

**IN THE COURT OF THE IIND ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS**  
**JUDGE, U.K. KARWAR.**

**Sessions Case No. 36/2014**

C.W. 36    P.W. 37  
Duly sworn on: 09-07-2025

Name : Dr. Subhash S. Tandel  
Father's name : Satya Tandel  
Age : 62 Years  
Occupation : Rtd. Senior Specialist  
Residence : Karwar

**Examination in Chief by PP:**

1. From July 2013 to August 2025, I worked in Karwar District Hospital as a Senior Specialist. During my tenure in the said Hospital, I have conducted several Postmortem and I have submitted P.M reports to the Court and I have deposed for the Courts.

2. On 15-02-2014 at 4.00 pm when I was on duty, I have received a requisition from C.W.57 through C.W.49 alongwith dead body of Ashwini for conducting Postmortem. Now I am seeing the requisition and same is already marked as Ex.P.68. The signature of the witness is marked as Ex.P.68(a). In the said requisition, the IO has also requested to collect the samples for DNA test. After receipt of the dead body of Ashwini, I have conducted the Postmortem at the mortuary of District Hospital, Karwar from 4.15 to 6.15 pm. During the Postmortem, I have collected cloths which were on the body. When I collected the cloths, it was blood stained. Thereafter, I have handed over the said cloths to C.W.49.

3. While conducting the Postmortem, I found that the body was normal built and nourished, Rigor mortis well developed all over the body. Further, I found the following the external injuries over the body.

1. There is incised wound measuring 16 cm X 5 cm X bone depth from below pinna of left ear, extending from lateral border of sternocleidomastoid muscle, upto chin of mandible, cutting all vessels, nerves and muscles. There is a fracture of body of mandible.

2. Incised wound on left wrist, exposing the wrist joint measuring 3.5 inches X 2.5 inches X bone deep at dorsal aspect. Cut portion hanging with the tag of the skin, cutting tendons vessels and nerves. These are the features of antemortem injuries.

4. After dissection of the body, brain was intact and pale. The chest was intact and it was pale. Heart chambers were intact and pale. The stomach and small intestine contains semi digested food and large intestine contains faecal matters and it was pale. And all other internal organs were intact. As the injury no.1 and 2 obvious and bleeding was profused and there were blood clots, I was definite about the cause of the death. In my opinion, cause of death is as a result of profuse bleeding, secondary to cutting of large vessels, bleeding to hypovolemic shock. At the time since death is 12 to 24 hrs before postmortem. We cannot assess the age of the wound, if victim dies on the spot. For conducting postmortem, I have issued postmortem report. Now I am seeing the postmortem report and same is marked as Ex.P.82 and the signatures are marked as Ex.P.82(a) and (b). Now I am seeing the cloths which were collected during the postmortem and the said cloths are already marked as MO.14 to 16.

5. On 10-05-2014, I received a requisition from C.W.57 through C.W.51 along with sealed weapon and C.W.57 sought clarification for two

questions in the requisition. Now I am seeing the requisition and same is already marked as Ex.P.72 and signature of the witness is marked as Ex.P.72(a). After receipt of the sealed weapon, I opened the same and thereafter I measured the weapon and prepared the drawing. When I examined the weapon, it was having wooden handle, lower edge was sharp and upper edge was blunt, tip was sharpened and slight bend. From the examination of the weapon, my opinion is that the injuries shown in the postmortem report can be caused assault by this weapon. After the examination I repacked the same in cloth bag and put the seal and also I have signed on the handle. Now I am seeing the weapon which I have examined and same is already marked as MO.26. The defect found in lower edge of MO. 26 was not found at the time of examination. Now I am seeing the signature on the handle of the weapon and now it is marked as MO.26(c). Now I am seeing the drawing of MO.26 and same is marked as Ex.P.83 and the signature of the witness is marked as Ex.P.83(a). And I have also issued opinion report. Now I am seeing the Opinion report and same is marked as Ex.P.84 and signature is marked as Ex.P.84(a). Thereafter, I have returned MO.26 alongwith Ex.P.83 and Ex.P.84 to the concerned Police. On my opinion, the death is homicidal.

**Cross examination: By Sri AAA., Counsel for Accused:**

6. I am a skin specialist. I do not have certificate of forensic pathology or forensic medicine. The witness volunteers that at the time of our graduation, we learned about forensic medicine as a subject. In the year 2014, there were no forensic specialist in the District Hospital. I do not had authorization for conducting postmortem. Witness volunteers that I have conducted the postmortem on the instruction of D.H.O. There is no written authorization from the D.H.O.

7. While conducting the postmortem I have followed the procedure which was in existence. Now I cannot say the procedure which I followed. I don't know the format for transferring the body to mortuary. It is true that I have not mentioned in the postmortem report that the injuries are antemortem in nature. It is true that, I have not mentioned the word 'homicide' in the postmortem. It is true that I have not signed on the MO.14 to 16. We are not maintaining any register for handing over the cloths. Now I cannot see my signature and seen on MO.26/1 bag, as my colleagues are also examined the same. I cannot say that who has examined the MO.26 before my examination or after the examination. It is false to suggest that MO.26 does not contain my signature. It is suggested that there is a difference between the signature in postmortem and on MO.26 and the witness volunteers that the signature on MO.26 is my short signature.

8. It is true that there is irregular in the lower edge. It is true that tip of the MO.26 is having sharp. It is false to suggested that there is a difference in the dimension of MO.26 and drawing at Ex.P.83. We are not maintaining any register for returning of weapon after the examination. It is true that the wound shown in the postmortem at Ex.P.82 are possible from axe, sword or any other sharp objects. It is false to suggest that I am not specialized for examination of weapon and to give opinion on postmortem. It was suggested that since I am dermatologist, I cannot conduct postmortem, analyze wound, analyze weapon and to give opinion and the witness stated that I have completed my MBBS degree. It is false to suggest that now I am seeing the weapon for the first time in the Court. It is false to suggest that I have never done the analysis and drawing of the weapon. It is false to suggest that I have not collected the cloths of the body. It is false

to suggest that I have not conducted postmortem and I am deposing falsehood before the Court on the say of Police.

**Re-examination – Nil -**

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

(Mayanna B L.)

Ind Addl. District & Sessions Judge,  
Uttara Kannada, Karwar.