



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

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

-:PRESENT:-

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

S.C. NO: 5016/2025

Complainant : The State of Karnataka,
By Koratagere Police Station,
Koratagere Taluk,
Tumakuru District.
[By : Public Prosecutor]

-:VERSUS :-

Accused : Ramachandraiah.M.D,
S/o Late Doddanayaka,
Aged about 48 years,
R/o Mallekavu,
C.N. Durga Hobli,
Koratagere Taluk,
Tumakuru District.
[By : -K.B.A- Advocate]

1. Name of complainant	Lakshmikantha.M.H - CW-1
2. Date of commission of offense	27.04.2024
3. Date of report of occurrence	27.04.2024
4. Offenses complained of	The offence Punishable under section



	307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code
5. Date of arrest of accused	28.04.2024
6. Date of commencement of trial	08.12.2025
7. Date of closing of trial	10.04.2026
8. Opinion of the Judge	The accused is not found guilty for the offences punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code.
9. Order of offence	Acquitted as per final order.
10. State represented by	Public prosecutor.
11. Accused by	Sri. M.H- Advocate.

II - JUDGMENT - II

The present Session Case is registered against the accused on the basis of committal order dated 15.02.2025 passed under section 209 of Cr.P.C for the offences punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code by the Learned Civil Judge and JMFC Court, Koratagere in C.C.No.779/2024.



2. The crime No.125/2024 registered against the accused on the basis of first information at Ex.P.14 given by C.W.1/P.W.9 Lakshmikantha.M.H dated 27.04.2024 before the complainant Police Station for the offence punishable under section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code. As per Ex.P.14 first information allegations against the accused that, on 27.04.2024 at about 5-30 p.m C.W.2 and C.W.3 were present near their house which is situated at Mallekavu Village, Koratagere Taluk, at that time the accused suddenly came and abused C.W.2 in filthy language by stating that (ನಮಗೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡೋದಿಲ್ಲೇನೋ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಡೋದಿಲ್ಲೇನೋ) why you have not giving more land in their name and made galata, for that C.W.2 stated that their father equally divided the property into 4 parts and given his share, so the accused with an intention to commit murder stabbed with iron dragger on the head of the C.W.2 and caused bleeding injury. Then he took chopper which was kept near the house of C.W.2 and assaulted on the right hand and below left knee and caused grievous injury. The accused also caused life threat to C.W.2. On the basis of the said information given by C.W.1 crime registered against the accused for the offences



punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code.

3. On the basis of the first information at Ex.P.14 the complainant police registered the crime No.125/2024 against accused as per FIR dated 27.04.2024 as per Ex.P.17. In the FIR also allegations made against the accused as stated in the first information. After registering crime the Investigating Officer P.W.11 conducted investigation. Investigating Officer P.W.11 submitted charge-sheet before jurisdictional Magistrate for the offence punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code.

4. After filing final report, the Learned Magistrate took cognizance of offence registered a criminal case against the accused in C.C.No.779/2024 for the offence punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code. Thereafter, the presence of the accused secured before the Court. As the alleged offence punishable under section 307 of IPC is triable exclusively by the Sessions Court, the Learned Magistrate committed matter to this Court as per committal order dated 15.02.2025 under section 209 of Cr.P.C.



5. After committal, the Court registered Sessions Case number S.C.No.5016/2025 against the accused and secured his presence before the Court. After securing presence of accused, the Court, upon perusal of final report and other records, framed charge against him for the offenses punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code as per charge dated 04.10.2025. The accused denied charge framed against him and pleads to face trial. Consequently the Court set the matter for trial.

6. During trial the prosecution examined total 11 witnesses as P.W.1 to P.W.11 though as per final report I.O cited 17 witnesses. On behalf of prosecution he got marked 27 documents at Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.27. The prosecution also identified eight material objects as per M.O.1 and M.O.8. After prosecution evidence the Court examined the accused on 21.04.2026 as provided under section 313 of Cr.P.C, and explained incriminating material against him and he denied materials against him. However he stated he has not committed any offence in answer to materials explained to him and he has not pleads to produce any materials on his behalf. He denied the materials against him as false case



registered against him. The accused denied materials produced by the prosecution in the evidence before the Court. Under the circumstances, trial closed and posted the matter for argument.

7. I have heard the learned Public Prosecutor and counsel for accused. Learned Public Prosecutor by relying upon material witnesses and evidence produced before the Court submitted that though P.W.6/victim and mahazar witnesses P.W.4, P.W.5 and P.W.7 have not supported the prosecution case in it's entirety, there is nothing on record to disbelieve their version. It is argued that the prosecution proved the incident through the evidence of P.W.6 and P.W.9. Placing upon all the materials available on record, the learned Public Prosecutor argued that the prosecution established the guilt of the accused hence the accused are liable to convict. Relying upon the same he prays to impose maximum punishment.

8. The counsel for the accused argued that injured and eye witnesses are turned hostile. Recovery of weapons alleged to have been used for assault i.e. knife M.O.1 is not proved from the evidence of P.W.6 and P.W.9. Hence there is no material to convict the



accused on the basis of evidence of police officials and Investigating Officer. With above grounds 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 that on 27.04.2024 at 5.30 p.m near the house of C.W.2 situated at Sy. No.110 of Mallekavu Village within in the jurisdiction of Koratagere Police Station, when the C.W.2 and C.W.3 were present the accused person with an intention to commit murder of C.W.2 stabbed with sharp dagger on the head of the C.W.2 and caused bleeding injury and made him to fell down on the ground, then accused assaulted the C.W.2 on his right hand and below left knee with chopper and caused bleeding injury with an intention and knowledge that at said assault likely to cause death thereby C.W.2 was sustained injuries, thereby the accused committed offence punishable under Section 307 of IPC,?

2) Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on same day, time the accused person with an common intention to commit murder has intentionally abused the C.W.2 in filthy language thereby gave provocation to C.W.2 by knowing it to be likely that such provocation will cause to



break public peace, thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 504 of IPC,?

3) Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on same day, time the accused person with an common intention to commit murder C.W.2, has committed criminal intimidation by threatening the C.W.2 with threat to cause death and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 506 of IPC,?

4] 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 : In the Negative;

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

|| R E A S O N S ||

11. **POINT NO.1 TO 3:-** In the case on hand, though separate charges are framed against the accused for the offences punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code but said alleged offences emerged from a single incident. There is no different incident and same is arisen out of in a single incident. All the



charges are required common appreciation of materials hence same are discussed together to decide whether any such incident occurred on the day of incident. As per prosecution case, the accused stabbed with sharp dagger on his head and caused grievous injury on his right hand and below left knee with chopper and gave life threat because of land dispute. In the case on hand, C.W.2/victim and C.W.3 are material witnesses, who are examined before the Court as P.W.6 and P.W.3.

12. 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.

13. The accused persons have been charged for offence of attempt to murder punishable under Section 307 of IPC. Same is reproduced verbatim as under:-

"Section 307. Attempt to murder-Whoever does any act with such intention or knowledge, and under such circumstances that, if he by that act caused death, he would be guilty of murder, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine; and if



hurt is caused to any person by such act, the offender shall be liable either to imprisonment for life, or to such punishment as is hereinbefore mentioned.

Attempts by life convicts-When any person offending under this section is under sentence of imprisonment for life, he may, if hurt is caused, be punished with death.

The essential ingredients required to be proved in the case of an offence under Section 307 IPC are as under:

- (i) that the death of a human being was attempted;
- (ii) that such death was attempted to be caused by, or in consequence of the act of the accused; and
- (iii) that such act was done with the intention of causing death; or that it was done with the intention of causing such bodily injury as : (a) the accused knew to be likely to cause death; or (b) was sufficient in the ordinary course of nature to cause death, or that the accused attempted to cause death by doing an act known to him to be so imminently dangerous that it must in all probability cause (a) death, or (b) such bodily injury as is likely to cause death, the accused having no excuse for incurring the risk of causing such death or injury."



14. P.W.1 Doctor deposed that on 27.04.2024 at evening hours Hanumantharayappa brought by his relatives with the history of assault by Ramachandraiah with knife on 27.04.2024. On examination of Hanumantharayappa he found that multiple stab injuries over legs and head, sever head injury and fracture shaft of ulna (fore arm fracture). Accordingly he had issued wound certificate. He had referred him to district hospital Tumakuru for CT scan. On 20.09.2024 he had received requisition of PSI, Koratagere opinion of the injuries and weapon and police produced the dragger and iron chopper. On examination he found that the injuries sustained by Hanumantharayappa may be caused by using the dragger and iron chopper which was examined by him and he had given report as per Ex.P.2. He had identified dragger and iron chopper at M.O.1 and M.O.2. During the cross-examination he admitted that he was not mentioned the time and age of the injury in the injury certificate at Ex.P.1. He admitted that the injuries noted in Ex.P.1 could also have been caused by a fall on sharp stones or broken glass, or by being hit against such sharp object.



15. P.W.2 PWD Engineer who prepared the sketch of the spot of the incident. He deposed that on 26.06.2024 he visited the spot of the incident with C.W.15 and he shown the spot of the incident which is situated in front of the house of Lakshmikantha of Mallekavu, C.N.Durga hobli. He had verified the spot of the incident and prepared rough sketch, returned to the office and prepared sketch. He had also took GPS photographs through his mobile, taken the printout from the computer, prepared sketch and submitted to Assistant Executive Engineer. Thereafter Assistant Executive Engineer forwarded the same to the Koratagere Police Station.

16. P.W.3, as per the prosecution case she is the eye witness to the incident. She was present at the time of spot mahazar and seizure mahazar. She has produced blood stained clothes before the police. Her evidence is very material to prove the guilt of the accused. In her evidence, she deposed that complainant and accused are the relatives. There was a land dispute between them and accused persons. Her uncle, father-in-law and his brothers were got divided the properties and residing separately. She has clearly stated that the



accused has not assaulted her father-in-law, not abused and not caused life threat. She had identified her signature at Ex.P.6 spot mahazar and seizure mahazar at Ex.P.7. She identified photographs at Ex.P.8 to Ex.P.11. These photographs were taken near the house and police station. But she did not know for what purpose photographs taken. The police did not seize anything before her. She did not give statement before the police. P.W.3 did not identify M.O.1 and M.O.2. The prosecution treated P.W.3 as hostile and cross-examined at length but nothing worthwhile was elicited from her mouth to prove the guilt of the accused.

17. P.W.4 and P.W.5 are the seizure mahazar witnesses to Ex.P.7. Both of them identified their signature on Ex.P.7. Further deposed that about 1½ years back the police took their signatures at police station. But they do not know for what purpose police took their signatures. P.W.4 and P.W.5 further deposed in their presence nothing was seized by the police. They do not know the contents of Ex.P.7. The prosecution treated P.W.4 and P.W.5 as hostile and cross-examined



at length but nothing worthwhile was elicited from their mouth to prove the guilt of the accused.

18. P.W.6 victim and injured. His evidence is very materials to prove the case of the prosecution. P.W.6 deposed that his parents are having 4 children, he is the elder son, accused is second son, Siddanayaka and Hanumesh were married, divided the properties equally and residing separately. There was no dispute between him and the accused. The accused was not assaulted him, was not abused and not caused life threat. Even he stated that he was not took treatment in the hospital as the accused assault on him. He did not given any statement before the police. Even today the relationship between him and his brother were cordial. P.W.6 deposed that his brother never demanded for more share in the land. The prosecution treated P.W.6 as hostile and cross-examined at length but nothing worthwhile was elicited from his mouth to prove the guilt of the accused.

19. P.W.7 is spot mahazar witness to Ex.P.6. He identified his signature on Ex.P.6. He deposed that about 8-10 months back when he was proceeding along with his cow near the land of C.W.2, the police took his



signature. He did not know the contents of Ex.P.6 but he identified his presence in the photographs at Ex.P.8 to Ex.P.10. He did not have any information about this case. The prosecution treated P.W.7 as hostile and cross-examined at length but nothing worth was elicited from his mouth to prove the guilt of the accused.

20. P.W.8 Dr.Shashidar, deposed that on 07.05.2024 Koratagere police brought the injured Hanumantharayappa for analysis of blood group. On the same day he collected the blood sample of Hanumantharayappa. As per the lab report the blood group is "O" positive. Accordingly P.W.8 issued lab report as per Ex.P.13.

21. P.W.9, the complainant, deposed that the accused is his uncle. There was land dispute between the accused and him. At the time of incident he had been to his work, one Devaraju called him over the phone and asked him to come home, accordingly he returned. By the time he reached the home, his wife had already taken his mother-in-law and his father to the hospital. Further he deposed that his father sustained injuries to his head and leg. He did not know how his father sustained injuries and who had assaulted him. He



identified his signature on Ex.P.14 complaint. He is not aware of the contents of Ex.P.14. He had not furnished any information to anyone. The accused had not committed any offence. The prosecution treated P.W.9 as hospital and cross-examined at length but nothing worth while was elicited from his mouth.

22. P.W.10, eye witness to the incident and is very material witness to the prosecution. He deposed that he did not know anything about this case. He had not seen the incident. He had not given any statement to the police. The prosecution treated P.W.10 as hospital and cross-examined at length but nothing worth while was elicited from his mouth.

23. P.W.11, Investigating Officer, she deposed that, on 27.04.2024 at about 8-30 p.m C.W.1 appeared before the police station and filed written complaint. She received the complaint and registered the case in Crime No.125/2024 and submitted FIR to the Court and to higher officials. She identified her signature on Ex.P.14 complaint and on Ex.P.17 FIR. Further P.W.11 deposed that on 28.04.2024 she visited the spot of the incident wherein she served the notice on C.W.5 and C.W.6 and secured the presence of panchas and



conducted mahazar in the place shown by C.W.3 as per Ex.P.6. During the mahazar collected the blood stain cotton and without blood stain cotton. P.W.11 deposed that C.W.3 produced dragon and sickle and same was seized by conducting mahazar between 8-00 a.m and 10-00 a.m. She has identified mahazar at Ex.P.6 and photographs at Ex.P.8 to Ex.P.10. She identified M.O.3 to M.O.8. Further P.W.11 deposed that she deputed C.W.13 and C.W.14 to trace out the accused and on the same day C.W.13 and C.W.14 were produced the accused at about 10-45 a.m and C.W.13 submitted report as per Ex.P.18. On 29.04.2024 at about 10-30 a.m C.W.3 produced cloths of the injured and she served notice on C.W.7 and C.W.8 and secured their presence, conducted mahazar between 10-30 and 11-15 a.m as per Ex.P.7 and seized panche and baniyan. She identified her signature on Ex.P.7 and identified photograph at Ex.P.11. She identified panche and baniyan as per M.O.9 and deposed she recorded the statement of witnesses. On 07.05.2024 she collected the blood group report as per Ex.P.17 and conducted other formalities of the investigation. Due to election she got transferred, therefore she handed over further



investigation charge to C.W.17 and he filed charge-sheet against the accused.

24. In this case P.W.6 is the victims and P.W.3 and P.W.10 are eye witness are the star witnesses to the prosecution case but they have completely resile from their earlier statement. Though the prosecution treated them hostile and cross-examined no incriminating has been elicited from their mouth to support the prosecution version. Their testimony does not inspire the confidence and failed to establish either the occurrence of the incident or involvement of the accused. It is settled law that though testimony of the hostile witnesses is not to be rejected in toto, the Court can rely upon the portion which inspires confidence. In the present case no such reliable portion available. P.W.7 is mahazar witnesses to the Ex.P.6, P.W.4 and P.W.5 are the seizure mahazar witnesses to Ex.P.7. But unfortunately all these witnesses have turned hostile, they have denied their presence at the time mahazar and also denied the alleged seizure proceedings. Though the prosecution treated them hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution but no material contradictions supporting the prosecution case has



been brought on record. It is pertinent to note that unfortunately, C.W.5 spot mahazar witness was dead.

25. In this case P.W.6 is cited by the prosecution as an injured witness and is therefore material witness. Ordinarily, evidence of injured witness carries Court evidential value. However testimony of P.W.6 in the present case suffers from serious contradictions and inconsistent rendering it unreliable. In his chief examination P.W.6 did not support the prosecution case and denied the occurrence of the alleged incident. As such he was treated as hostile by the prosecution however nothing worth while was elicited from the mouth of this witness to support the case of the prosecution.

26. Evidence of P.W.1 clearly establishes that P.W.6 sustained grievous injuries and injuries were caused by weapon like dagger and iron machete. However it is trite law that medical evidence is corroborative not substantive. In *Solanki Chimmanbai Ukbhi Vs. State of Gujarath*, 1983(2) SCC 174 Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that, "ordinarily, the value of medical evidence is only corroborative. It proves that the injuries could have been caused in the manner alleged and nothing more. The use which the defence can make of



the medical evidence is to prove that the injuries could not possibly have been caused in the manner alleged and thereby discredit the eye witnesses. Unless, however the medical evidence in its turn goes so far that it completely rules out all possibilities whatsoever of injuries: taking place in the manner alleged by eye witnesses, the testimony of the eye witnesses cannot be thrown out on the ground of alleged inconsistency between it and the medical evidence.”

27. Of-course the evidence of P.W.1 clearly establishes that injured has sustained injuries and the injuries could be caused by dragger and iron machete. However the history of assault recorded by the doctor is based on the narration of the injured and is not substantive evidence. When the injured himself has turned hostile, history mentioned in the wound certificate cannot be used to fix criminal liability on the accused. The medical evidence is only corroborative evidence cannot substitute direct evidence regarding the assailant. Thus, why the medical evidence supported the occurrence of injury, it does not identify the assailant nor does it independently proved the guilt of



the accused. Hence the evidence of P.W.1 is not helpful to prove the guilt of the accused.

28. Evidence of Investigating Officer is formal and procedural and pancha witnesses P.W.4, P.W.5, P.W.7 to Ex.P.6 and Ex.P.7 spot mahazar and seizure mahazar. All these witnesses turned hostile under these circumstance conducting spot mahazarand seizure mahazar as per Ex.P.6 and Ex.P.7 are doubtful. Further in this case P.W.6/victim, P.W.9/complainant and P.W.3 and P.W.10 eye witnesses all are turned hostile. So evidence of P.W.11 is not helpful to the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused.

29. In the present case even as per the wound certificate P.W.6 is sustained a grievous injuries but P.W.6, P.W.3, P.W.9 and P.W.10 are clearly deposed that the accused had not assaulted P.W.6. Under the circumstances the prosecution has failed to at threshold in proving who inflicted those injuries. When the identity of the assailant is not proved, the question of intention under section 307 does not arise. In the present case there is no admissible evidence connecting the accused to the alleged offence.



30. In the case on hand, I considered all the aspects before this Court specifically evidence of P.W.1 doctor Purushotham Nayak. Though the evidence of P.W.1 proved that victim is sustained certain injuries but his evidence is not able to prove that said injury caused by the accused. Though the wound certificate discloses that the assault by Ramachandraiah with knife on 27.04.2024. however in this case, the victim P.W.6 himself clearly stated the accused has not assaulted him. Further more eye witnesses P.W.3 and P.W.10 are clearly deposed that the accused not assaulted P.W.6 Under the circumstances, the evidence of P.W.1 and wound certificate Ex.P.1 is not help to prove the guilt of the accused. Hence, I am unable to accept the contention of the prosecution that the accused have assaulted the victim and caused injured thereby they have committed offence 307 of IPC.

31. The evidence of P.W.6 victim, eye witnesses P.W.3 and P.W.10 and complainant P.W.9 does not discloses that the accused abused in filthy language and caused threat to the life of P.W.6. Hence the prosecution has failed to prove the offence alleged against the accused under Section 504 and 506 of IPC.



32. The criminal law mandates that the guilt must be proved beyond reasonable doubt. In view of the totality of the evidence, this Court finds that victim and eyewitnesses P.W.6, P.W.3, P.W.9 and P.W.10 have turned hostile. The medical evidence does not prove the identity of the accused. P.W.11 Investigating Officer evidence is not substantive. Hence the prosecution has failed to prove the charge under section 307 of IPC beyond reasonable doubt.

33. After considering all other materials, I am of the view that prosecution failed to prove the charge framed against the accused for the offences punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of IPC. No charges are proved against the accused. Consequently, accused is entitled to benefit of doubt in the case on hand and entitled to acquittal from all the charges. It is relevant to note that incident dated 27.04.2024 is not proved. Hence, I am of the opinion that it is not necessary to discuss all the charges separately as the incident itself is not proved. Under the circumstances, I feel it is better to extend the benefit of doubt in favour of the accused as there is doubt in the mind of Court against the allegations made



against the accused. Accordingly, I answer point No.1 to 3 in the Negative.

34. **POINT NO.4:-** In view of my answer to point No.1 to 3, I conclude that the prosecution failed to prove the charges leveled against the accused for the offences punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of IPC. Consequently, the accused is entitled to benefit of doubt and entitled to acquittal. Hence, I proceed to pass the following:-

|| ORDER ||

The accused Ramachandraiah.M.D S/o Late Doddanayaka is ***not found guilty*** for the offences punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code.

Acting under section 235(1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, the accused Ramachandraiah.M.D S/o Late Doddanayaka is herewith ***acquitted*** from the charges framed against him for the offences punishable under Section 307, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code.



The bail bonds executed by the accused and his sureties is herewith stands canceled.

The bail bond and surety bonds executed by accused and his surety 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 and M.O-2 dragger and iron chopper after expiry of appeal period as it is valuable.

The office is directed to destroy the material objects M.O-3 to M.O-8 after expiry of appeal period as it is worthless.

(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 23rd day of June, 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 : Dr.K.Purushotham Naik.K



PW.2	:	Hemanth.S.G
PW.3	:	Yashodamma
PW.4	:	Vishwaradya
PW.5	:	Deraju
PW.6	:	Hanumantharayappa.M.V
PW.7	:	Ranganath
PW.8	:	Dr.Shashidar
PW.9	:	Lakshmikantha
PW.10	:	Devaraju
PW.11	:	Padma.N

LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR PROSECUTION

Ex.P.1	:	Wound Certificate
Ex.P.2	:	Report
Ex.P.3	:	Letter from PWD to Koratagere Police Station
Ex.P.4	:	Sketch
Ex.P.5	:	Photographs taken from GPS Map Camera
Ex.P.6	:	Spot Mahazar
Ex.P.7	:	Seizure Mahazar
Ex.P.8 to 11:	:	Photographs
Ex.P.12	:	Statement of P.W.3
Ex.P.13	:	Lab report
Ex.P.14	:	First Information
Ex.P.15	:	Statement of P.W.10
Ex.P.16	:	FSL report
Ex.P.17	:	First Information Report
Ex.P.18	:	Report
Ex.P.19	:	Certificate under Section 65(B) of

**Indian Evidence Act**

Ex.P.20 & P.21: C.D

Ex.P.22 : Certificate under Section 65(B) of
Indian Evidence Act

Ex.P.23 : Certificate under Section 65(B) of
Indian Evidence Act

Ex.P.24 to P.27 :R.T.C extracts

Ex.P.28 : Statement of P.W.6

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR DEFENSE

-NIL-

LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED FOR DEFENSE

-NIL-

**MATERIAL OBJECTS IDENTIFIED FOR THE
PROSECUTION**

M.O.1 : Draggar
M.O.2 : Iron chopper
M.O.3 : Cover containing blood sample
M.O.4 : Cover containing cotton
M.O.5 : Cover containing blood
stain mud
M.O.6 : Cover containing without blood
stain mud
M.O.7 : Blood stain mud
M.O.8 : Without blood stain mud

sd/-

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