

ASLK030014992018



APPENDIX-12

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
LAKHIMPUR, NORTH LAKHIMPUR

Present: Smti Saraswati Johori Padun, AJS
Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur, Assam

(Date of Judgment: 10-08-2026)

(G.R. Case No.484/2018)
PRC 418/2018

North Lakhimpur P.S. Case No.220/2018
under section 353/323/379/34 IPC

COMPLAINANT	STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY	Sri Ratul Dutta, Learned Asstt. P.P.
ACCUSED	A.1 Sri Bhabit Saikia S/o : Late Puneswar Saikia R/o: Moidomia PS: North Lakhimpur Dist- Lakhimpur (Assam) A.2 Smti Beli Saikia W/o : Sri Bhabit Saikia R/o: Moidomia PS: North Lakhimpur Dist- Lakhimpur (Assam)
REPRESENTED BY	Sri Satyajit Dutta, Learned Advocate accused persons

APPENDIX-13

Date of offence	02.03.2018
Date of FIR	03.03.2018
Date of Charge Sheet	31.05.2018
Date of Framing of Charges/offence explanation	11.06.2020
Date of commencement of evidence	03.09.2022
Date of argument	07.08.2026
Date on which judgment is reserved	07.08.2026
Date of Judgment	10-08-2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	Acquitted

Accused Details:

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether Acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Sec. 428 Cr.P.C.
A1	Sri Bhabit Saikia	N/A	N/A	Sec.353/323/294/34 of IPC	Acquitted	N/A	N/A
A2	Smti Beli Saikia	N/A	N/A	Sec.353/323/294/34 of IPC	Acquitted	N/A	N/A

J U D G M E N T

PROSECUTION'S CASE IN BRIEF:

1. The accused persons, Sri Bhabit Saikia and Smti Beli Saikia (hereinafter referred to as A1 & A2), stand trial for allegedly committing offences punishable under Sections 353, 323, and 294 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

BRIEF OF THE PROSECUTION CASE:

2. The case of the prosecution arises from an First Information Report (FIR) lodged on 03.03.2018 by Sri Amulya Konch (PW-1), Forest Range Officer, North Lakhimpur. The informant alleged that on 02.03.2018 at around 07:30 AM, a forest team conducted a search raid at the timber mill/depot owned by the accused persons at Charaimoria/Moidomia to check for illegal logs. Upon attempting to seize unauthorized timber, the accused persons allegedly formed a common intention, misbehaved using obscene words, physically obstructed the forest officials from performing their official duties, and assaulted a departmental laborer to prevent the removal of materials.
3. On receipt of the F.I.R, a case being numbered as North Lakhimpur P.S Case No.220/2018, u/s-353/323/379/34 of IPC was registered and the investigation was carried out by A.S.I. Sri Deepjyoti Bharali. After conclusion of the investigation, the I.O. submitted charge sheet against A-1

& A-2 for the offences punishable under section 353/323/379/34 of I.P.C.

4. Based on the charge-sheet cognizance u/s-353/323/294/34 of IPC was taken against the accused persons. A-1 & A-2 were summoned and upon appearance of A-1 & A-2, they were allowed to go on bail and copies of relevant documents were furnished to them u/s 207 Cr.P.C. Considering the materials on record and after hearing both the parties, particulars of offence u/s 353/323/294/34 IPC was read over and explained to them, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.
5. The prosecution in support of its case examined five witnesses whereas the defence did not adduce any evidence. The statement of A-1 & A-2 u/s-313 Cr.P.C were recorded. They denied all the allegations and pleaded innocent.

POINT FOR DETERMINATION:

6. Upon hearing and on perusal of record this Court has framed the following points for determination:
 - I. Whether A-1 & A-2, in furtherance of their common intention, on 02.03.2018 at about 07:30 a.m., used criminal force against the informant and his staff, who are public servant and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s 353/34 of IPC?

- II. Whether A-1 & A-2, on the same date, time and place, in furtherance of their common intention, voluntarily caused hurt to the labour who was taken by the informant and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s-323/34 of IPC?
- III. Whether A-1 & A-2, in furtherance of their common intention, on the same date, time and place, had abused/rebuked to the informant with obscene words in a public place causing annoyance informant and others and thereby committed offence punishable u/s 294/34 IPC?

DISCUSSION OF EVIDENCE, DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF:

7. The depositions of the prosecution witnesses are reproduced herein below for ready reference.
8. PW-1 Sri Amulya Konch in his evidence deposed that he is the informant of this case and he knows the accused persons. About 3 years ago, a minor argument took place between the accused persons and a person named Dipak, who is a laborer in their department, at the Timber Depot. Following that, he filed a first information report (FIR) at the police station regarding this incident. Exhibit P-1/PW-1 is the FIR submitted by him and Exhibit P-1(1) is his signature on it. After filing the said FIR, the dispute between them and the accused persons was mutually

resolved and settled between both parties through a compromise. For this reason, he does not wish to pursue this case further.

9. In cross-examination PW-1 deposed that on the day of the incident, the Timber Depot of the accused persons was closed due to the Doul Yatra festival. When their departmental personnel went there, the accused Beli Saikia stated that since her husband was not present, she could not open the Timber Depot. This led to an argument, and during that argument, the accused Beli Saikia lodged a case against Sri Paban Saikia and Sri Basanta Hazarika of their department bearing GR Case No.472/2018. He also deposed that as the accused had filed a case against them, they also lodged a case against the accused persons. He also stated that he has no objection if the accused persons acquitted from this case.
10. PW-2 Sri Basanta Hazarika in his evidence deposed that he knows the informant. He was the Ranger, North Lakhimpur at the time of the incident. He knows the accused persons standing in the dock. The incident took place in the year 2018. He was serving as Forester-I at North Lakhimpur Range Territorial. He along with the informant Amulya Konch, ACF Ranjit Ram, Deputy Ranger Pawan Saikia and other members of their forest team visited Belly Timber Depot at Charaimoria which was owned by accused Bhabit Saikia. They had gone to check on the timbers and their team found some illegal timbers in the depot. Informant

then called office vehicles and labourers to take the illegal timbers away. At that time, an unruly situation took place. Both the accused persons prevented them from taking the illegal timbers. They also physically assaulted some labourers brought by their department. The police who had accompanied them managed to control the situation and also provided them security to bring the timbers out.

11. In cross-examination he admitted the fact that on the date of occurrence, there was a 'Dol Utsav'. He denied to the suggestion that on the date of occurrence, the timber depot was closed due to 'Dol Utsav'. He admitted the fact that the timer depot and the house of the accused persons are located in the same campus. He would not be able to say if the Officer leading the raid had shown any papers to the accused persons to justify the raid. He admitted the fact that at around 9:00 am, he and Pawan Saikia had asked accused Belly Saikia to open the gate of the depot. He denied to the suggestion that they had abused the accused Belly Saikia verbally and threatened her when she refused to open the gate. He denied to the suggestion that he had broken the gate on the back side of the campus and unauthorizedly entered the campus and pushed accused Belly Saikia when she had asked not to enter as her husband was absent. He admitted the fact that he and Pawan Saikia were called to Lakhimpur P.S with regard to some complaint filed by accused Bhabit Saikia. He does not know if that complaint let to the registration of a case

bearing No. GR-472/2018. He had never received any summons regarding such case. He denied to the suggestion that because of the complaint against them, they had filed this false case as a counter to the complaint by the accused. He admitted the fact that he had not specified the names and designation of the persons accompanying him in the raid in his 161 statement. He cannot recall if he had mentioned or not in his 161 statement that the informant had called for vehicles and labourers to carry the illegal timbers. He denied to the suggestion that he had deposed falsely that the informant had called for vehicles and labourers to carry the illegal timbers. He denied to the suggestion that he had not stated in his 161 statement that the accused persons had pushed and assaulted some labourers of their department. He admitted the fact that he did not state in his 161 statement that the police had brought the situation under control and provided security to them in bringing the timbers because the police were present itself and had seen everything. He denied to the suggestion that he has deposed falsely.

12. PW-3 Sri Pawan Kumar Saikia in his evidence deposed that he knows the informant. He was the Ranger, North Lakhimpur at the time of the incident. He knows the accused persons standing in the dock. The incident took place in the year 2018. He was serving as Deputy Ranger at North Lakhimpur Range Territorial. He along with the informant Amulya Konch, ACF Ranjit Ram, Basanta

Hazarika, Lalit Deka and other members of their forest team visited Belly Timber Depot at Charaimoria which was owned by accused Bhabit Saikia. They had gone to check on the timbers and their team found some illegal timbers in the depot. When they attempted to bring the seized illegal timbers, the accused persons stopped them from taking the illegal timbers. Later under police protection they managed to bring the seized timbers to their office. Exhibit P-2/PW-3 is the seizure list vide which MO-1 (MR 131/2018 by which is one seizure list of seizure of the illegal timbers) was seized and Exhibit P-2(1)/PW-3 is his signature. He does not recall the police recording his statement.

13. In cross-examination he admitted the fact that on the date of occurrence, there was a 'Dol Utsav'. He denied to the suggestion that on the date of occurrence, the timber depot was closed due to 'Dol Utsav'. He admitted the fact that the timer depot and the house of the accused persons are located in the same campus. He would not be able to say if the Officer leading the raid had shown any papers to the accused persons to justify the raid. He denied to the suggestion that at around 9:00 am, he and Basanta Hazarika had asked accused Belly Saikia to open the gate of the depot. He denied to the suggestion that they had abused the accused Belly Saikia verbally and threatened her when she refused to open the gate. He denied to the suggestion that he had broken the gate on the back side of the campus and unauthorizedly entered the campus and

pushed accused Belly Saikia when she had asked not to enter as her husband was absent. He had only heard that accused Bhabit Saikia had filed some complaint against them before the O/C N.L P.S but he was never questioned and had received no summons in any such case. He does not know if that complaint led to the registration of a case bearing No.GR 472/2018. He had never received any summons regarding such case. He denied to the suggestion that because of the complaint against them, they had filed this false case as a counter to the complaint by the accused. He admitted the fact that they had not provided any notice to the accused persons with regard to their raid because as per forest rules, no such notice is required to be provided. The accused persons did not agree to sign on the seizure list and hence their signatures are not seen in the seizure list. The signatures in the seizure list all belong to the people of their department. He admitted the fact that in the seizure list, no local people had affixed their signatures though they had tried to find anyone willing to sign as a witness. He denied to the suggestion that MO-1 was prepared in their office and hence there are no signatures of any independent witnesses. He denied to the suggestion that the accused persons had not obstructed them in performing their official duties. He denied to the suggestion that he has deposed falsely.

14.PW-4 Dr. Sashi Sonowal in his evidence deposed that on 03-03-2018, he was serving as Sr. M&HO at North

Lakhimpur Civil Hospital. On that day, at about 04:30 pm, he had examined Sri Dipak Saron R/O- Japisajia, P.S- North Lakhimpur, Dist.-Lakhimpur upon being identified and escorted by H.G Dinamoni Sonowal vide Casualty Emergency Registration No.1818. On examination, he found pain on frontal head and neck of the body. Exhibit P-3/PW-4 is the Medical Report issued by him in which Exhibit P-3(1)/PW-4 is his signature.

15. In cross-examination PW-4 deposed that there is no police requisition number mentioned in the report. Case reference is also not mentioned. The duration of the pain is not mentioned. He did not advise for X-ray to the patient.
16. PW-5 SI Sri Dipjyoti Bharali is the Investigating Officer of this case and in his evidence he deposed that on 03.03.2018, he was posted at N.L P.S as Attached Officer and after registration of the case as N.L P.S case No.220/2018, u/s 353/323/379/34 of IPC, he was entrusted with the investigation of the case. The ejahar was lodged by Sri Amulya Konch, Ranger, North Lakhimpur Forest Range, alleging that on 02.03.2018 while they were on raid duty at the timber mill of the accused persons namely, Sri Bhabit Saikia and Smti Beli Saikia misbehaved with him and also physically assaulted one of the labours engaged by the informant. During investigation, he recorded the statement of the informant and other witnesses present. He visited the place of occurrence i.e. timber mill of the accused persons located at Moidomia and

prepared the sketch map. Exhibit P-4/PW-5 is the sketch map and Exhibit P-4(1)/PW-5 is his signature. The injured labour Sri Dipak Saron was also forwarded for medical examination. He collected his medical report later on. He also seized a seizure list of seizure of sawn timbers from the office of the informant. Exhibit P-2(2) is his signature in the seizure list. The accused persons themselves visited the P.S. and they were released after serving them notice u/s-41 Cr.P.C. They also lodged ejahar against the forest official on the same occurrence at NLPS which was registered as NLPS Case No.219/2018. On 31.05.2018 after finding sufficient material, he filed the charge sheet against both the accused persons namely, Sri Bhabit Saikia and Smti Beli Saikia u/s 353/323/379/34 of IPC vide CS-242/2018. Exhibit P-5/PW-5 is the charge sheet and Exhibit P-5(1)/PW-5 is his signature.

17. In cross-examination PW5 deposed that he received ejahar on 03.03.2018. In the ejahar it is mentioned that the incident took place on 02.03.2018 at about 07:30 a.m. The informant is a Regional Forest Ranger. The office of North Lakhimpur Forest Range Office is at a distance of about one kilometer from the North Lakhimpur PS. The informant has mentioned any reason for delay in filing the FIR. The variety of timber tree has not been mentioned in the ejahar. The name of the injured labour is also not mentioned in the FIR. In the forest raid conducted by forest official only forest official goes to conduct the same.

Police is not taken along with the forest official in conducting raid. The informant did not take any police official to the place of raid on the day of the alleged incident. The informant has not annexed any document showing his raid of the place of occurrence. No document was provided by the informant showing his authority in conducting raid at the place of occurrence while his statement u/s-161 Cr.P.C. was recorded by him. He does not know the date when the accused lodged the ejahar against the informant and other police official. The FIR lodged by the informant is numbered as N.L P.S case No.220/2018 and the FIR lodged by the accused persons is numbered as NLPS Case No.219/2018. By referring to the case number it appears that the FIR lodged by the accused persons was registered before the FIR lodged by the informant. In the sketch map of the P.O. petrol pump and party zone Dhaba are depicted however no one from that place have been examined as witnesses in this case as they claimed that they did not know anything about the incident. In the medical report of the injured (Exhibit-P-3) police reference case number is not mentioned. The name of the injured is mentioned as Dipak Saron in Exhibit-P-3 but in the charge-sheet the name of the injured is mentioned as Dipak Sonar. He did not seize anything from the accused persons. The seizure list which he seized from the possession of the informant is not available in the case-record and also not seen in the court. PW-2 Basanta

Hazarika in his statement before the I.O. did not state that informant had called for vehicle and labours to carry the illegal timbers. He also did not state that accused persons had pushed and assaulted some labours of their department. No stolen timbers were recovered from the possession of the accused persons. He denied to the suggestion that he filed C/S against the accused without conducting proper investigation.

ARGUMENT AT THE BAR:

18. I have heard the argument of learned A.P.P. for the prosecution and the learned counsel for accused persons at length.
19. Mr. Ratul Dutta, the Ld. APP argued that the prosecution has successfully established its case through the consistent testimonies of the departmental eyewitnesses, PW-2 and PW-3. The Learned APP submitted that these public servants were acting in the bona fide discharge of their official duties during a scheduled forest raid when they discovered illegal timber. It was argued that the accused persons actively obstructed the public servants by causing an unruly scene, using obscene language, and physically pushing and assaulting a departmental laborer, Sri Dipak, to deter the team from seizing the illegal property. The prosecution highlighted that the physical discomfort and trauma of the worker are duly supported by the medical testimony of PW-4. The Learned APP further contended

that the hospitalization of the informant, PW-1, does not weaken the case, as the remaining witnesses explicitly detailed the execution of the raid and the unlawful resistance put up by the accused persons, which satisfies the statutory ingredients of Sections 353, 323, and 294 read with Section 34 of the IPC.

20. Mr. Satyajit Dutta, the Ld. Defence Counsel argued that the entire prosecution is a malicious, engineered fabrication designed as a counter-blast to shield forest officials from their own high-handedness. The defense pointed out that the accused persons had already lodged a prior criminal complaint against the forest staff, registered as NLPS Case No. 219/2018, before the present FIR was recorded. The Learned Counsel highlighted that the informant himself (PW-1) completely turned hostile, admitting that the matter was a minor issue settled through a mutual compromise and revealing that the department filed this case solely to counter the legal actions initiated by the accused woman. Furthermore, the defense argued that the prosecution failed to produce any legal search warrant or statutory authorization for the raid, and completely failed to present the primary material corpus the allegedly seized timber—before the Court. The defense further argued also underscored that the allegedly injured laborer was never brought to the witness box, the medical certificate lacked basic police case reference details, and no independent public witnesses were examined despite the availability of

nearby public commercial establishments, thereby rendering the prosecution's case entirely unbelievable and unproven beyond a reasonable doubt. Hence the Ld. Defence prayed for the acquittal of the accused persons from the charges in this case.

APPRECIATION OF EVIDENCE AND FINDINGS:

21. To substantiate the charges, the prosecution examined 05 (five) witnesses including the I.O.
22. This Court has meticulously scrutinized the oral, documentary, and medical evidence on record. The prosecution's case suffers from structural failure, material contradictions, non-production of seized article, and appears to be a retaliatory FIR against both the accused persons.
23. The prosecution case completely collapsed during trial. PW-1 deposed that there was merely a "minor argument" between the accused and a laborer named Dipak. Crucially, he testified that the dispute was completely resolved and settled via an amicable compromise. He directly declared that he does not want to pursue the case and has no objection to the acquittal of the accused persons.
24. It was well established by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sat Paul v. Delhi Administration*, (1976) 1 SCC 727 and *Gura Singh v. State of Rajasthan*, (2001) 2 SCC 205 that the evidence of a hostile witness is not wiped off the record entirely; the portions of testimony and

admissions extracted during cross-examination that support the defense's stance are fully valid and can be relied upon by the Court to determine guilt or innocence.

25. In cross-examination, PW-1 exposed the real malice behind the prosecution, admitting that the depot was closed for the 'Doul Yatra' festival. When the accused woman stated she could not open it in her husband's absence, an altercation arose. PW-1 candidly admitted that because the accused Smti Beli Saikia filed a criminal complaint against forest officials Pawan Saikia and Basanta Hazarika, the department filed this case as a direct counter-blast. This is verified by the I/O (PW-5), who confirmed that the accused persons filed their FIR first, which was registered as NLPS Case No. 219/2018, whereas the forest official's FIR was registered subsequently as NLPS Case No. 220/2018. This chronological dynamic strongly corroborates the defense's stand of a retaliatory prosecution.

26. In this regard the Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of Karnataka v. L. Muniswamy, (1977) 2 SCC 699 and Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Maharashtra, 2021 SCC On Line SC 315 held that when a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide intentions and maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance or acting as a counter-blast to an ongoing or previous dispute, it amounts to an abuse of the judicial machinery and leaves the prosecution version severely compromised.

27. To sustain a charge under Section 353 IPC, the prosecution must strictly prove that the public servants were acting in the lawful discharge of their public duty. The legality of this raid is legally unsupported.
28. The I/O (PW-5) explicitly admitted under cross-examination that the informant provided no search warrant, authorization order, or legal documents showing his authority to raid the premises, either during the incident or during the Section 161 CrPC examination. PW-3 admitted that the residential house and timber depot share the same campus and that no notice was given to the occupants before entering.
29. Under the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Manzurul Haque v. State of Bihar*, (1979) 4 SCC 517, where the legal authority or statutory justification of a public official's specific actions (such as a forced search or a raid) is not placed on record or proved during trial, the accused cannot be held criminally liable under Section 353 IPC for merely resisting an unauthorized or unproven intrusion. Furthermore, the I/O (PW-5) admitted that no stolen or illegal timbers were ever recovered or seized from the possession of the accused.
30. Most critically, PW-5 conceded that the alleged seizure list of sawn timber "is not available in the case-record and also not seen in the court." PW-3 admitted that no independent local witness signed the seizure sheet; it only contained

signatures of forest staff. This absolute absence of the primary material objects (corpus delicti) strikes at the very root of the prosecution's story.

31. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Vijay Jain v. State of M.P.*, (2013) 14 SCC 315 ruled that the non-production of primary seized material objects before the trial court, combined with a lack of any valid explanation for their absence, is fatal to the prosecution's claims regarding the physical occurrence of the crime itself.
32. To attract Section 294 IPC, the obscene acts or words must occur in a public place to the annoyance of others. The incident took place inside a private commercial/residential campus during a closed festival day. The I/O (PW-5) testified that adjacent public venues, specifically a petrol pump and a "Party Zone Dhaba," were depicted on the sketch map (Exhibit P-4). However, the I/O explicitly admitted that not a single independent witness or worker from these public venues was examined, as they stated they knew nothing of the incident. There is zero evidence of public annoyance on record.
33. Similarly, the charge of voluntary cause of hurt under Section 323 IPC is crippled by severe evidentiary gaps. The allegedly injured laborer, Dipak, was never produced or examined in court as a witness. The medical officer (PW-4) testified he found "pain on frontal head and neck" of one Sri Dipak Saron. However, under cross-examination, PW-4

admitted that his medical report (Exhibit P-3) lacked any police requisition number, case reference number, or duration of pain. No X-ray was advised, and the finding of "pain" is entirely subjective. The I/O (PW-5) also admitted that while the medical report lists the name as "Dipak Saron," the statutory charge sheet names the injured as "Dipak Sonar." Furthermore, the FIR does not mention the name of any injured laborer at all. The I/O explicitly impeached PW-2 (Basanta Hazarika) during cross-examination by confirming that PW-2 never stated in his 161 CrPC police statement that the accused persons pushed or assaulted any laborers. This improvement during trial is an uncorroborated afterthought.

34. Criminal jurisprudence dictates that the prosecution must prove every ingredient of an offense beyond reasonable doubt. In this case, the informant turned hostile and admitted the case was an amicable settlement and a counter case to an earlier FIR. The raid's statutory authority was completely unproven, the seized material objects were entirely missing from the court records, the identity of the injured laborer was contradictory, and the independent public witnesses were non-existent.
35. Guided by the legal thresholds established in the authoritative precedents of the Supreme Court, the essential ingredients of Sections 353, 323, and 294 IPC read with Section 34 IPC have failed to stand legal scrutiny of this Court against both the accused persons.

ORDER

36. In view of my discussions in the foregoing paragraphs the accused Sri Bhabit Saikia and Smti Beli Saikia are hereby acquitted of the charges framed against them under Sections 353, 323, and 294 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, on the ground of complete lack of credible evidence. The accused persons are set at liberty forthwith.

37. The bail bonds of A-1 and A-2 stands extended for six months.

38. File be consigned to the record room after completion of due legal formalities.

39. The case is disposed of on contest.

This judgment is given under my hand and seal of this court on this the 10th day of August, 2026.

(Saraswati Johori Padun)
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Dictated & Corrected by me :

Typed and transcribed by:

(Sri Ghanashyam Baraik)
Stenographer Grade II

APPENDIX – 14

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESSES, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
PW1	Sri Amulya Konch	Informant
PW2	Sri Basanta Hazarika	Other witness
PW3	Sri Pawan Kr. Saikia	Panch witness
PW4	Dr. Sashi Sonowal	Medical witness
PW5	Sri Dipjyoti Bharali	Police witness

B. Defence Witnesses, if any:

C. Court Witnesses, if any:

LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE/ COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution:

	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit-P-1/PW-1	Ejhar
2	Exhibit-P-1(1)/PW-1	Signatures of PW-1
3	Exhibit-P-2/PW-3	Seizure list
4	Exhibit-P-2(1)/PW-3	Signature of PW-3
5	Exhibit-P-3/PW-4	Medical report
6	Exhibit-P-3(1)/PW-4	Signature of PW-4
7	Exhibit-P-4/PW-5	Sketch map
8	Exhibit-P-4(1)/PW-5	Signature of PW-5

9	Exhibit-P-5/PW-5	Charge-sheet
10	Exhibit-P-5(1)/PW-5	Signature of PW-5

B. Defence: None

C. Court Exhibits: None

D. Material Objects:

	Exhibit Number	Description
1	MO-1 (MR No.131/2018)	Seizure of illegal timbers

(Saraswati Johori Padun)
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Dictated & Corrected by me :

Typed and transcribed by:

(Sri Ghanashyam Baraik)
Stenographer Grade II