

MHAU160005832025



Received on 17.12.2024

Registered on 17.12.2024

Decided on 16.03.2026

Duration 01 Years, 02 Months, 30 Days

Sessions Case No. 118 of 2025**Exh.No.33/A****Form No. XXXII****Part'A'**

(Title Page of Judgment)

(Para 44(i) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual)

	<p>IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, GANGAPUR, TAL. GANGAPUR, DISTRICT – CHHATRAPATI-SAMBHAJINAGAR</p> <p>Present : S.B. Bahalkar, Additional Sessions Judge.</p> <p>(Judgment date 16.03.2026)</p> <p>(Sessions Case No.118/2025)</p> <p>(Old Sessions Case No.138/2024)</p>
	<p>FIR No.868/2024, U/Sec.80 and 108 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station MIDC Waluj, Chhatrapati-Sambhajinagar</p>
COMPLAINANT	<p>STATE OF MAHARASHTRA, Through The Police Inspector, Police Station MIDC Waluj, Chhatrapati-Sambhajinagar</p>
REPRESENTED BY	<p>Mr. K. S. Gande, Learned A.P.P for the State</p>
ACCUSED	<p>Gaurishankar Mahesh Prasad Age - 20 years, Occu. Private Service, R/o – Sukiyama, Dist. Jahanabad, State – Bihar, current R/o. Near Sawata</p>

	Mandir, Old Ranjangaon, Tq. Gangapur, Dist. Chh. Sambhajinagar
REPRESENTED BY	Mr. S.B. Sawant, Learned Adv. for the Accused

Part -'B'
(Para 44(ii) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual)

Date of offence	01.10.2024
Date of FIR	03.10.2024
Date of Charge-sheet	27.11.2024
Date of Framing of Charges	01.10.2025
Date of commencement of evidence	14.01.2026
Date on which judgment is reserved	12.03.2026
Date of the Judgment	16.03.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	---

Accused Details

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on bail	Offences charges with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428, Cr.PC.
(1)	Gaurishankar Mahesh Prasad	04.10.2024	17.03.2025	U/Sec.80 and 108 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023	Acquitted	-	11 Months and 07 days

J U D G M E N T
(Delivered on 16th March 2026)

Accused being the husband of Nishi Kumariya, the deceased subjected her to cruelty to meet his unlawful demand of

money i.e. dowry and thereby abetted her to commit suicide. Hence, he is facing trial under Sections 80 and 108 the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short “the BNS”).

Brief facts of the prosecution case are as under :-

[2] Nishi Kumariya, the deceased was the daughter of Gulshan Yadav, the informant. She was married to the accused in March-2024. The informant gave Rs.10 lakh to the accused as dowry. After the marriage she went to the house of the accused for co-habitation at village Sukiyama, Bihar. The accused was at job at MIDC, Waluj, Maharashtra. He used to reside at village Ranjangaon Shenpunji near MIDC, Waluj.

[3] About one and half month prior to the incident the accused alongwith deceased, came to reside at village Ranjangaon Shenpunji. Thereafter, the accused started to demand Rs. 2 lakh from the deceased to purchase motorcycle and used to insist her to bring the said money from her father. On that count he used to beat her everyday. Therefore, the deceased by phone calls used to disclosed her father and mother about the demands made by the accused and harassment caused by him. However, her father and mother did not have money, hence, they could not fulfill the said demands. Therefore, the accused beat the deceased.

[4] Thereafter, on 02.10.2024 son of the informant received phone call from police of Chhatrapati-Sambhajinagar, and it was informed that Nishi Kumariya hanged herself to the ceiling of her house at Ranjangaon Shenpunji and committed suicide. Then, the

informant alongwith his one relative came to Ghati Hospital, Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar, where they saw dead body of Nishi Kumariya.

[5] The incident was reported to MIDC Waluj Police Station. On the basis of said report, Accidental Death No. 168/2024 came to be registered and handed over to LPHC Smt. Chande for inquiry. Smt. Chande prepared inquest panchanama on the dead body and forwarded the same for post-mortem. She visited to the spot of the incident and prepared panchanama of the scene of the spot. She seized pieces of '*Odhani*' under the said panchanama. She recorded statements of witnesses.

[6] On 03.10.2024 Gulshan Yadav, the father of the deceased lodged FIR against the accused, wherein he alleged that on account of non-fulfillment of his unlawful demand of money, the accused subjected the deceased to cruelty and thereby abetted her to commit suicide.

[7] On the basis of said FIR, crime vide C. R. No.I 868/2024 under Sections 80 and 108 the BNS, came to be registered and handed over to API Gitte for investigation. He received inquest panchnama, spot panchnama and seized pieces of '*Odhani*' from LPHC Smt. Chance.

[8] During the investigation, API Gitte arrested the accused. He recorded statements of the witnesses. He got recorded statements of the informant under section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik

Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, before Learned J.M.F.C., Gangapur. Thereafter, he forwarded viscera of the deceased and seized muddemal to Forensic Science Laboratory for Chemical Analysis. He collected C.A. reports. He received postmortem report, wherein probable cause of death is mentioned as “Death due to Hanging”. On completion of the investigation, he submitted charge-sheet against the accused under sections 80 and 108 the BNS in the Court of J.M.F.C., Gangapur.

[9] Since the offence under Sections 80 and 108 the BNS are tribal exclusively by the Court of Sessions, the Learned J.M.F.C., Gangapur committed the case to this Court.

[10] I have framed Charge (Exh.15) against the accused under Sections 80 and 108 the BNS. Particulars of offences were read over and explained to the accused to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

[11] Statements of the accused under Section 351 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 was recorded. He has admitted that relationship between the parties. He has also admitted that he alongwith the deceased was residing at Ranjangaon Shenpunji. However, he has denied the allegations made by the prosecution. He has submitted that the deceased was married to him against her wish, hence, she committed suicide. Prosecution witnesses are her relatives, hence, to implicate him falsely they have deposed against him.

[12] Following points arise for my determination. I have recorded my findings thereon for the reasons stated below:-

Sr. No.	Points	Findings.
1.	Does the prosecution prove that the accused abetted deceased Nishi Kumariya to commit suicide ?	Not proved.
2.	Does the prosecution prove that the accused, caused "dowry death" of deceased Nishi Kumariya ?	Not proved.
3.	What Order ?	Accused is acquitted.

REASONS

Point Nos.1 and 2 :-

[13] It is not in dispute that death of Nishi Kumariya was suicidal.

[14] The accused has been charged under section 108 of the BNS for abetment of suicide by the deceased. Therefore, question remains that as to whether the accused abetted her to commit suicide? Abetment is defined under Section 45 of the BNS as under :-

Section 45. *A person abets the doing of a thing, who—*

(a) instigates any person to do that thing; or

(b) engages with one or more other person or persons in any conspiracy for the doing of that thing, if an act or illegal omission takes place in pursuance of that conspiracy, and in

order to the doing of that thing; or

(c) intentionally aids, by any act or illegal omission, the doing of that thing.

Explanation 1.—*A person who, by wilful misrepresentation, or by wilful concealment of a material fact which he is bound to disclose, voluntarily causes or procures, or attempts to cause or procure, a thing to be done, is said to instigate the doing of that thing.*

Illustration.

A, a public officer, is authorised by a warrant from a Court to apprehend Z. B, knowing that fact and also that C is not Z, wilfully represents to A that C is Z, and thereby intentionally causes A to apprehend C. Here B abets by instigation the apprehension of C.

Explanation 2.—*Whoever, either prior to or at the time of the commission of an act, does anything in order to facilitate the commission of that act, and thereby facilitates the commission thereof, is said to aid the doing of that act*

[15] Gulshan Yadav (PW-1), is the father of the deceased. He is an informant. He states that Nishi Kumariya was his daughter. She was married to the accused in March-2024. After the marriage Nishi Kumariya went for cohabitation to the house of the accused at village Sukiyama, Bihar. About one month after the marriage Nishi Kumariya came back to his house. At that time she stayed there for one month and again went back to the house of the accused at village Sukiyama.

[16] Gulshan Yadav (PW1) further states that, about 20 days thereafter his daughter – Nishi Kumariya came to Ranjangaon

Shenpunji along with the accused for cohabitation. About one month thereafter Nishi Kumariya made him phone call and informed that the accused was demanding from her gold chain and two wheeler vehicle and on that count he beat her. Two days thereafter he received phone call from police Maharashtra and he was informed that his daughter – Nishi died. He also came to know that door of her house was closed and her body was taken out by breaking open the door.

[17] It has further come in the evidence of Gulshan Yadav (PW-1) that, thereafter, he along with his relative Vijay Yadav (PW3) and one Sanjeet Yadav came to Aurangabad, Maharashtra. Police took them to the Government Hospital at Aurangabad. He saw dead-body of his daughter - Nishi. Thereafter, he went to the police station and lodged FIR against the accused vide Exh.26.

[18] Vijay Yadav (PW3) is the relative Gulshan Yadav (PW-1). He states that, Gulshan Yadav is the father-in-law of his son. On 02.10.2024 he had been to his village Daryapur, Bihar. At that time, Gulshan Yadhav made him phone call and informed him that his daughter – Nishi Kumariya died. Thereafter, he along with Gulshan Yadav and one another relative came to Aurangabad. They went in Government Hospital at Aurangabad. They saw dead-body of Nishi Kumariya.

[19] It has further come in the evidence of the Vijay Yadhav (PW3) that, Gulshan Yadhav had disclosed him that accused – Gaurishankar was demanding gold chain and motorcycle from Nishi Kumariya and on that count the accused used to beat

Nishi Kumariya. However, he categorically stated that, he does not know as to whether Nishi Kumariya committed suicide or she was killed.

[20] On examination of evidence of Gulshan Yadhav (PW2) and Vijay Yadav (PW3), it appears that they made general allegations about alleged unlawful demand and ill-treatment caused by the accused to deceased Nishi Kumariya. They have not mentioned any specific incident or date about the alleged unlawful demand of gold chain and motorcycle made by the accused and ill-treatment caused to deceased – Nishi Kumariya.

[21] It has come in the evidence of Vijay Yadav (PW3) that, Gulshan Yadav (PW2) i.e. the informant disclosed him that the accused used to demand gold chain and motorcycle from the deceased and on that count he used to beat her. However, Gulshan Yadav (PW2) nowhere states that he disclosed Vijay Yadav (PW3) about the alleged demand of gold chain and motorcycle and about alleged ill-treatment caused by the accused to deceased – Nishi Kumariya. In the circumstances, hearsay deposition of Vijay Yadav (PW3) is not admissible in the evidence.

[22] Moreover, from the evidence of Gulshan Yadhav (PW2) it appears that about one month after the marriage Nishi Kumariya came back to his house. At that time, she stayed there for one month and again went to the house of the accused at Sukiyama. However, Gulshan Yadave (PW2) nowhere states that during her stay Nishi Kumariya complained before him that the accused used to

demand gold chain or motorcycle and on that count he used to beat her. Thus, inference can be drawn that till her first visit after her marriage to the house of Gulshan Yadav (PW2), deceased – Nishi Kumariya had no grievance against the accused as regards to unlawful demand of gold chain and motorcycle.

[23] It has further come in the evidence of Gulshan Yadhav (PW2) that, about one month after Nishi Kumariya and accused came to reside at Ranjangaon, Maharashtra, she made him phone call and informed him that, accused – Gaurishankar was demanding her gold chain and two wheeler vehicle and on that count he beat her. Thus, this was the first occasion, when the deceased informed her father i.e. Gulshan Yadav (PW2), about the alleged unlawful demand made by the accused and about ill-treatment caused to her by the accused.

[24] As stated above the deceased informed her father i.e. Gulshan Yadav (PW2) by phone call. In the circumstances, the Investigation Officer was required to collect the CDR and SDR of the phone numbers of the deceased and her father i.e. Gulshan Yadav (PW2). Such, evidence might have thrown light on the material aspect of the case. However, non collection of such material evidence on the part of the Investigating Officer creates reasonable doubt about the fairness about the investigation. In such circumstances, inference can be drawn that there had been no such phone calls between the deceased and her father and she had not informed him about any such alleged unlawful demand made by the accused and alleged harassment caused by the accused.

[25] Prosecution has adduced evidence of API – Gitte (PW4), the Investigating Officer. He states that he visited to the spot of incident and prepared panchanama of the spot in presence of the panch witnesses. He recorded statements of the witnesses.

[26] Vijaykumar Borhade (PW1) is one of the witnesses whose statement was recorded by API–Gitte (PW4). Vijaykumar Borhade (PW1) states that, in the year 2024 accused Gaurishankar along with his wife was residing in his room at Ranjangaon-Shenpunji as a tenant. On the day of the incident he had been to his workplace. At about 04:30 p.m. he received phone call from his house, by which he was informed that the wife of accused – Gaurishankar hanged herself in the said room and committed suicide.

[27] Evidence of Vijaykumar Borhade (PW1) further shows that, therefore, he came back home and saw from the window of the house of the accused that wife of accused – Gaurishankar had hanged herself to the ceiling fan and committed suicide. Thereafter, police came there and broke open the door of the house and took down the dead-body. Thereafter, the dead-body was forwarded to the hospital. He does not know as to why wife of accused Guarishankar committed suicide. Thus, evidence of Vijaykumar Borade (PW1), even if, accepted as true and correct, it would not be helpful to prove the guilt of the accused.

[28] In the matter of Ankush s/o. Tulshiram Thakre Vs. The State of Maharashtra - 2014 ALL MR (Cri) 3567, in Para Nos.11 and 14 the Hon'ble High Court observed as under :-

“11. On considering the evidence of complainant and her son-in-law PW2 Fattu, it is noted that in the evidence of none of these witnesses, there are specific allegations of cruelty as required under the law, to be established by the prosecution. The existence of cruelty cannot be proved merely because suicide has been committed. Undoubtedly, to a large extent the concept of “Cruelty” will be subjective; but no claim of “cruelty” can be made without an objective basis. Thus, merely because the victim has taken a drastic step of ending her life, it cannot be presumed that the treatment that was being given to her was cruel, so as to attract punishment provided for, in Section 498-A of the Indian Penal Code makes it clear that Cruelty means, “ any willful conduct which is of such a nature as is likely to drive a woman to commit suicide or cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether mental or physical) of the woman”. The words “willful conduct” and “likely to” used in Explanation clause (a) are significant. The words “likely to” used in the said Clause show that clause(a) of Explanation of Section 498-A of the Indian Penal Code requires the willful conduct to be of such a nature as would likely to drive a woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury, or danger to life, limb or health. As reactions of different persons vary, the extent of cruelty treatment needs to be objectively assessed in order to see whether a reasonable or average person would be likely to be driven to commit suicide or cause grave injury to her on account of such treatment. At the cost of repetition, it may be emphasized that suicide has been in fact committed, cannot, by itself, be considered as proof of cruelty.”

“14. In the light of above facts and settled legal position, it is noted that even if a person would commit suicide because of certain acts of the accused, the accused cannot be said to have committed abetment of suicide by the deceased unless the accused would intend, while causing such acts to the victim, that he/she should commit suicide. As such, it is necessary for the prosecution to establish that by his acts, the accused could reasonably foresee that because of his conduct, the victim was almost certain or at least, quite likely to commit suicide. Unless this is established, a person cannot be charged of having abetted commission of suicide, even if, suicide has been committed as a result of some of the acts committed by the accused”.

[29] In the case of **Satish Fakira Dhangar and others Vs. State of Maharashtra – 2009 ALL MR (Cri) 2083**, in Para Nos.19, 22 and

24 the Hon'ble High Court observed thus :-

“19. The cumulative effect of the foregoing discussion is that there are only sweeping allegations about ill-treatment and harassment of deceased Kalpana in the matrimonial house. It is probable that she was dissatisfied due to simpleton nature of the Appellant No.1 and unbearable load of domestic work after the partition amongst the two brothers. The evidence on record does not show that the ill-treatment was on account of failure to pay demanded loan of Rs.10,000/- to the Appellant No.2. It appears that the F.I.R. was prepared after due deliberations between PW-Dharmendra, PW-Firoj and PW-Dagubai etc. The sweeping allegations of matrimonial cruelty by themselves would not be sufficient to raise presumption about abetment of the Appellants in the commission of her suicide. The presumption under Section 113-A of the Indian Evidence Act, requires consideration of “all other circumstances of the case”, before it may be invoked. The learned Sessions Judge appears to have overlooked the expression “having regard to all other circumstances of the case”, before raising of the presumption.

*“22. The Apex Court in **Rajbabu and another Vs. State of M.P. (2008 ALL MR (Cri) 2894(S.C.))** observed :-*

“The mere fact that a woman committed suicide within seven years of her marriage and that she had been subjected to cruelty by her husband or any relative of her husband, does not automatically give rise to the presumption that the suicide had been abetted by her husband or any relative of her husband. The Court is required to look into all the other circumstances of the case. One of the circumstances which has to be considered by the Court is whether the alleged cruelty was of such nature as was likely to drive the woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health of the woman”.

“24. Taking a stock of the evidence on record and the relevant legal position, I have no hesitation in holding that the prosecution failed to prove alleged matrimonial cruelty and abetment of the suicide of Kalpana by the Appellants. They should not have been convicted on the basis of the sweeping allegations about the matrimonial cruelty. The learned Sessions Judge committed patent error while raising presumption under Section 113-A of the Indian Evidence Act in the absence of appropriate substratum to infer degree of cruelty which could

drive deceased Kalpana to commit the suicide. Under these circumstances, the impugned Judgment of conviction and sentence is quite unsustainable”.

[30] It is only alleged by the father of the deceased that two days prior to the death, the deceased had made him phone call and informed him that the accused was demanding from her gold chain and motorcycle and on that count he beat her. However, it is already discussed that prosecution has not adduced evidence as regards to CDR and SDR of the phone numbers of the deceased and her father. Thus, the prosecution has not adduced sufficient and cogent evidence to establish that two days prior to the incident the deceased had made phone call to her father and informed him about unlawful demand and ill-treatment caused by the accused. Thus, no mens rea can be attributed to the accused. So also, evidence as regards to the allegations of unlawful demand of gold chain and harassment caused to the deceased, is vague in nature and the same is not reliable. Therefore, it cannot be said that the prosecution has proved ingredients of “abetment” as defined under Section 45 of the BNS. i.e. instigation on the part of the accused to drive the deceased to commit suicide. Moreover, it is well settled that as reactions of different persons vary, extent of cruelty needs to be objectively assessed in order to see whether a reasonable or average person would be likely to be driven to commit suicide.

[31] Section 80 of the BNS speaks thus :

80. Dowry death - (1) *Where the death of a woman is caused by any burns or bodily injury or occurs otherwise than under normal circumstances within seven years of her marriage and it is shown that soon before her death*

she was subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or any relative of her husband for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry, such death shall be called “dowry death”, and such husband or relative shall be deemed to have caused her death.

Explanation – For the purposes of this sub-section. “dowry death” shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (28 of 1961).

(2) Whoever commits dowry death shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than seven years but which may extent to imprisonment for life.

[32] Under Section 118 of the Bharatiya Saksh Adhiniyam, 2023 there is presumption as regards to dowry death, which speaks thus:-

118. Presumption as to dowry death – *When the question is whether a person has committed the dowry death of a woman and it is shown that soon before her death such woman had been subjected by such person to cruelty or harassment for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry, the Court shall presume that such person had caused the dowry death.*

Explanation – For the purposes of this section, shall have the same meaning as in section 304-B of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)

[33] Section 2 of The Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 speaks thus:-

2. Definition of ‘dowry’. — *In this Act, “dowry” means any property or valuable security given or agreed to be given either directly or indirectly —*

(a) by one party to a marriage to the other party to the marriage; or

(b) by the parent of either party to a marriage or by any other person, to either party to the marriage or to any other person,

*at or before[or any time after the marriage] [in connection with the marriage of the said parties, but does not include] dower or mahr in the case of persons to whom the Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) applies. [***]*

Explanation II.— The expression “valuable security” has the same meaning as in section 30 of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860).

[34] In the light of above provisions under Section 80 of the BNS, Section 118 of the Bharatiya Saksh Adhinyam, 2023 and Section 2 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, if the material placed on record is examined, it will reveal that since beginning it is not the case of the prosecution that there was any direct or indirect agreement between the accused and the parents of the deceased regarding giving or accepting any property or valuable security in the marriage of deceased Nishi Kumariya to the accused. Moreover, Gulshan Yadav (PW2) nowhere states that, the accused or his parents demanded dowry from him or he agreed to give them dowry. In the circumstances, for a moment, even if, it is assumed that accused demanded gold chain or motorcycle from the deceased or her parents, that cannot be said to be "dowry" as defined in Section 2 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. Therefore, section 80 of the BNS, is not applicable. Consequently, presumption under section 118 of the Bharatiya Saksh Adhinyam, 2023, is also not applicable to this case.

[35] For the reasons stated above, I hold that prosecution has failed to prove beyond reasonable doubts the guilt of accused for the

offences punishable under Sections 80 and 108 of the BNS. I, therefore, answer Point Nos.1 and 2 in the negative.

Point No.3 :-

[36] In view of my findings on Point Nos.1 and 2 as above, the accused is liable to be acquitted. I, therefore, in answer to Point No.3, pass the following order. :-

ORDER

[1] Accused - **Gaurishankar Mahesh Prasad** is hereby acquitted of the offences punishable under Sections 80 and 108 the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, vide Section 258(1) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

[2] Bail bonds of the accused shall stand cancelled.

[3] Accused shall furnish P.R.Bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rs.Twenty-Five Thousand only) and surety of like amount, in compliance of Section 481 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

Date:- 16.03.2026

(S.B. Bahalkar)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Gangapur

...To be continued on page No.18

ANNEXTURE-A**Part 'C'****(Para 44(iii) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual)
LIST OF PROSECUTION /DEFENCE/COURT WITNESSES****A. Prosecution:-**

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
(1)	Vijaykumar Baburao Borhade – (PW1)- Exh.23	Eye witness to the alleged incident
(2)	Gulshan Madan Yadav (PW2) – Exh.25	Father of the deceased and Informant who lodged the complaint
(3)	Vijay Devnandan Yadav (PW3) – Exh.27	Witness
(4)	Sanjay Madhavrao Gitte (PW4) – Exh.30	Investigating Officer who conducted the whole investigation of the matter and after completion of the investigation who filed charge-sheet

B. Defence Witnesses, if any:-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
	–	–

C. Court Witnesses, if any :

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
	-	--

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT EXHIBITS**A. Prosecution:**

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	PW2 – Exh.26	Complaint.

B. Defence:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	Exh.18	Spot panchanama
2.	Exh.19	Inquest panchanama
3.	Exh.20	P. M. Report
4.	Exh.21	Seizure panchanama
5.	Exh.22	Post-mortem report

C. Court Exhibits:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	15	Charge
2.	16	Particulars of the accused
3.	32	Statement of the accused recorded under Sec.351 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023

D. Material Objects:-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
-	-	-

Date:- 16.03.2026

(S. B. Bahalkar)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Gangapur