



**IN THE COURT OF THE IV ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE TUMAKURU, SITTING AT MADHUGIRI**

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

-:PRESENT:-

SMT. SUMANGALA S BASAVANNOUR, B.COM., L.L.M.,
IV ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, TUMAKURU-MADHUGIRI

S.C. NO: 5006/2025

Complainant : The State of Karnataka,
By Pavagada Police Station,
Pavagada Taluk,
Tumakuru District.

[By : Public Prosecutor]

-: VERSUS :-

Accused : 1. Narasimhappa,
S/o Sanna Erappa,
Aged about 55 years,

2. Karthik,
S/o Narasimhappa.S,
Aged about 21 years,

The accused No.1 and 2 are
R/at Ponnasamudra,
Pavagada Taluk,
Tumakuru District.

[By : A.N.R- Advocate]

1. Name of complainant	Sadashiva - CW1/PW-1
------------------------	----------------------



2. Date of commission of offense	22-23/07/2023
3. Date of report of occurrence	23.07.2023
4. Offenses complained of	The offence Punishable under Section 436, 427 of Indian Penal Code
5. Date of arrest of accused	A.1 - 19.08.2023 A-2 - 24.07.2023
6. Date of commencement of trial	02.06.2026
7. Date of closing of trial	11.08.2026
8. Opinion of the Judge	The accused No.1 and 2 are not found guilty for the offences punishable under section 436, 427 of Indian Penal Code
9. Order of offense	Acquitted as per final order.
10. State represented by	Public prosecutor.
11. Accused by	A.1 & 2 – A.N.R- Advocate.

II - JUDGMENT - II

The present Session Case is registered against the accused on the basis of committal order dated 04.01.2025 passed under section 209 of Cr.P.C for the



offences punishable under section 436, 427 of Indian Penal Code by the Learned Magistrate Pavagada in C.C.No.2040/2023.

2. The crime No.175/2023 was registered against accused No.1 and 2 by the complainant at Pavagada Police Station for the offence punishable under section 436, 427 of Indian Penal Code, as per FIR dated 23.07.2023 marked as Ex.P.5. The FIR registered on the basis of the first information dated 23.07.2023 given by C.W.1/P.W.1 Sadashiva as per Ex.P.1. As per Ex.P.1 first information allegations against the accused No.1 and 2 that, C.W.1 was kept wooden shop beside the road on Poonasamudra- Pavagadda Yethinahalli Village and the accused No.1 and 2 objected for keeping the shop besides their hotel. On 22-23/07/2023 midnight 3-00 a.m the accused set fire to the wooden shop thereby causing a loss of Rs.10,000/- to the C.W.1. Hence the complainant has lodged the first information on the basis of which the police have registered the above crime against the accused No.1 and 2 for the above said offences.



3. On the basis of the first information at Ex.P.1 the complainant police registered the crime No.175/2023 against accused No.1 and 2 as per FIR dated 23.07.2023 as per Ex.P.5. In the FIR also allegations made against the accused as stated in the first information. After registering crime the Investigating Officer P.W.7 conducted entire investigation. After completing investigation submitted charge-sheet before jurisdictional Magistrate for the offence punishable under Section 427, 436 of Indian Penal Code.

4. After filing final report, the Learned Magistrate took cognizance of offence registered a criminal case against the accused persons in C.C.No.2040/2023 for the offence punishable under Section 436, 427 of Indian Penal Code. Thereafter, the presence of the accused were secured before the Court. As the alleged offences punishable under Section 436 of IPC is triable exclusively by the Sessions Court, the Learned Magistrate committed matter to this Court vide committal order dated 04.01.2025 under section 209 of Cr.P.C.



5. After committal, the Court registered Sessions Case in S.C.No.5006/2025 against the accused persons and secured their presence before the Court. After securing presence of accused, the Court, upon perusal of final report and other records, framed charge against them for the offenses punishable under Section 436, 427 as per charge dated 29.08.2025. The accused denied charge framed against them and pleads to face trial. Consequently the Court set the matter for trial.

6. During trial the prosecution examined total 7 witnesses as P.W.1 to P.W.7. As per final report 8 witnesses have cited as charge-sheet witnesses. On behalf of prosecution they got marked 5 documents at Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.5 and got marked one material objects as M.O.1 and closed prosecution side. After prosecution evidence the Court examined the accused on 17.08.2026 as provided under section 313 of Cr.P.C., and explained incriminating material against them. They denied all the materials against them and pleaded their ignorance about the allegations made against them. However they have not chosen to lead any evidence on their behalf. Further they stated they will



not going to furnish any documents and witness on their behalf as their defense. Subsequently trial closed and the matter posted to argument.

7. I have heard counsel for the accused and Learned Public Prosecutor. Learned Public Prosecutor submits that P.W.1 complainant and P.W.2 wife of the complainant supported the case of the prosecution but independent witnesses not supported the prosecution case official witnesses supported the case on hand. Investigating Officer C.W.8 who is examined as P.W.7 proved charge framed against the accused No.1 and 2. Evidence of P.W.7 is sufficient to convict the accused. The documents furnished before the Court is sufficient to prove the guilt of accused No.1 and 2 in the present case. Ex.P.2 panchanama shows wooden shop damaged and same was burnt and how it was burnt is proved by the Investigating Officer i.e it was by setting fire. Evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 and Ex.P.2 are sufficient to prove the guilt of the accused No.1 and 2. With above grounds he prays to convict the accused and prays to impose maximum punishment.



8. The learned counsel for the accused relying upon evidence of prosecution witnesses submits that there is no material against the accused No.1 and 2. Though as per Ex.P.1 the C.W.1 stated his wooden shop burnt but evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 contrary to each other. Eye witnesses turned hostile and they nowhere stated about lighting fire by accused No.1 and 2. Though Ex.P.2 panchanama shows that Investigating Officer conducted spot panchanama but it does not disclose who lit fire and how much loss sustained by P.W.1. The material witnesses not supported the prosecution case. Evidence of investigating team is not sufficient to convict the accused. There is no material to show involvement of accused No.1 and 2. Hence case against accused No.1 and 2 is not proved beyond reasonable doubt and accused are liable to acquit from the above said offences and prays to acquit the accused.

9. After hearing the parties and after perusing the materials on record the points that arise for my consideration is:-

1] Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt on 22-23/07/2023 midnight 3-00 a.m on



Poonasamudra- Pavagadda Yethinahalli Village besides the road the accused persons with an intention to cause destruction of shop of C.W.1 committed mischief by fire to shop of C.W.1 by causing of destruction of petty shop, thereby the accused have committed offence punishable under section 436 of IPC, ?

2] Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on the same day, time and place, the accused persons with an intention to cause loss committed mischief by set fire to C.W.1 petty shop thereby C.W.1 sustained loss to the amount of Rs.10,000/-, thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 427 of IPC, ?

3] What order or sentence, ?

10. My findings on the above points are as here under:-

Point No.1 : In the Negative;

Point No.2 : In the Negative;

Point No.3 : As per final order
for the following:-



|| REASONS ||

11. **POINT NO.1 AND 2:-** In the case on hand, there are two charges are framed against the accused for the offences punishable under Section 436, 427 of IPC and point for determination is framed, I feel it is proper to discuss all the points together to avoid repetition of facts and conclusion. There is reason to discuss all these points together because all the charges arising from a single incident. All the allegations are connecting to each other and it is not possible to discuss separately because appreciation of materials to decide one charge is also required to appreciate to all other charges. As per the prosecution case. Incident occurred at once and it has to be decided together. Suppose incident is proved it is not necessary to discuss to all charge separately. To see whether such incident occurred or not is concerned common appreciation of evidence on record is sufficient. Hence I assigning common reasons to come to conclusion for above said four points for determination with respect to charge framed against the accused.



12. P.W.1, Sadashiva/complainant, deposed that he was running a wooden shop near the bus stand. Earlier his shop was situated adjacent to the rented house of Prasannakumar. When Prasannakumar asked him to vacate the premises, Amarnath agreed to provide space for shifting the shop. However, the accused, whose shop was also situated near by objected and threatened P.W.1 not to establish the wooden shop there. P.W.1 further deposed that, they purchased wooden shop for Rs.10,000/- to Rs.12,000/- and kept the said shop in the place of Amarnath which is situated near the bus stand. P.W.1 further stated that on intervening night of 22/23-07-2023 at about 3-00 a.m he informed that his shop was on fire. On reaching the spot he found the wooden shop completely burnt and saw the accused standing behind the shop. He lodged the complaint as per Ex.P.1 and he identified his signature on Ex.P.1. He also deposed that the police visited the spot and conducted the spot mahazar and seized the lock and latches.

13. P.W.1 during the cross-examination deposed that, prior to this incident there was no quarrel between



the accused and P.W.1. He stated that the accused shop was situated on Y.N.Hosakote-Pavagada main road and on the left side of the accused shop there is road leading to Veerabhadreshwara temple and on the left side of the road there is room belongs to Gowrajji and Kalyanamantapa. P.W.1 further admitted that he was residing in a rented house where he was running a shop selling coffee, tea, petrol, diesel, beedi and Cigarettes. Although he had a licence for the business he had not produced it before the police. He had also admitted that rented house effected by the fire and it's door was burnt, following which Gowrajji's grand son Prasanna f asked him to vacate the house. The roof of wooden shop belongs to Veranna was little damaged and said shop is old one. Further admitted that the wooden shop situated besides leading to leading to Veerabhadreshwara temple, was burnt. But he could not state it's survey number. He claims to have purchased the shop of Rs.12,000/- but he had no documentary proof. He admitted that shop measured about 6 feet in hight and width and that road was only 5-6 feet wide. He further admitted that he did not know whether road leading to accused's hotel and temple was



situated in Sy.No.7/2. Further stated that his shop was not situated on the land belonging to Mruthunja and Nallappa. He also admitted that 20-30 persons were present at the time of the incident and he did not witness who set fire to the shop but he seen the accused were present at the spot.

14. P.W.2, Mallamma, wife of the complainant/ P.W.1, deposed that they had been residing in a rented house belonging to Prasanna Kumar for about 9 years and were running a business in wooden shop. The accused No.1 who was residing in a adjacent house had earlier set fire to their door and subsequently raised objections when they attempted to shift their shop near the house of Amarnath. She further stated that at about 3-00 a.m in the year 2023 she noticed smoke and on informing her husband, P.W.1 went to the spot and found that their shop had been set on fire. She thereafter went to the spot and found shop completely burnt. Thereby they sustained loss of Rs.10,000/-. When she went to the spot she found that both accused came from Veerabhadraswamy Temple. Further stated that the accused set fire to their shop due to a business



related grudge. She identified the accused No.1 before the Court and also stated that she could identified accused No.2 though the accused No.2 was absent before the Court. The counsel for the accused submitted no dispute regarding identity of the accused.

15. P.W.2 during the cross-examination deposed that there was no agreement for running the shop on Amarnath's land. They were selling patrol, diesel, collar pipe which are required for former. They were stored all the above articles in the rented premises without obtaining permission to sell patrol and diesel. P.W.2 admitted that the roof of the wooden shop was entirely damaged. She has stated that a quarrel existed between them and accused over the business matter.

16. P.W.3 Eranna and P.W.4 Lokesh, though cited as an eye witnesses, did not support the prosecution case and stated that, they were unaware of the incident and did not know what act committed by the accused. Despite being treated as hostile and subjected to lengthy cross-examination nothing favourable to the prosecution was elicited.



17. P.W.5 Sudhakara and P.W.6 Naresh mahazar witnesses to Ex.P.2. They identified their signature on Ex.P.2 deposed that 2 years back police obtained their signatures on Ex.P.2 at police station and police did not took them to any place and seized anything in their presence. The prosecution treated P.W.5 and P.W.6 hostile and cross-examined at length but nothing worthwhile was elicited from their moth to support the case of prosecution.

18. P.W.7 Gurunatha, PSI, Badavanahalli, deposed that on 23.07.2023 C.W.1 came to the police station and lodged the written complaint, he received the same, registered the case in Crime No.175/2023, submitted FIR to the Court and higher officer. He identified his signature on Ex.P.1 first information and Ex.P.5 FIR. On the same day he visited the spot of the incident at Honnasamudra. He conducted spot mahazar in the presence of C.W.4 and C.W.5 as per Ex.P.2 between 4-00 p.m and 5-00 p.m and seized lock along with it's latches from the spot. On the same day he recorded the further statement of C.W.1 and statements of C.W.2 to C.W.4. P.W.7 further deposed that on 24.07.2023, his



staff who had been deputed to trace the accused, produced the accused No.2 before him at about 10-00 a.m at the police station, he arrested him and recorded his voluntary statement. On 19.08.2023 the accused No.1 appeared before him pursuant to the grant of anticipatory bail. He enquired into the matter and released him on bail. On 11.09.2023 he recorded the statement of C.W.7 and upon completion of investigation filed a charge-sheet against the accused.

19. P.W.7 during the cross-examination deposed that, prior to receiving the complaint in the present case, he had not received any complaint regarding the burning of the wooden shop. He admitted that there was distance of about 5 feet between the shop of the accused and Gowrajji Kalyanamantapa. Further admitted that a tar road leading to Veerabhadraswamy temple exists nearby and that a Hotel and Kalyanamantapa are situated adjacent to the said road. He further deposed said wooden shop is 8 feet length 6 feet width. He denied the suggestion that said shop could not be kept besides the hotel. He pleaded ignorance as to from whom said wooden shop was



purchased. He has clearly stated that he had not collected any documents regarding the place where the wooden shop was situated/kept. Further stated said shop was kept on the foot path. Though P.W.7 was cross-examined at length but nothing worthwhile was elicited from his mouth to disprove his evidence.

20. It is a settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that in a criminal trial, a duty is cast upon the prosecution that it has to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Even an iota of doubt in the prosecution story entitles the accused to the benefit of doubt.

21. The accused persons have been charged for offence of mischief and damage punishable under Section 436 and 427 of IPC. Same is reproduced verbatim as under:-

Mischief by fire or explosive substance with intent to destroy house, etc.—

Whoever commits mischief by fire or any explosive substance, intending to cause, or knowing it to be likely that he will thereby cause, the destruction of any building which is



ordinarily used as a place of worship or as a human dwelling or as a place for the custody of property, shall be punished with imprisonment for life, or with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Section 427 of IPC reads as follows;

Mischief causing damage to the amount of fifty rupees;

Whoever commits mischief and thereby causes loss or damage to the amount of fifty rupees or upwards, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both.

22. From the evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 it is clear that there was a business rivalry between the accused and P.W.1 and due to such business rivalry the accused set the fire to the wooden shop of the P.W.1 thereby causing loss to him.

23. P.W.1 evidence discloses that, on 22-23/07/2023 midnight 3-00 a.m a villager informed him that his shop was burning. Therefore he went to the spot and saw that the accused were present behind the wooden shop



and wooden shop was completely burnt. However, the contents of the complaint discloses some what a different version, it is stated therein that on 22/23/07/2023 the new wooden shop which was kept beside their shop was burning due to fire. Therefore the complainant and his wife went near the shop. At that time, Narasimhappa/ accused was there and on seeing them he fled from the spot in the darkness. The complaint does not discloses the villagers are informed regarding the fire in the shop. On the contrary P.W.1 deposed that his villager informed that his shop was burning so he went near the spot. His evidence does not discloses that his new wooden shop was kept besides his shop.

24. On the contrary P.W.2 wife of the complainant deposed that, in the year 2023 at 3-00 a.m the accused No.1 set the fire to their wooden shop. On that day when they woke up early morning and notice the smoke, she asked her husband to go and see what happened. Accordingly, P.W.1 went to the spot and informed her that shop had been compeltely burnt. So she immediately went to the spot found that the shop



had been completely burnt causing a loss of Rs.10,000/-. She further deposed that when they reached to the spot both the accused came from the side of the Veerabhadraswamy temple.

25. P.W.1 clearly stated that the accused were present back side of the shop, but on the contrary P.W.2 deposed that the accused were coming from the side of the Veerabhadraswamy temple. Further P.W.1 stated that the accused were fled from the spot in the darkness. Whereas P.W.2 deposed that after noticing the smoke, she asked her husband to visit the spot of the incident. However, on the contrary P.W.1 deposed that a villager informed about burning of the shop pursuant to which he went to the spot. The evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 is inconsistent to each other regard to manner in which they came to know about the incident and the presence and moments of the accused at the spot. These material contradictions create a doubt regarding their claim that had seen the accused near the place of the occurrence.

26. P.W.1 and P.W.2 are the husband and wife and both are interested in the case of the prosecution.



Therefore, their evidence needs to be scrutinized with caution. However, their evidence could have been corroborated by independent witnesses supported the case of the prosecution. In the present case. P.W.3 and P.W.4 were cited as eye witnesses to incident. Accordingly to the prosecution P.W.3 and P.W.4 had seen the accused No.1 and 2 lighting the fire to the wooden shop. P.W.4 immediately informed the complainant Sadashiva about the incident. However, evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 does not discloses that Lokesh had informed them about the incident. Further P.W.3 and P.W.4 were completely turned hostile to the case of the prosecution. Even prosecution treated them hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution nothing worthwhile was elicited in their cross-examination in support of the case of the prosecution. Therefore, the fact that P.W.3 and P.W.4 were turned hostile is fatal to the case of the prosecution.

27. The complainant/ P.W.1 in his complaint at Ex.P.1 and in his evidence stated that he had purchased the wooden shop from Juttalu Eranna i.e. C.W.7 for consideration of Rs.10,000/- . In this case



except the evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 with respect to purchase of wooden shop from Eranna no documentary evidence has been placed before the Court to establish that P.W.1 has purchased the shop from Eranna for Rs.10,000/-. Furthermore, P.W.3 and P.W.4 are turned hostile and C.W.7 Juttalu Eranna reported to have died. Under these circumstance, there is no material before this Court to establish that the complainant had purchased the wooden shop from Eranna this fact is lacuna to the case of the prosecution.

28. The prosecution alleged that the accused due to business enmity with P.W.1 and P.W.2, intentionally set fire to the wooden shop belonged to P.W.1 which was being used for carrying petty business, thereby caused loss of Rs.10,000/-. At the out set, applicability of Sec.436 of IPC requires consideration. As per Section 436 of IPC, where mischief is committed by fire with requisite intention or knowledge in respect of a building ordinarily used as place of worship or as a human dwelling or as a place for the custody of property. In the present case, the prosecution evidence only shows that structure was a small wooden shop used for



carrying of petty business. The prosecution has not placed any satisfactory materials to establish that the said shop was ordinarily used for the custody of property. No inventory of goods alleged to be kept in the shop, details of such goods or other reliable materials has been produced. Therefore, the essential ingredients required for Section 436 of IPC has not been established.

29. Evidence regarding occurrence also requires careful scrutiny. P.W.1 and P.W.2 are husband and wife and they have stated that, on coming to know about the incident, they went to the spot and saw the accused No.1 and 2 near their shop. However neither of them claims to have witnessed the accused setting fire to the shop. Their evidence regarding presence of the accused near the spot is therefore only subsequent to occurrence. Mere presence of the accused near the spot without any further incriminating circumstances connecting them with the fact of setting fire, cannot by itself establish that they were culprits.

30. The alleged business enmity may provide a possibility motive but motive by itself cannot substitute



and substantiate evidence connecting the accused with the commission of offence. Further, P.W.3 and P.W.4 examined by the prosecution have not supported the prosecution case and have been treated as hostile. Their evidence does not furnish independent corroboration regarding the involvement of the accused.

31. The prosecution has also alleged that the incident caused a loss of Rs.10,000/-. However, no satisfactory material has been produced to establish the nature and value of the property alleged destroyed. Mere assertion of P.W.1 and P.W.2 regarding the amount of loss, in the absence of supporting material does not by itself established the alleged incident of damage.

32. P.W.1 has deposed regarding the alleged purchase of wooden shop from Eranna. However, no documents relating to the alleged purchase, payment of consideration, transfer or possession, or ownership of shop has been produced before the Court. The prosecution has also not examined Eranna to substantiate the alleged transaction. It is reported that Eranna is no more. Though his non examination may be explained by his death, the prosecution has not



produced any other independent material to establish the alleged purchase or the value of the shop. Therefore, evidence of P.W.1 regarding alleged purchase of the wooden shop remains substantially uncorroborated.

33. More importantly, the prosecution has failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that it was the accused No.1 and 2 who caused the fire. P.W.1 and P.W.2 admittedly reached the spot only after learning about the incident. Their evidence that they saw the accused near the spot thereafter does not amount to direct evidence of the act of setting fire. In the absence of any witnesses who saw the accused No.1 and 2 committing the act and in view of the fact that P.W.3 and P.W.4 have not supported the prosecution, involvement of the accused No.1 and 2 remains doubtful.

34. As regards Section 427 of IPC, the prosecution must establish the commission of mischief as defined under Section 425 of IPC and the consequently damages or loss to the prescribed incident. In the present case though burning of the wooden shop is



proved however, there is no material before this Court to establish that the accused No.1 and 2 were lit the fire with intention to causing loss to P.W.1/ complainant and requisite ingredients of Section 427 of IPC are not satisfied.

35. On considering material evidence on record, the prosecution has failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the accused intentionally set fire to the wooden shop of P.W.1. The prosecution has also failed to establish the essential ingredients of Section 436 and independently the ingredients necessary for an offence under Section 427 of IPC.

36. Even Investigating Officer evidence also does not discloses regarding any properties kept in the shop. Moreover, P.W.1 and P.W.2 also not asserted that they have kept the grocery or articles in the said wooden shop. Further spot mahazar witnesses are also turned hostile.

37. Evidence of P.W.7 Investigating Officer is only corroborative and cannot take place of substantive evidence. In the present case though the evidence of



Investigating Officer discloses that he has registered case on the basis of complaint Ex.P.1 filed by the complainant. But unfortunately P.W.3 and P.W.4 eye witnesses have turned hostile. Evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 is contradictory to each other and neither of them has witness the incident. Further evidence of P.W.7 Investigating Officer is clearly shows that on 23.07.2023 he has visited the spot of the incident and conducted mahazar as per Ex.P.2. However, though it is established from the evidence of Investigating Officer P.W.7 he visited the spot of the incident i.e Ponnasamudra Village, but his evidence does not prove the conducting of mahazar in the presence of C.W.4 and C.W.5 as shown by P.W.1. Since P.W.3 and P.W.4 are turned hostile, further more the prosecution failed to examine C.W.7, it is fatal to the case of the prosecution.

38. In view of the same I believe it is fit case to acquit the accused by extending benefit of doubt in their favour. The prosecution failed to prove charge leveled against the accused. Consequently accused is entitled for acquittal. Accordingly, I answer point No.1 and 2 in the Negative.



39. **POINT NO.3:-** In view of my answer to point No.1 and 2, I conclude that the prosecution failed to prove the charges leveled against the accused for the offences punishable under section 436, 427 of Indian Penal Code. Consequently, the accused No.1 and 2 are entitled to benefit of doubt and entitled to acquittal. Hence, I proceed to pass the following:-

|| ORDER ||

The accused No.1 Narasimhappa S/o Sanna Erappa, accused No.2 Karthik S/o Narasimhappa are ***not found guilty*** for the offences punishable under section 436, 427 of Indian Penal Code.

Acting under section 235(1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, the accused No.1 Narasimhappa S/o Sanna Erappa, accused No.2 Karthik S/o Narasimhappa are herewith ***acquitted*** from the charges framed against them for the offences punishable under section 436, 427 Indian Penal Code.



The bail bonds executed by the accused No.1 and 2 and their sureties' stands canceled.

The bail bond and surety bonds executed by accused No.1 and 2 and their sureties under Section 437-A of Cr.P.C shall be in force for a period of 6 months from this day.

The office is directed to confiscate M.O-1 lock and latches after expiry of appeal period as it is valuable.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and computerized by her, Judgment revised and corrected by me, printed by the steno, and then signed and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 25th day of August, 2026)

sd/-

(SUMANGALA S BASAVANNOUR)
IV Additional District & Sessions Judge,
Tumakuru, Sitting at Madhugiri

II ANNEXURE II

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR PROSECUTION

PW.1	:	Sadashiva
PW.2	:	Mallamma
PW.3	:	Eranna



PW.4 : Lokesh
PW.5 : Sudhakar
PW.6 : Naresha
PW.7 : Gurunath

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR
PROSECUTION**

Ex.P.1 : Complaint
Ex.P.2 : Spot Mahazar
Ex.P.3 : Statement of P.W.3
Ex.P.4 : statement of P.W.4
Ex.P.5 : First Information Report

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR DEFENSE

-NIL-

LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR DEFENSE

-NIL-

**MATERIAL OBJECTS IDENTIFIED FOR THE
PROSECUTION**

M.O.1 : Lock and laches

sd/-

IV Additional District & Sessions Judge,
Tumakuru, Sitting at Madhugiri