say of complainant though he know the Accused is innocent. The complainant with an intention to vacate the Accused from their shop as there was family dispute false complaint is registered against him and he denied that he has not conducted the investigation properly and took the signature on mahazar at the Police Station itself and took voluntary statement of the Accused forcibly.

44. PW16 Abhishek, pancha to the seizure panchanama deposed that about 3 years back police came near Omkar Motors shop in connection of theft case and robber was also there and police shown him the thief and he identified the Accused before the Court as that person and there is CCTV install in their office and in that said CCTV footages there was record of Accused coming out of the house and identified his photo in Ex.P

14 and in the said photo the Accused is showing bangles which was hidden and the police took photo at that time.

45. The learned Public Prosecutor cross-examined him after treating him as partly hostile witness with the permission of the Court **in which he denied that 7 gold bangles were seized from the place shown by the Accused.**

46. The learned Counsel for the Accused cross-examined the witness in which he admits that there is no document to show that he was working at Omkar motors and he denied that he has not gone to Police Station and took his signature near park and he was not working at Omkar motors. He admits that he has seen the Accused present before the Court earlier and police took his signature and he admits that he do not know anything except putting **signature and pleaded ignorance about the contents of the mahazar** and he admits that at the instance of police he put signature.

47. Documents like complaint, mahazars, inquest, RFSL report, photographs, pen-drive etc., are marked as per Exs.P1 to 27.

48. The learned Public Prosecutor submits her arguments that there is sufficient evidence to show that the Accused has committed the offences alleged against him and further submits that prosecution has proved the guilt of the Accused by reading cogent and acceptable evidence and further submits that the prosecution has also proved chain of circumstances without breaking any chain and proved that the except the Accused no one has committed the offences and hence prayed to convict the accused.

49. Per contra, the learned Counsel for the Accused submits that the Accused is innocent of the offences alleged against him, learned Counsel for the Accused further submits that the entire case is based on the circumstantial evidence, there is no eye-

witness to the alleged incident, witnesses are hearsay witnesses and there are material contradictions in the evidence deposed by the witnesses. The learned Counsel for the Accused has further submitted that the seizure mahazar was also not proved by the prosecution. The learned Counsel for the Accused has further submitted that the prosecution has not proved the case as per the Judgment passed by the **Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of Sharad Birdhi Chand Sarda Vs. State of Maharashtra**. Hence, view from any angle, the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the chain of circumstances by placing the cogent evidence before this Court and accordingly prayed for acquittal of the Accused.

50. On perusal of the entire evidence of the prosecution witnesses and arguments submitted by learned Public Prosecutor and defense counsel it appears to me that the prosecution case is depending

circumstantial evidence. As rightly argued by learned counsel for the accused. When prosecution case is depending upon circumstantial evidence, link in chain of circumstances has to be proved without any break. But herein the present case, even if, it is said that the Accused trespassed into house and gagged cloth to the mouth of victim and snatched 7 gold bangles from her and even from the CC TV footages it appears that one person wearing helmet went inside the house, but no witness identified the said person as accused, since as per prosecution case itself the accused wearing helmet while entering the house and further witnesses were also deposed as the person is wearing helmet they are not in a position to say the person who entered into the house. Therefore, it cannot be said that accused himself has gagged cloth to the mouth of victim and snatched 7 gold bangles.

51. With regard to confession statement of the accused is concerned it is the case of the prosecution that on 21.08.2019 accused was arrested and when he was in custody he gave confession statement as per Ex.P21 and on the basis of the said statement, Investigating Officer has recovered the nicker(underwear) used by the accused to gag the mouth of the victim at the time of incident.

52. Furthermore, in order to prove the case of the prosecution that on the day of incident the accused gagged the mouth of the victim with underwear and snatched 7 gold bangles, as per statement marked at Ex.P.21. However, by looking to the evidence of prosecution witnesses, it appears that there is contradiction in the evidence deposed by the witnesses and voluntary statement given by the Accused marked at Ex.P.21. PW1 deposed in his evidence, that in the postmortem report it is mentioned that the death of the deceased is due to cardiac arrest as a result of

coronary artery insufficiency consequent to coronary artery decreased and there are contusions present over right cheek and left elbow, it is also mentioned there is possibility of cardiac arrest due to stress caused by assault cannot be ruled out and he has mentioned in the opinion that contusion are possible if a person is gagged the mouth by cloth by using force and because of this stress and shock may be the reason for cardiac arrest. In the cross-examination the PW1 has admitted that his over all opinion with regard to the death of the deceased is due to cardiac arrest and infirmities in the body of the deceased might have been caused due to her age as it is mentioned as 84 years and heart diseases may be due to age factor and external injuries might have been caused due to blood force or some other reasons and PW1 admits that because of age factor deceased might have suffered heart attack and died.

53. PW2 deposed in her chief examination that on 21.08.2019 when she went to walk by 7.00 a.m and

returned by 8.15 a.m., at that time her husband and mother were in the home and her mother informed her that when she was brushing her teeth by opening door a person came behind her by wearing helmet and gagged her mouth with cloth and threatened her and snatched her 7 gold bangles, it is pertinent to note that complainant did not reveal that her mother informed her that Accused is the person who committed the said offence at any point of time i.e. her mother did not identified the Accused and stated before anybody about the accused person, and not stated about identification of Accused at the time of incident while giving statement nor at the time of spot mahazar and but she deposed that she identified the accused on the basis of his walking styles and cloths in CCTV footage, which creates the doubt whether the Accused only committed theft or not. She deposed that after the incident her mother was speaking as usual for one day, on second day of incident she faced some problem, and admits that after two days of incident her mother died due to

chest pain and due to alleged incident her mother suffered chest pain and then she took her to Hospital, in the Hospital her mother died. In this regard the prosecution is miserably failed in proving the proximity of death of the deceased and alleged incident. She further deposed that police shown the said CCTV footages to her and Ex.P12 CD played before her through laptop, and for the first time she deposed that she identified footages, said CD is marked as Ex.P18. Perusal of the 65-B certificate of Indian Evidence Act, it is noted that, the same is not in the prescribed format and also he is not in conformity by 65(B)(4), and further the said certificate is cyclo-styled and semi-blank and further there is no details as found in Sec.65(B)(4) format. Hence, the entire evidence cannot be admissible and further, the mahazar witnesses to the seizure panchanama of bangles does not deposed that in their presence, the accused does not deposed that he had kept the stolen bangles beneath the tiles and further the alleged spot is also a public place.

Further in her cross-examination once she deposed that the alleged incident took place on 19.08.2019 when she went to walk, once again she deposed that on 21.08.2019 the alleged incident was taken place and there is contradiction about the date of incident as deposed by the complainant. She admits in her cross-examination that her husband under went eye surgery 2 weeks earlier to incident and taking rest and in the year 2019 in the month of July or August her mother underwent waist surgery at JSS Hospital and she used to walk with the help of walker and she further admits that after the incident her mother went to her brother's house situated behind their house and informed about the incident and his brother gave complaint to police, police conducted mahazar at 12.00 noon in the spot, but at the time of mahazar her mother did not disclose that the Accused committed the offence. She further admits that in the CCTV footage a person who came inside was wearing helmet, and she deposed in her cross-examination that her mother identified the

Accused with his voice, but her mother did not stated the same before police even at the time of conducting mahazar or at the time of lodging complaint who snatched the bangles, but she deposed in her cross-examination that her mother identified the Accused with his voice, which creates doubt about the person who snatched the bangles.

54. Therefore, when there is no eye witness to the incident and prosecutions case is totally depending upon the circumstantial evidence, the prosecution evidence is not sufficient to show that accused has committed the offences punishable under Section 392, 450 and 302 of IPC. Furthermore, even in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses there are many material contradictions regarding cause of death of deceased Nagarathna and presence of the accused at the spot on the day of incident. Therefore, evidence produced by the prosecution is not sufficient to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the accused has committed the

offences alleged against him. Hence, it is decided to acquit the accused on the benefit of doubt. Therefore, point Nos.1 to 3 are answered in the **Negative**.

55. **Point No.4:-** In view of my findings on the Point, I proceed to pass the following:

::O R D E R ::

Acting U/sec.235(1) of Cr.P.C. the Accused person is hereby **ACQUITTED** for the offence punishable U/Sec.392, 450 and 302 of I.P.C.

The Accused person shall be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case.

The order of interim custody of bangles in PF No.72/2020 passed by this Court dated 10.09.2020 is made absolute.

The bail bonds and surety bonds executed by and on behalf Accused in compliance of Section 437(A) of Cr.P.C. shall remain for a period of 6 months.

MO-1 being worthless is ordered to be destroyed after appeal period.

File be consigned to Record Room.

[Dictated to the Stenographer, directly on computer, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this the **31st** day of **July, 2026**]

(Anantha H)

IV Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Mysuru.

::ANNEXURE ::

List of Witnesses examined on behalf of Prosecution:

- P.W.1 : Dr.Dayanand R
- P.W.2 : Smt.Prabhavathi
- P.W.3 : Sri.Maheshwara
- P.W.4 : Sri Srikanth
- P.W.5 : Sri Chandrashekar
- P.W.6 : Sri Manoja
- P.W.7 : Sri Mahadevu
- P.W.8 : Sri Prakash
- P.W.9 : Smt.Priyanka
- P.W.10 : Sri Vipul Shah
- P.W.11 : Sri Mehar Ahmed
- P.W.12 : Sri Rajesh
- P.W.13 : Sri Sudeep Kumar
- P.W.14 : Sri N G Srihari
- P.W.15 : Sri Gangadhar S
- P.W.16 : Sri Abhishek

List of Witnesses examined on behalf of Accused:

- NIL -

List of Documents exhibited on behalf of Prosecution:

Ex.P1 : Postmortem Report
Ex.P1(a), : Signature of PW1
(c) and
(d)
Ex.P1(e) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P2 : Sketch
Ex.P3 : RFSL Report
Ex.P3(a) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P4 : Complaint
Ex.P4(a) : Signature of PW2
Ex.P4(b) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P5 : Mahazar
Ex.P5(a) : Signatures of PW2
Ex.P5(b) : Signatures of PW4
Ex.P5(c) : Signatures of PW15
Ex.P6 to 9: Photographs
Ex.P10 : Complaint
Ex.P10(a) : Signature of PW2
Ex.P10(b) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P11 : CD mahazar
Ex.P11(a) : Signature of PW3
Ex.P11(b) : Signatures of PW10
Ex.P11(c) : Signatures of PW11
Ex.P12 : CD
Ex.P13 : Mahazar
Ex.P13(a) : Signature of PW5
Ex.P13(b) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P13(c) : Signature of PW16
Ex.P14 : Mahazar photographs
Ex.P15 : Inquest panchanama
Ex.P15(a) : Signature of PW9
Ex.P15(b) : Signature of PW9
Ex.P15(c) : Signature of PW14

Ex.P15(d) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P16 : 65B certificates
Ex.P16(a) : Signature of PW11
Ex.P16(b) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P17 : Certificate
Ex.P17(a) : Signature of PW12
Ex.P17(b) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P18 : CD
Ex.P19 : FIR
Ex.P19(a) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P20 : Report
Ex.P20(a) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P21 : Voluntary statement of Accused
Ex.P21(a) : Signature of PW15
Ex.P22 : Permission letter
Ex.P22(a) : Signature
Ex.P23 to : Bills
27
Ex.P23(a) : Signature of PW15
to 27(a)

List of Exhibits marked on behalf of Accused:

- NIL -

List of Material Objects marked in the case:

MO-1 : Underwear

(ANANTHA H)

IV Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Mysuru.