

KAMS300007892025



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

Dated this the 9th day of June 2026

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

CC./287/2025

COMPLAINANT: State by Bilikere Police Station

(By learned APP)

//Vs//

ACCUSED: Manchappa,
S/o late Manchappa,
Aged about 34 years,
Driver of the Ashok Leyland
Dosth Vehicle bearing
Reg.No.KA-09-AA-1670,
Mellahalli,
Mysuru Taluk & District.

(By Sri PNK, Adv.)

Date of commission of
offence : 03.01.2025

Date of report of offence : 03.01.2025

Name of the complainant : Venkatesh Gowda

Date of recording evidence : 20.11.2025

Date of closing evidence : 24.04.2026

Offences complained of : Sec.281, 106 of B.N.S. and Sec.187 of IMV Act.

Opinion of the Judge : Accused found not guilty.

JUDGMENT

This is the Charge Sheet filed by Police Inspector, Bilikere Police Station against the accused alleging that, he had committed the offences punishable U/Sec.281, 106 of B.N.S. and Sec.187 of IMV Act.

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

The case of the prosecution that on 03.01.2025 at about 00:20 hours, near Maralayyanakoppalu Gate on the Hunsur-Mysuru Road, within the limits of Bilikere Police Station, the accused while driving Ashok Leyland Dost vehicle bearing Registration No. KA-09-AA-1670, allegedly drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and collided with the rear side of Hero Splendor motorcycle bearing Registration No.KA-45-U-9521, which had been parked on the roadside by CW.2. As a consequence of the said collision, Jalendra, who was standing near and leaning against the motorcycle, sustained fatal injuries and died at the spot. It is further alleged that the accused left the place of occurrence without rendering assistance to the injured or informing the police. Hence, the present charge sheet came to be filed against the accused for the offences punishable under Sections 281 and 106 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

and Section 187 of I M V Act, 1988

3. In this regard, CW.1 lodged complaint before the police. It is on the basis of the said information, a case came to be registered against the accused person in Crime No.1/2025 for the offences punishable under sections U/Sec.281, 106 of B.N.S. and Sec.187 of IMV Act. That after preparing panchanama, recording the statements of witnesses, seizure of the vehicles and on completion of investigation, the investigation officer filed a charge sheet against the accused person 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 appeared before the court through his counsel and he was released on bail. Thereafter, the copies of the prosecution papers have been supplied to the accused person as contemplated under Section 230 of B.N.S.S postulates.

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

6. To prove the guilt of the accused person, the prosecution has got examined in all 7 witnesses as P.W.1 to P.W.7 and got marked 21 documents at Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-21. The statement of the accused under Section 351 of B.N.S.S has been recorded. He has denied the incriminating evidence and no defence evidence is claimed by him.

7. Perused the records 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 onon 03.01.2025 at about 00:20 hours, near Maralayanakoppalu Gate on the Hunsur–Mysuru Road, while CW.2 had stopped Hero Splendor motorcycle bearing Registration No. KA-45-U-9521 by the roadside and Jalendra was standing near the said motorcycle, the accused drove Ashok Leyland Dost vehicle bearing Registration No. KA-09-AA-1670 in a rash and negligent manner so as to endanger human life and thereby committed an offence punishable under Sec.281 of B.N.S?
2. Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, the accused drove the vehicle bearing No.KA-09-AA-1670 with high speed in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against the rear side of Hero Splendor motorcycle bearing Registration No. KA-45-U-9521, which was stationed on the side of road and thereby caused an accident resulting in Jalendra, who was standing near and leaning against the said motorcycle, sustaining grievous injuries to his head, face, legs and other parts of the body and consequently dying on the spot, committed an offence punishable U/Sec.106 of B.N.S?
3. Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that on the above said date, time and place, the accused, with intent to commit an offence, after the accident occurred, without informing the local police station and without admitting the injured person to the hospital for treatment, fled away from the spot, thereby accused committed an offence punishable under Sec.187 of IMV Act?
4. 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 to 3 : In the Negative

Point No.4 : As per the final Order

for the following -

REASONS

10. POINT NO.1 to 3:- These points are inter connected and hence they have been taken up together for discussion.

It is the particular case of prosecution that on that on 03.01.2025 at about 00:20 hours, near Maralayyanakoppalu Gate on the Hunsur-Mysuru Road, within the limits of Bilikere Police Station, the accused while driving Ashok Leyland Dost vehicle bearing Registration No. KA-09-AA-1670, allegedly drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and collided with the rear side of Hero Splendor motorcycle bearing Registration No.KA-45-U-9521, which had been parked on the roadside by CW.2. As a consequence of the said collision, Jalendra, who was standing near and leaning against the motorcycle, sustained fatal injuries and died at the spot. It is further alleged that the accused left the place of occurrence without rendering assistance to the injured or informing the police. Hence the prosecution has to prove the ingredients of Sec.281, 106 of B.N.S. and Sec.187 of IMV Act against the accused person.

11. To prove the guilt of accused, the prosecution has to establish the following ingredients :

Sec.281 of B.N.S deals with rash and negligent driving on a public way. It applies to anyone who drives or rides a vehicle in a manner that endangers human life or is likely to cause hurt or injury to another person.

Sec.106 of B.N.S deals with causing death by a rash or negligent act.

Sec.187 of the Motor Vehicles Act (MVA) deals with drivers who flee the scene of an accident, failing to report it to the police, or refuse to provide necessary information and medical aid to the victims.

12. In order to substantiate the case of prosecution, it has examined in all 7 witnesses as PW-1 to 7. Of witnesses, CW-1 is the complainant who got examined as PW-1; CW-2 is an eye witness who got examined as PW-2; CW-4 is the Mahazar witness who got examined as PW-3; CW-5 is the mahazar and seizure witness who got examined as PW-4; CW-6 is the mahazar and seizure witness who got examined as PW-5; CW.12 is other witness who got examined as PW.6 and CW-16 is the IO who got examined as PW-7. In corroboration of oral evidence, the prosecution got marked Ex.P.1 to 21 documents.

13. PW.1, who is the first informant and father of the deceased Jalendra, has deposed that about 11 months prior to his evidence, his son Jalendra and CW.2 had gone on a motorcycle to sell ginger grown in their agricultural land. According to him, at about 12.30 a.m. to 1.00 a.m., CW.2 telephoned him and informed that an accident had occurred near Maralayanakoppalu while they were proceeding from

Hunsur towards Bilikere. Immediately he went near Hunsur and found that his son had sustained injuries and had died. On the next day morning, he lodged a complaint before the police, which is marked as Ex.P.1 and his signature thereon is marked as Ex.P.1(a).

14. At this stage, as PW.1 did not fully support the prosecution case regarding the manner of occurrence, the learned APP sought permission of the Court to treat the witness as partly hostile and to cross-examine him. In the cross-examination by the learned APP, it was suggested to PW.1 that CW.2 had informed him over the phone that an Ashok Leyland Dost vehicle bearing Registration No. KA-09-AA-1670 had dashed against the motorcycle and caused the accident. It was further suggested that he had stated before the police that the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the said vehicle. The witness denied the suggestions to the extent they were not found in his chief-examination and stated that he had no personal knowledge regarding the manner in which the accident occurred. He admitted that he was not present at the spot and that whatever information he received was through CW.2 after the incident. Nothing substantial could be elicited in the cross-examination by the learned APP to establish that PW.1 had personally witnessed the occurrence or that he could identify either the offending vehicle or its driver. His evidence therefore remains confined to the fact that he received information about the accident and subsequently lodged the complaint before the police.

15. In his cross-examination by the learned counsel for accused, his evidence discloses that he was not present at the spot at the time of occurrence and had no direct knowledge regarding the accident. According to him, after receiving information regarding the incident, he approached the police station and lodged the complaint as per Ex.P.1. His evidence establishes the circumstances under which the criminal law was set in motion. His testimony regarding the manner of accident, identity of the offending vehicle, identity of the driver and alleged rashness or negligence is purely hearsay in nature and cannot be treated as substantive evidence.

16. It is a settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that the evidence of a complainant who is not an eyewitness can be relied upon only to prove lodging of the complaint and registration of the case. Such evidence cannot be used to establish the occurrence itself or the complicity of the accused unless it is corroborated by independent and reliable evidence.

17. PW.2, who is cited as an eyewitness to the incident, has deposed that he knew the deceased Jalendra. According to him, on 02.01.2025, he and Jalendra had gone to Periyapatna on Hero Splendor motorcycle bearing Registration No. KA-45-U-9521 for the purpose of collecting money in connection with their ginger business. While they were returning and had reached near Maralayanakoppalu, he stopped the motorcycle by the side of road and went to attend nature call. Jalendra remained standing near the motorcycle and was leaning against it. He further deposed that while he was attending nature call,

he heard a sound and immediately turned back. At that time, he noticed that an accident had occurred and an Ashok Leyland vehicle coming from the Hunsur side had dashed against Jalendra. As a result of the impact, Jalendra sustained injuries and died at the spot. He has further stated that he informed CW.1 about the accident over phone and also informed the police. Thereafter, an ambulance was called and the dead body was shifted to the Government Hospital, Hunsur.

18. PW.2 told that he showed the place of occurrence to the police. The police conducted a spot mahazar in his presence and in the presence of CWs.3 and 4. The said spot mahazar is marked as Ex.P.2 and his signature thereon is marked as Ex.P.2(a). He stated that he went to Bilikere Police Station, where the police photographed the vehicles involved in the accident, identified his signature on the seizure mahazar marked as Ex.P.3, which is marked as Ex.P.3(a). He identified the photographs taken at the time of spot mahazar, which are marked as Ex.P.4 and Ex.P.5. He also identified the photographs of Hero Splendor motorcycle No.KA-45-U-9521 at Ex.P.6 to P.9 and the photographs of Ashok Leyland vehicle No. KA-09-AA-1670 as Ex.P.10 and 11 and the police recorded his statement during the course of investigation.

19. At this stage, learned APP prays to treat the witness as partly hostile. In his cross-examination by the learned APP he admits that spot mahazar was conducted between 3.00 to 4.00 p.m. and conducted seizure mahazar in the police station between 4.30 to 5.30 p.m.

20. In his cross-examination by the learned counsel for accused, PW.2 admitted that at the time of the alleged accident he had moved away from the motorcycle to attend nature call and he was not standing near the motorcycle when the accident occurred. According to his own version, he only heard a sound and thereafter turned back towards the road. He further admitted that he did not actually witness the moment of impact between the alleged offending vehicle and the motorcycle. He conceded that after hearing the sound, he turned around and noticed that an accident had already occurred. Thus, his knowledge regarding the actual manner in which the accident took place is not based upon direct observation. It is elicited that the incident had occurred during late night hours and that visibility at the spot was limited. It is important to note that PW.2 admitted that he could not clearly observe the vehicle number which involved in the accident at the time of occurrence and he had not seen the person who was driving the vehicle. The learned counsel for the accused further elicited that no independent persons were present near the spot at the time when he allegedly heard the sound of the accident. As PW.2 had not personally witnessed the vehicle approaching the motorcycle, so he could not say the speed at which the vehicle was being driven. He came to know about certain particulars of the vehicle during the course of investigation conducted by the police. Nothing substantial was elicited in his cross-examination to establish that he had actually seen the accused driving the offending vehicle or that he had directly witnessed the collision.

21. CW.4 / PW.3 – Ranjith Kumar, who is a mahazar witness has deposed that on 03.01.2025 near Maralayyanakoppalu spot mahazar was conducted he signed to it, which got marked as Ex.P2 and his signature on it as Ex.P2(b). At that time CW.2 & 3 were with him and said mahazar was conducted between 3.00 p.m. to 4.00 p.m. and a photo was also taken which got marked as Ex.P4. Then he went to Bilikere Police station, there accident bike was seized with a photo. He identified his signature on Ex.P3 Seizure Mahazar as Ex.P3(b) and photo got marked as Ex.P5.

22. CW.5 / PW.4 – Adarsh, who is a seizure mahazar witness, who deposed that he knows the accused person. He identified his signature on Ex.P14 seizure mahazar as Ex.P14(a) which he signed on 20.01.2025 at Bilikere police station. As he was called by accused through phone, went to police station and at that time accused and Kiran were with him. At this stage, learned APP prays to treat the witness as partly hostile. In his cross-examination by the learned APP except denial nothing has been elicited from the mouth of this witness. Even if his evidence is accepted in its entirety, it only establishes procedural aspects of investigation.

23. CW.6 / PW.5 – Kiran Kumar, who is also a seizure mahazar witness, identified his signature on Ex.P14 seizure mahazar as Ex.P14(b) which he signed on 20th January at Bilikere police station between 10.00 a.m. to 11.00 a.m. As the Accused called him over phone, he went to police station, at that time accused and CW.5 were with him. At this stage, learned

APP prays to treat the witness as partly hostile. In his cross-examination by the learned APP except denial nothing has been elicited from the mouth of this witness. Therefore, the evidence of PW.4 and 5 is only formal in nature and does not establish either rashness or identity of the accused.

24. CW.12 / PW.6 – Thyagaraju, the motor vehicle inspector, deposed that on 22.01.2025 he received request from Bilikere Police Station by stating that there was an accident between two vehicles and the vehicles should be analysed. On the same day, he visited to Bilikere Police Station and found vehicle number KA 09 AA 1670 Ashok Ley Land Dosth, white color vehicle and KA 45 U 9521 Hero Spender Plus bike, black, blue and red color bike in the said station and he examined them.

25. According to this witness, on examination of Ashok Ley Land Dosth bearing No.KA 09 AA 1670, no damages were found. But when Hero Spender Plus Bike bearing No.KA 45 U 9521 was examined he found the damages on its headlight mask, Battery box cover, Right front footrest, Rear mud guard, Brake lamp, Both indicators are damaged, Rear lamp shield, grip handle, Left side body shield is damaged, Both mirrors are damaged, Side guard and rear number plate are damaged.

26. He further deposed that he had driven the vehicle KA 09 AA 1670 and the vehicle KA 45 U 9521 and checked their condition, its brake system were in good condition and given a report that the said accident was not due to any mechanical

defects. The said report was got marked as Ex.P15 and his signature on it as Ex.P15(a).

27. In his cross-examination by the learned counsel for accused he admits that there was no damages to the vehicle bearing No.KA 09 AA 1670. Thus, the IMV Report merely establishes that the vehicles were involved in a collision and that the accident was not attributable to mechanical failure. However, the report does not indicate who was driving the vehicle at the relevant time. Nor does it establish rashness or negligence. Therefore, the evidence of PW.6 has limited evidentiary value.

28. CW.16 / PW.7 – Lolakshi T.S., is an I.O. of this case and she deposed that on 03.01.2025 at 9.30 am, while she was in charge of the station, received a written complaint from CW-1 and registered a case in Cr.No.1/2025 for the offences under Section 281, 106 BNS and Sec.187 of IMV Act and submitted FIR to the court and her superiors. She identified her signature on the complaint Ex.P1 as Ex.P1(b). She also identified her signature on the FIR Ex.P16 as Ex.P1(a).

29. She further deposed that on the same day, between 10.30 am to 1.00 pm, she conducted inquest panchanama in the presence of CW.8 to 10, which got marked as Ex.P12 with the consent of the accused. On the same day, she received the PM report from CW.13, which got marked with the consent of the accused. On the same day, from 3 pm to 4 pm, she conducted the spot mahazar in the presence of CW.3 and 4 at the place shown by CW.2. The spot mahazar already marked as Ex.P2 and

her signature on it as Ex.P2(c). On the same day, a photograph was taken which already got marked as Ex.P4. On the same day, she recorded the statements of CW.1 & 2. On the same day, from 4.45 pm to 5.30 pm, she conducted seizure mahazar and seized Hero Slender bike bearing number KA 45 U 9521 at the police station premises in the presence of CW.3 and 4 and the same already got marked as Ex.P3 and her signature on it as Ex.P3(c).

30. She further deposed that on 20.01.2025, between 10.00 am and 10.45 am, the accused Manchappa produced the vehicle KA 09 AA 1670 Ashok Leyland in the police station premises and she seized the same by conducting seizure mahazar in the presence of CW.5 and 6, which is already marked as Ex.P14 and she identified her signature on it as Ex.P14(c). Photographs of the lorry were taken during the mahazar and the said photographs have already been identified as Ex. 10 and 11.

31. She further deposed that on 22.01.2025, she served notice under section 133 of the IMV Act to CW.11, the owner of vehicle KA 09 AA 1670 Ashok Leyland and received a reply. The said notice and reply are marked as Ex. 17 and 18, her signatures on it marked as Ex.17(a) and 18(a). On the same day, she obtained an indemnity bond from him and released the vehicle into his possession. The said indemnity bond is marked as Ex.19 and her signature on it as Ex. 19(a). On the same day, she issued a notice under Section 35(1) B.N.S.S. to the accused and released him on bail.

32. She further deposed that on 28.02.2025, she obtained an indemnity bond from CW1, the owner of the vehicle KA 45 U

9521 and released the vehicle. The said indemnity bond was marked as Ex.P20 and her signature on it as Ex.P20(a). On the same day, she obtained the IMV report from CW.12, which was already marked as Ex.P15 and her signature on it was marked as Ex.P15(b). She also identified the same by looking at the CD of photos taken during the investigation of this case and got marked as Ex.P21. After the completion of investigation, she filed the chargesheet against the accused person since sufficient evidence has been found against the accused.

33. Though she has narrated the course of investigation, she is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. Her conclusion regarding involvement of the accused is only an inference drawn during investigation. During cross-examination, it is elicited that no independent eyewitness identifying the accused was secured during investigation. It is further brought out that the case substantially rests upon the statement of PW.2. When PW.2 himself fails to identify the accused before the Court, the investigation loses its foundational support.

34. On careful close reading of Ex.P.1 shows that it merely narrates that an accident had occurred resulting in the death of Jalendra. The complaint itself does not constitute proof of the facts stated therein. Unless the facts contained in the complaint are established through reliable oral evidence before the Court, the complaint by itself cannot be treated as proof of the guilt of the accused. Further, the complainant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. Therefore, Ex.P.1 only establishes that information regarding an accident was furnished to the police

and nothing more. Whereas, Ex.P.2 is the FIR registered on the basis of Ex.P.1. The FIR is not a substantive piece of evidence. Its object is merely to set the criminal law in motion and record the earliest version of the occurrence, but it does not establish the truthfulness of its contents. Therefore, Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.2 merely prove that a criminal case came to be registered regarding a road traffic accident.

35. Similarly, Ex.P.3 is the spot mahazar prepared by the Investigating Officer. The mahazar indicates the place where the accident occurred, the position of the motorcycle, the physical features of the road and other surrounding circumstances noticed after the accident. The document may establish that an accident had in fact taken place at the location mentioned therein. However, the spot mahazar was prepared after the occurrence. It does not reveal who was driving the offending vehicle. It does not disclose the speed at which the vehicle was being driven. It does not establish rashness or negligence on the part of any particular individual. Ex.P.4 to Ex.P.11 – Photographs of the scene of occurrence and damaged vehicles, which undoubtedly show the aftermath of the accident. They depict the damaged motorcycle and the location where the accident occurred. However, photographs merely capture the condition of the vehicles after the incident. They do not depict the actual occurrence. They do not show who was driving the offending vehicle. They do not indicate the speed of the vehicle or the manner in which the accident occurred. Consequently, these photographs are only corroborative in nature and do not prove rashness, negligence or identity of the accused. In Ex.P.12

– IMV Report, the inspector opined that there was no mechanical defect in the vehicles inspected by him. Thus, the report excludes the possibility of mechanical failure being the cause of the accident. However, the report does not establish who was driving the vehicle at the relevant time. It does not state that the accused was driving the vehicle. It also does not indicate that the vehicle was driven rashly or negligently.

36. Ex.P.13 – Inquest Mahazar establishes that an inquest was conducted over the dead body of Jalendra. The purpose of an inquest is only to ascertain the apparent cause of death and note the injuries found on the body. It is not intended to determine who caused the death. Therefore, the inquest report only proves that Jalendra sustained injuries and died. It does not establish that the accused was responsible for those injuries. Ex.P.14 – Post-Mortem Report reveals that Jalendra sustained multiple injuries and that death occurred due to injuries suffered in a road traffic accident.

37. The medical evidence thus conclusively proves the factum of death and the cause of death. However, the medical officer cannot identify the person responsible for causing the injuries. Medical evidence can establish how a person died but cannot establish who caused the death unless supported by other evidence. Therefore, Ex.P.14 proves the cause of death but not the guilt of the accused. Ex.P.15 to Ex.P.21 the remaining documents consist of seizure mahazars, notices, replies, vehicle records and other investigation papers. These documents merely

demonstrate the steps taken during investigation. They are essentially corroborative in nature.

38. Even if these documents are accepted in their entirety, they do not independently establish:

- (a) that the accused was driving the vehicle;
- (b) that he drove the vehicle rashly or negligently; or
- (c) that he was responsible for the accident.

At the highest, they show that the investigating agency suspected the involvement of the accused and proceeded with investigation accordingly.

39. Upon cumulative assessment of the oral and documentary evidence, this Court finds that the prosecution has successfully established only two facts: Firstly, that a road traffic accident occurred on 03.01.2025 and secondly, that Jalendra sustained fatal injuries in the said accident and died as a consequence thereof. However, the prosecution was required to establish much more before a conviction could be recorded.

40. The prosecution was under a legal obligation to prove beyond reasonable doubt:

- (i) that the accused was the person driving vehicle No.KA-09-AA-1670 at the relevant time;
- (ii) that he drove the said vehicle in a rash and negligent manner endangering human life; and

(iii) that such rash and negligent act directly resulted in the death of Jalendra.

41. The evidence adduced falls far short of proving these foundational facts. The prosecution's star witness, PW.2, admits that he had moved away from the motorcycle for attending nature call and did not witness the actual impact. He further admits that he could not identify either the offending vehicle or its driver. These admissions completely erode the evidentiary value of his testimony on the crucial aspects of the case. There is no independent eyewitness to identify the accused. No circumstance has been brought on record conclusively connecting the accused with the act of driving the vehicle at the relevant time. The remaining witnesses are only formal witnesses who speak about the complaint, mahazars, inquest, post-mortem examination and investigation. Their evidence does not fill the serious gaps in the prosecution case. The documentary evidence proves the occurrence of an accident and the death of Jalendra. However, none of the documents proves the identity of the accused as the driver or establishes rash and negligent driving.

42. It is a cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that suspicion, however grave, cannot take the place of proof. A criminal Court must insist upon legal proof and not act upon conjectures or assumptions. Where the evidence gives rise to two possible views, the view favourable to the accused must be adopted. In the present case, the deficiencies in the prosecution evidence are not minor inconsistencies but go to the root of the

matter. The chain of evidence remains incomplete and the prosecution has failed to establish the essential ingredients of the offences charged. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered opinion that it would be unsafe to base a conviction upon such uncertain and insufficient evidence. The accused is therefore entitled to the benefit of doubt. Hence, the prosecution has failed to prove the offences punishable under Sections 281 and 106 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 187 of the Motor Vehicles Act beyond all reasonable doubt. Hence, the above points are answered in the **Negative**.

43. **Point No.4:** In the result, this court proceeds to pass the following:-

ORDER

Acting U/Sec 278(1) of B.N.S.S., the accused is hereby acquitted of the offences punishable U/Sec.281, 106 of B.N.S. and Sec.187 of IMV Act.

The bail bond and surety bond of accused already executed by him holds good for 6 months as contemplated U/Sec.481 of B.N.S.S

(Dictated to the stenographer directly on computer, typed by him, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open court this 9th day of June 2026)

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

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

PW-1 : Venkatesh Gowda
PW-2 : Basavaraju
PW-3 : Ranjith
PW-4 : Adarsh
PW-5 : Kiran Kumar
PW-6 : Thyagaraju K.J.
PW-7 : Lolakshi T.S.

For Defence: - NIL -

2. List of Documents marked on behalf of Prosecution:

Ex.P1 : Complaint
Ex.P2 : Spot Mahazar
Ex.P3 : Property seizure memo
Ex.P4 & 5 : Photos
Ex.P6 to 9 : Bike photos
Ex.P10 & 11 : Ashok leyland vehicle photos
Ex.P12 : Inquest panchanama
Ex.P13 : Post Mortem report
Ex.P14 : Seizure mahazar
Ex.P15 : IMV Report
Ex.P16 : FIR
Ex.P17 : Notice u/sec.133 of IMV Act
Ex.P18 : Reply notice
Ex.P19 & 20 : Indemnity bonds
Ex.P21 : CD

For Defence : -NIL -

3. List of material objects marked on behalf of Prosecution

- NIL -

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