

KAMS300006692021



IN THE COURT OF I ADDITIONAL SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE
AND JMFC, HUNSUR

Dated this the 27th day of May 2026

Presided Over by Smt. Bhagyamma
B.Com. L.L.B.,

CC./391/2021

COMPLAINANT: State by Hunsur Town Police Station

(By learned APP)

//Vs//

ACCUSED:

1. Lakshmi,
W/o late Papaiah,
Aged 50 years,
R/at V.P. Bore,
Hunsur City,
Mysuru District.
2. Deepika,
W/o Manjunath,
Aged 29 years,
R/a Srirampura,
Hunsur City,
Mysuru District.
3. Manjunatha,
S/o Lingaraju,
Aged 34 years,
R/a Srirampura,
Hunsur City,
Mysuru District.

4. Jesudas,
S/o William Sagay Raj,
Aged 33 years,
R/at Udayanagara,
Hunsur City
Mysuru District.

(By Sri BJP, Adv.)

Date of commission of offence : 27.12.2020

Date of report of offence : 29.12.2020

Name of the complainant : Raghu

Date of recording evidence : 23.02.2023

Date of closing evidence : 23.01.2025

Offences complained of : Sec.323, 324, 504, 506 R/w Sec.34 of IPC

Opinion of the Judge : Accused-1 to 4 found not guilty for the offences under Sec.324, 504, 506 R/w Sec.34 of IPC and

Accused-1 & 2 found guilty for the offence under Sec.323 R/w Sec.34 of IPC

JUDGMENT

This is the Charge Sheet filed by Police Head Constable, Hunsur Town Police Station against the accused-1 to 4 alleging that, they have committed the offences punishable U/Sec.323, 324, 504, 506 R/w Sec.34 of I.P.C.

2. The facts of the prosecution case in brief are that:

That on 27.12.2020 at about 6.00 p.m., within the limits of

Hunsur Town Police Station, in front of the house of CW-1 situated at V.P. Bore, the accused Nos.1 and 2 were abusing CW-1 and CW-2 with regard to the smoke coming towards their house. When CW-1 and CW-2 told them to speak with the house owner regarding the said issue, the accused persons picked up a quarrel and abused them in filthy language. Thereafter, the accused Nos.3 and 4 also joined in the quarrel and assaulted CW-1 with clubs on his left hand and right side of the body and accused No.1 also head-butted CW-1 near his left eyebrow. When CW-2 intervened, accused Nos.1 and 2 assaulted CW-2 with their hands all over the body, back and head and also snatched away her karimani sara, due to which CW-1 sustained simple injuries. Further, all the accused persons threatened CW-1 and CW-2 with dire consequences. Thereby, the accused persons committed offences punishable U/sec.323, 324, 504, and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. In this regard, CW.1 lodged the complaint before the police. It is on the basis of the said information, a case came to be registered against the accused persons in Crime No.206/2020 for the offences punishable under sections U/Sec.323, 324, 504, 506 R/w Sec.34 of I.P.C. Thereafter preparing panchanama, recording the statements of witnesses, seizure of the material objects and on completion of investigation, the investigation officer filed a charge sheet against the accused persons for the above said offences.

4. Upon the final report, the court took cognizance for the offences and issued summons. On due service of summons, the accused persons appeared before the court through their

counsel and were released on bail. Thereafter, the copies of the prosecution papers were supplied to the accused persons as contemplated under section 207 of Cr.P.C. postulates.

5. Later on hearing the learned APP and the learned advocate for accused persons, the charge has been framed, read over and explained to the accused in the language known to them. They denied the charge and claimed to be tried. Hence, the case is posted for trial.

6. To prove the guilt of the accused persons, the prosecution has got examined in all 8 witnesses as P.W.1 to P.W.8 and got marked 8 documents at Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-8 and also got marked 3 material objects as MO.1 to 3. The statement of the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C has been recorded. They have denied the incriminating evidence and no defence evidence is claimed by them.

7. Perused the materials available on record.

8. From the materials placed before the court the following points arise for my consideration;

1. Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that on 27-12-2020 at 6.00 PM, in front road of the house of CW.1, V.P. Bore, Hunsur town the accused-1 & 2 were abusing CW-1 & 2 with regard to the smoke coming towards their house, to which CW-1 & 2 told to ask with house owner, for which accused persons picked up quarrel and abused them in filthy language with intent to provoke a breach of the public peace, thereby committed an offence punishable U/Sec.504 R/

w Sec.34 of IPC?

2. Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, the accused-3 & 4 having common intention also joined in the quarrel and assaulted CW-1 with clubs on his left hand and right side of the body and accused No.1 head-butted CW-1 near his left eyebrow and caused simple injuries, thereby committed an offence punishable U/Sec.324 R/w Sec.34 of IPC?
3. Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, the accused-3 & 4 having common intention and while assaulting CW.1 and when CW.2 intervened the accused-1 & 2 assaulted CW.2 with hands on all over her body, back and on head and also snatched Karimani sara causing simple injuries, thereby committed an offence punishable U/Sec.323 R/w Sec.34 of IPC?
4. Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, the accused-1 to 4 having common intention picked up quarrel with CW.1 & 2 and threatened with dire consequences of life, thereby committed an offence punishable U/Sec.506 R/w Sec.34 of IPC?

5. What Order or sentence?

9. After the close scrutiny of the entire evidence and after hearing the arguments my findings to the above points are as follows:

Point No.1 : In the **Negative**
Point No.2 : In the **Negative**
Point No.3 : In the **Affirmative**
Point No.4 : In the **Negative**
Point No.5 : As per the final Order
for the following -

REASONS

10. POINT NO.1 to 4:- These points are inter connected and hence they have been taken up together for discussion.

It is the case of prosecution that on 27.12.2020 at 6.00 p.m. in front of the house of CW-1 situated at V.P. Bore, the accused Nos.1 and 2 were abusing CW-1 and CW-2 with regard to the smoke coming towards their house. When CW-1 and CW-2 told them to speak with the house owner regarding the said issue, the accused persons picked up a quarrel and abused them in filthy language. Thereafter, the accused Nos.3 and 4 also joined in the quarrel and assaulted CW-1 with clubs on his left hand and right side of the body and accused No.1 also head-butted CW-1 near his left eyebrow. When CW-2 intervened, accused Nos.1 and 2 assaulted CW-2 with their hands all over the body, back and head and also snatched away her karimani sara. Further, all the accused persons threatened CW-1 and CW-2 with dire consequences, due to which CW-1 sustained simple injuries. Hence the prosecution has to prove the ingredients of Sec.323, 324, 504, 506 R/w Sec.34 of I.P.C. against the accused.

11. In order to bring home the guilt of accused, the prosecution examined in all 8 witnesses as PW-1 to PW-8. Among them, CW.1 is the complainant examined as PW.2;

CW.2 is the victim witnesses examined as PW.1; CW.3 is an eye witness examined as PW.4; CW.4 is the owner of house of CW.1 examined as PW.5; CW.5 is the mahazar witness examined as PW.3; CW.7 is other witness examined as PW.8; CW.8 is a Medical Officer examined as PW.6 and CW.9 is the I.O. examined as PW.7 of this particular case. In support of oral testimony, the prosecution has produced 8 documents, which got marked as Ex.P-1 to 8 and also got marked 3 material objects as MO.1 to 3.

12. The prosecution examined CW-1/complainant as PW-2 – Raghu and deposed that about three years prior to his evidence around 4.30 p.m., while they were residing in a rented house at Chikkahunsur, the accused Nos.1 and 2 picked up a quarrel regarding the fume emitting from the firewood used for heating bathing water. The accused No.1 questioned his sister-in-law regarding the fume. Thereafter, they informed the house owner about the said issue and stated that they were tenants in the said house. Subsequently, the house owner arranged for installation of a pipe to avoid the smoke issue. However, the accused again picked up a quarrel and PW-2 told them to speak with the house owner. During the quarrel, the accused No.2 called her husband. Thereafter, the husband of accused No.2 dragged PW-2 out of the house onto the road and 4 persons were present along with them. The husband of accused No.2 and another person caught hold of PW-2 and assaulted him on his head. Further, the husband of accused No.2 assaulted PW-2 on his left elbow with a re-piece strap, and another person assaulted him on his left side with fists. At

that time, his friend Nadeem/CW-3 intervened and pacified the quarrel. Thereafter, PW-2 took treatment at the hospital and subsequently lodged a complaint before the police. The complaint was marked as Ex.P2 and his signature thereon was marked as Ex.P2(a). PW-2 further deposed that, during the quarrel, the husband of accused No.2 threatened him with dire consequences. He identified MO Nos.1 to 3 before the Court and also identified accused Nos.1 and 2 present before the Court. Since accused Nos.3 and 4 were absent, the learned counsel for the accused submitted that he had no objection regarding their identification.

13. In the cross-examination, PW.2 admitted that the dispute arose suddenly regarding smoke from the rented house. He admitted that accused-1 and CW.2 used to quarrel frequently regarding smoke nuisance. It is elicited that no independent neighbours were examined though several persons had gathered. Contradictions were brought regarding the exact overt acts of accused-3 and 4 and the weapon allegedly used. Though he alleged assault by club and reeper patti, there were no major grievous injuries. It was further suggested that accused persons never assaulted him and that due to prior quarrel a false complaint was lodged. The defence also questioned delay in lodging complaint and registration of FIR. However, nothing substantial was elicited to discredit the fact that PW.2 had sustained injuries in the incident.

14. CW-2/PW-1 – Manjula, the victim witness and sister-in-law of CW-1, deposed that in the year 2020 at about 6.00

p.m., accused Nos.1 and 2 complained to their house owner CW-4 regarding smoke emanating from the pipe above her house, pursuant to which the owner installed a pipe. Despite this, the accused continued to quarrel with them and scold her over the smoke issue. She further deposed that when CW-1 questioned the conduct of accused, the accused No.2 Deepika called her husband, who arrived along with three boys. At that time, CW-1 was taking a bath. One among the said boys, claiming himself to be a police officer dragged CW-1 out of the bathroom, then the husband of accused No.2 and 3 boys assaulted CW-1 by holding him by the neck and hitting him on the right side of his body. One of them also assaulted CW-1 with a club, due to which he fell down to the ground. PW-1 further stated that when she intervened to pacify the quarrel, accused Nos.1 and 2 snatched and tore her Karimani necklace. Thereafter, they taken the treatment at the Government Hospital, Hunsur. She identified the accused persons before the Court and also identified MO Nos.1 to 3, namely the club, re-piece strap and also blue & white full-sleeved shirt. She identified Ex.P1 – spot mahazar and her signature thereon marked as Ex.P1(a) and deposed that the police conducted the mahazar at the spot shown by the neighbours.

15. As PW.1 did not completely support the prosecution case, the learned APP sought permission to treat her as partly hostile. During cross-examination, the learned APP suggested that accused persons assaulted CW.1 during the quarrel regarding smoke nuisance. PW.1 admitted that accused-2 had called her husband to the spot and the accused persons

assaulted CW.1. She consented that accused-1 and 2 assaulted her and tore her Karimani sara when she intervened. It is admitted that the police conducted mahazar in her presence and obtained her signature on Ex.P1. She identified MO.1 to MO.3 before the Court. However, she did not fully support the prosecution regarding all overt acts attributed to accused persons.

16. In the cross-examination made by the learned counsel for the accused, several omissions and contradictions were elicited. Though PW.1 supported the prosecution regarding the quarrel arising out of smoke issue and assault on CW.1, she admitted that there was previous ill-will between the parties due to neighbourhood disputes. It was suggested that no such assault as alleged had taken place and that accused persons were falsely implicated owing to earlier enmity. She admitted that many people had gathered at the spot, but none except interested witnesses were examined. Her evidence regarding accused-1 and 2 assaulting her and snatching Karimani sara was not corroborated by independent evidence or recovery of the alleged sara. Her statement regarding presence and overt acts of accused-3 and 4 also suffered from inconsistencies. The defence further suggested that CW.1 himself sustained injuries due to accidental fall during quarrel, which she denied.

17. CW.3 / PW.4 – Nadeem, who is an eye witness has completely turned hostile to the case of the prosecution. Even in his cross-examination by the learned APP nothing worthwhile has been elicited. PW.3 did not fully support the

prosecution case and admitted that he signed Ex.P1 mahazar at the instance of police near Leela Cinema Talkies. He was unaware of contents of mahazar and seizure proceedings. His evidence weakened the prosecution regarding proper seizure of MO.1 to 3. Even after cross-examination by learned APP, nothing useful was elicited. His hostile evidence materially affected the prosecution as he was cited as an independent eyewitness.

18. CW-4/PW-5 – Shivagami, the owner of the house occupied by CW-1 and CW-2, deposed that he knew accused Nos.1 to 3 and that he had let out his house to CW-2. He further stated that the house of accused No.1 was situated adjacent to his house. He deposed that on 22.12.2022 at about 6.00 p.m., while he was in his house, the neighbours informed him about a quarrel. Thereafter, he went to the spot, then CW-1, CW-2, her husband and son had already gone to the hospital. PW-5 further deposed that the quarrel had arisen between CW-2 and accused No.1 regarding the smoke emanating from the house of CW-2. He stated that CW-1 had sustained injuries to his head and hand and that his clothes were torn. His evidence speaks that CW-2 had also sustained injuries, so he took CW-1 and CW-2 to the Government Hospital at Hunsur. Subsequently, he came to know that CW-2 had lodged a complaint against accused. He identified MO-3, the blood-stained and torn shirt belonging to CW-1.

19. PW.5 partially supported the prosecution and the learned APP treated him as partly hostile. During cross-

examination, he admitted that quarrel had taken place between the accused persons and CW.1 regarding smoke nuisance and that CW.1 had sustained injuries. He further admitted that MO.3 shirt belonged to CW.1 and it was bloodstained and torn. However, he did not fully support the prosecution regarding actual overt acts committed by each accused person.

20. In the cross-examination by the learned counsel for the accused, PW.5 admitted that he came to know about the quarrel through neighbours and reached the spot later. Therefore, he was not an eyewitness to the actual assault. Though he stated that CW.1 sustained injuries and clothes were torn, his evidence was only hearsay regarding actual overt acts of accused persons. He partially supported the prosecution and was also treated partly hostile.

21. CW.5 / PW.3 – Juber who is a mahazar witness has deposed that he knows CW.3 and accused-1, but he does not know accused-2 to 4. He has identified his signature on Ex.P1 as Ex.P1(b), which he signed two years back near Leela Cinema Talkies as per the say of police. At this stage, the learned APP prays to treat the witness as partly hostile. PW.3, the mahazar witness failed to support the seizure mahazar fully, therefore was treated partly hostile. During cross-examination, the learned APP suggested that the police had conducted mahazar in his presence near the spot of incident and seized MO.1 to MO.3 under Ex.P1 mahazar. It was suggested that he had signed Ex.P1 after knowing its contents. Though such

suggestions were put to him, PW.3 did not fully admit the prosecution case and merely admitted his signature on Ex.P1.

22. CW.7 / PW.8 – Harisha has deposed that he knows the accused persons but does not know CW.1 to 3. That in the year 2020 he was called near the house of accused-1 in order to conduct panchayath but not concluded, hence he informed to Lakshmi, Manjula to take further steps. At this stage, learned APP prays to treat the witness as partly hostile. PW.8 did not support the prosecution regarding assault and stated only about panchayath. Hence, the learned APP cross-examined him by suggesting that accused persons had assaulted CW.1 and CW.2 and that he had earlier stated the same before police. The APP also suggested that he was aware of the quarrel immediately after the incident. However, PW.8 denied the material suggestions and no useful evidence could be elicited in favour of prosecution. Thus, PW.8 admitted that he had no direct knowledge of assault and only came to conduct panchayath. He did not witness the incident personally. Therefore, his evidence had little evidentiary value regarding occurrence of assault.

23. CW.8 / PW.6 – Dr. Poornima, who is a medical officer has deposed that on 27.12.2020 at 7.00 p.m. CW.1 came to hospital in respect of the assault and on examination she found lacerated wound on left hand (1 x 0.5 cm) and there was pain in the movement of the hand; lacerated wound on left eye brow and pain on right waist and stomach pain and CW.1 was treated as in-patient from 27.12.2020 till 01.01.2021 and he was

discharged on 01.01.2021. She opined that the above said injuries are simple in nature and on 09.02.2021 she issued Wound Certificate which got marked as Ex.P5 and her signature on it as Ex.P5(a). She identified the MLC memo which got marked as Ex.P6 and her signature on it as Ex.P6(a).

24. In cross-examination, the doctor admitted that injuries mentioned in Ex.P5 were simple in nature and could also occur in a scuffle or fall. She admitted there were no grievous injuries or fracture. However, she consistently supported that CW.1 had sustained injuries and was treated as inpatient from 27.12.2020 to 01.01.2021. Her evidence corroborated the factum of injuries though not necessarily the exact manner of assault.

25. CW-9/PW-7 – Jagadisha T., the Investigating Officer of the case deposed that on 27.12.2020 at about 7.30 p.m., the Government Hospital at Hunsur forwarded the MLC report of CW-1 to the police station. Based on the said report, on 29.12.2020 between 2.10 p.m. and 2.45 p.m., he recorded the statement of CW-1 at the Government Hospital, Hunsur, thereafter returned to the police station at about 2.55 p.m and registered a case in Crime No.206/2020. The MLC report was marked as Ex.P6 and his signature thereon was marked as Ex.P6(b). He also identified his signatures on Ex.P2 and Ex.P7, marked as Ex.P2(b) and Ex.P7(b), respectively.

26. PW-7 further deposed that on the same day, he conducted a mahazar between 5.00 p.m. and 6.00 p.m., in front of the house of CW-1 as shown by CW-2 and in the presence of CW-5 and CW-6 as panch witnesses and seized one blue

checked shirt belonging to CW-1, one 2½ feet club, and one 2½ feet re-piece strap produced by CW-2. Thereafter, he brought the seized articles to the police station, subjected them to PF No.212/2020 and produced them before the Court. He identified MO Nos.1 to 3 before the Court. He further deposed that on the same day he recorded the statements of CW Nos.2 to 4 and CW-7. On 15.01.2021, he issued police notices to accused Nos.1 to 4. That on 09.02.2021, he obtained the wound certificate from CW-8, which got marked as Ex.P5 and his signature thereon got marked as Ex.P5(b). On the same day, he also recorded the further statement of CW-1. Since the investigation was completed, he filed the charge sheet against the accused persons. He identified accused No.1 before the Court and as accused Nos.2 to 4 were absent, the learned counsel for the accused submitted that he had no objection regarding their identification.

27. The defence elicited that FIR was registered after recording statement in the hospital and there was some delay in formal registration. It is elicited that no independent neighbours were examined though incident occurred in a residential locality. The I.O. admitted that he has not recovered Karimani sara. It was also suggested that mahazar and seizure were conducted subsequently to strengthen the prosecution case. However, the I.O. denied all such suggestions.

28. Upon careful appreciation of oral and documentary evidence, it is evident that the incident arose due to a trivial

neighbourhood dispute regarding smoke emanating from the rented house of CW.1 and CW.2. The evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 consistently establishes existence of quarrel between the parties. Their testimony regarding assault on PW.2 receives partial corroboration from medical evidence of PW.6 and Ex.P5 wound certificate. Whereas Ex.P2 complaint and Ex.P7 FIR disclose prompt reporting of incident. Ex.P1 spot mahazar and MO.1 to 3 indicate seizure of alleged weapons and torn shirt. However, the independent mahazar witness PW.3 did not fully support the prosecution and eye witness PW.4 completely turned hostile.

29. The prosecution mainly relied upon interested witnesses PW.1 and PW.2. Though evidence of injured witness ordinarily carries great evidentiary value, their version regarding visible acts of each accused is not wholly consistent. The allegation regarding snatching of Karimani sara remained unproved as the alleged necklace was not recovered or produced before the Court. The medical evidence of PW.6 establishes that PW.2 sustained simple injuries including lacerated wounds and pain over body. Ex.P5 wound certificate supports this fact. However, the injuries were simple in nature and the doctor admitted such injuries may occur in a scuffle or fall. Hence, the medical evidence only partially corroborates prosecution case.

30. Upon careful appreciation of the entire oral and documentary evidence on record, this Court finds that the prosecution has failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt the

ingredients of the offence punishable under Section 324 of IPC against the accused persons. Though PW.1 and PW.2 have spoken about the quarrel and alleged assault, their evidence suffers from material inconsistencies regarding the specific overt acts attributed to accused Nos.3 and 4 and the manner of assault. The independent eyewitness PW.4 has completely turned hostile and has not supported the prosecution case. Likewise, the mahazar witness PW.3 did not fully support the seizure proceedings. Though the medical evidence of PW.6 and Ex.P5 wound certificate disclose that CW.1 sustained simple injuries, the doctor has admitted that such injuries could also occur due to a fall or scuffle and there are no grievous injuries or fracture. Further, the prosecution has failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the injuries were caused by dangerous weapons in the manner alleged. The prosecution has also failed to establish the common intention of accused Nos.3 and 4 beyond reasonable doubt. Hence, the benefit of doubt must necessarily go in favour of the accused. Accordingly, accused Nos.1 to 4 are acquitted for the offence punishable under Section 324 read with Section 34 of IPC.

31. So far as the offence punishable under Section 504 IPC is concerned, except omnibus allegations of abuse in filthy language, the prosecution has failed to specify the exact words uttered by the accused so as to constitute intentional insult with intent to provoke breach of peace. Regarding the offence punishable under Section 506 IPC, the prosecution has not produced convincing evidence to establish criminal intimidation causing alarm to the complainant. Mere

allegations of threat without specific particulars are insufficient to attract the ingredients of Section 506 IPC. Hence, the accused are entitled for acquittal for the offences punishable under Sections 504 and 506 read with Section 34 of IPC.

32. However, the prosecution has succeeded in establishing that during the course of the quarrel, accused Nos.1 and 2 voluntarily caused simple hurt to PW.1 and PW.2. The evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 in this regard is consistent and finds corroboration from the medical evidence of PW.6 and Ex.P5 wound certificate. Therefore, the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt the offence punishable under Section 323 read with Section 34 of IPC against accused Nos.1 and 2. Accordingly, accused Nos.1 and 2 are convicted for the offence punishable under Section 323 read with Section 34 of IPC, whereas accused Nos.3 and 4 are acquitted of the said offence by extending the benefit of doubt. **Hence, this Court answers Point Nos.1, 2 and 4 in the Negative and Point No.3 in the Affirmative.**

33. **Point No.3:-** In the result, this court proceeds to pass the following-

ORDER

Acting under Section 248(1) of Cr.P.C., accused No.1 to 4 are hereby acquitted for the offences punishable under Sections 324, 504 and 506 read with Section 34 of IPC.

Acting under Section 248(2) of Cr.P.C., accused No.1 & 2 are hereby convicted for the offence punishable under Section 323 read with Section 34 of IPC.

Considering that the incident arose out of sudden quarrel between neighbours, injuries are simple in nature, the parties are residents of same locality and no previous criminal antecedents are placed before Court, the accused No.1 and 2 are sentenced to pay fine of Rs.2,000/- each, in default to undergo simple imprisonment for 15 days.

Out of fine amount, a sum of Rs.3,000/- shall be paid to PW.2 as compensation under Section 357 Cr.P.C.

Bail bonds of accused persons stand cancelled after expiry of appeal period.

MO.1 to 3 being worthless are ordered to be destroyed after the appeal period.

Office to furnish free copy of judgment to the accused-1 & 2 forthwith.

(Dictated to the stenographer directly on computer, typed by him, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open court this 27th day of May 2026)

(BHAGYAMMA)
I ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.
HUNSUR

ANNEXURE**1. List of witnesses examined on behalf of Prosecution:**

PW-1 : Manjula
PW-2 : Raghu
PW-3 : Juber
PW-4 : Nadeem
PW-5 : Shivagami
PW-6 : Dr. Poornima
PW-7 : Jagadeesh T.
PW-8 : Harisha

For **Defence**: - NIL -

2. List of Documents marked on behalf of Prosecution:

Ex.P1 : Spot Mahazar
Ex.P2 : Complaint
Ex.P3 : Statement of PW.4
Ex.P4 : Statement of PW.5
Ex.P5 : Wound Certificate
Ex.P6 : MLC Memo
Ex.P7 : FIR
Ex.P8 : Statement of PW.8

For **Defence** : -NIL -

3. List of material objects marked on behalf of Prosecution

MO.1 : Club
MO.2 : Repees Patti
MO.3 : Shirt

(BHAGYAMMA)
I ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.
HUNSUR