



Received On	31.07.2020
Registered On	31.07.2020
Decided On	17.03.2026
Duration	05 Yr.,07 Ms.,14 Ds.
CNR No. MHGA050003712020	

Part A**[Para 44 (i) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual]**

Exh.No. 22	
<u>IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS, DESAIGANJ.</u> [Presided over by : Satish Gopalrao Gore]	
Details of FIR/Crime and Police Station	Crime No. 50/2020, Police Station Desaiganj, District Gadchiroli
Date of Judgment	17.03.2026
Case No.	Regular Criminal Case No. 24/2020
Complainant/Prosecution	The State of Maharashtra, Through Police Station, Desaiganj, Tah. Desaiganj, District Gadchiroli (Informant : Dubraj Pundlik Dhore)
Represented by	Shri. R.W. Sakinalawar (learned Special Assistant Public Prosecutor)
Accused	Dipak Pandurang Donadkar, Aged about 42 Yrs, Occ: Labour, R/o. Kurud, Tq. Desaiganj, Dist: Gadchiroli.
Represented by	Shri. M.R. Shende Adv.

Part B**[Para 44 (ii) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual]**

Date of Offence	16/02/2020
Date of F.I.R.	16/02/2020
Date of Chargesheet	31/07/2020
Date of framing of Charge/Particular	03/02/2026
Date of commencement of evidence	13/02/2026
Date on which judgment is reserved	12/03/2026
Date of the judgment	17/03/2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	17/03/2026

Accused Details

Rank of the accused	Name of accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offence Charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428, Cr.PC.
	Dipak Pandurang Donadkar	03.02.2026	17.03.2026	324 of I.P.C.	convicted	Convicted U/S. 324 IPC, but release on probation of good conduct for a period of one year instead of sentencing him.	03.02.2026 to 17.03.2026

Appendix Part C

[Para 44 (iii) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual]

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

RANK	NAME	EXHIBIT	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
PW1	Tularam Bakshiji Lakade	11	Panch witness
PW2	Dubraj Pundlik Dhore	12	Informant/victim Victim/Eye-witness
PW3	Gopal Vishwas Dhore	13	Eye-witness
PW4	Rohini Vishwas Dhore	14	Eye-witness
PW5	Mohandas Raghunath Soyam	16	Investigation Officer
PW6	Dr. Dhiraj Prabhakar Pachkawade	19	Doctor

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution:

Sr. No.	Exhibit number	Description
1.	Exhibit P1/PW1	Spot and seizure panchanama
2.	Exhibit P2/PW2	Statement of victim
3.	Exhibit P3/PW2	FIR
4.	Exhibit P4/PW5	Query letter
5.	Exhibit P5/PW6	MLC
6.	Exhibit P6/PW6	Query report

D. Material Objects:

Sr. No.	Material Object number	Description
1.	Article "A"	Stick

Abbreviations used in this Judgment (<i>in alphabetical order</i>)	
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973	Cr.PC.
Indian Evidence Act, 1872	Evidence Act
Indian Penal Code, 1860	I.P.C.

J U D G M E N T[Delivered on 17th day of March, 2026]

The accused is facing trial for the offence punishable under **Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860** (*hereinafter referred as "the I.P.C." for sake of brevity*).

Prosecution's Case in Nutshell is as under :-

2. On 16.02.2020 at about 18:00 p.m., the informant Shri. Dubraj Pundlik Dhore, R/o Kurud, Tah: Desaiganj, Dist: Gadchiroli, was standing in front of his house at Gandhi square in his village. At that

time, accused came near to him and hit on his head by stick. He sustained bleeding injury. His nice Rohini Yashwant Dhore called his nephew namely Gopal Dhore on phone. Gopal Dhore carried him at Rural Hospital, Desaiganj. Doctor gave treatment to him. Police recorded his statement (**Exh.P2/PW2**) at that place.

3. On the basis of said statement (**Exh.P2/PW2**) Desaiganj police authority registered F.I.R. (**Exh.P3/PW2**) bearing Crime No. 50/2020 for the commission of offence punishable under Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code against accused. Investigation handed over to ASI Mohandas Raghunath Sayam, B. No. 739. He drew common spot and seizure panchnama (**Exh.P1/PW1**). He collected MLC of injured and recorded statement of witnesses, etc. In light of all the collection of evidences, he put forth his conclusion that the accused committed offence punishable under Section 324 of the I.P.C.

4. There was neither claim of discharge nor the accused could be discharged in view of Section 239 of Criminal Procedure Code. Therefore, I framed charge (**Exh.8**) against him, on 03.02.2026. The contents of charge was read over and explained to him in vernacular. He claimed to be tried and denied the accusation. Therefore, his plea at **Ex.9** was duly recorded. Thus, the trial commenced and prosecution got the challenge of proving alleged guilt.

5. Considering the material on record, following points arise for my determination. Findings thereon are recorded for the reasons as follows :-

Sr.No.	Points	Decisions
1	Dose the prosecution prove that, on 16.02.2020 at about 06:00 pm., at	

	Gandhi Chowk, Kurud, Tah. Desaiganj, Dist. Gadchiroli, accused voluntarily caused hurt to informant by means of dangerous weapon i.e. stick and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 324 of I.P.C. ?	In affirmative
2	What Order?	As Per Operative Order

REASONS

6. In order to establish guilt of the accused, the prosecution has examined total 6 witnesses. **PW.1** Tularam Bakshiji Lakade (**Exh.11**), **PW.2** Dubraj Pundlik Dhore (**Exh.12**), **PW.3** Gopal Vishwas Dhore (**Exh.13**), **PW.4** Rohini Yashwant Dhore (**Exh.15**), **PW.5** Mohandas Raghunath Sayam (**Exh.16**) and **PW.6** Dr. Dhiraj Prabhakar Pachkawade (**Exh.19**). The prosecution closed its side of evidence on 02.03.2026 by filing pursis (**Exh.20**). Prosecution adduced the documentary evidence of statement of informant (**Exh.P2/PW2**), FIR (**Exh.P3/PW2**), spot and seizure panchanama (**Exh.P1/PW1**), Query letter (**Exh.P4/PW5**), MLC (**Exh.P5/PW6**) and Query report (**Exh. P6/PW6**).

7. The statement of accused (**Exh.21**) under Section 313(1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure was recorded. He denied every incriminating circumstance against him. His defence is of total denial. He did not examine witness on his behalf.

8. Heard Shri. R.W. Sakinalawar, learned special A.PP for State and Shri. M. R. Shende, learned advocate for the accused. Lrd. APP highlighted the available testimonies and claimed that the offences

are established. He submitted that testimonies of witnesses are harmonious to each other. The offence of voluntarily causing hurt is serious and therefore, the accused shall not go unpunished. Hence, urged to convict the accused.

9. Lrd. Advocate for the accused argued that the prosecution story is improbable. He pointed out the inconsistencies in between PW2 & PW3 who are eye witnesses of alleged offence. He further argued that they are interested witnesses. He further pointed out the earlier casual fights between accused and informant. His defence is that in quarrel with accused, the informant fell down and sustained injury to his head. He further argued that the compromise was occurred in the police station in respect of said quarrel. Therefore, he submitted that the accused deserves for acquittal.

10. The standard of proof in criminal cases is set as proof beyond reasonable doubts. To prove any fact beyond reasonable doubt means to prove existence of that fact in belief of the Court or in supposition of a man of ordinary prudent who would act as if the fact exists. The belief of Court or the supposition of such ordinary prudent man is cemented only when there emerges no doubt of reasonable character over the evidence. No matter whatsoever slight such doubt is, if it is reasonable in circumstances, it proves fatal to prosecution.

11. When the case is based upon direct evidence, the witnesses assume significance. Anyone who either saw, smelled or perceived facts must depose accordingly. It is the mandate of Section 60 of Evidence Act. But, when such evidence is not available, then prosecution is heavily depended upon the circumstantial evidence. It is said that man can lie but the circumstances cannot. But, the

possibility of simulation of circumstances must be ruled out. Moreover, it becomes duty of the prosecution to establish that the chain of circumstantial evidence send into guilt of the accused only and nobody else. So, proving any fact or charge by circumstantial evidence is not a simple task for prosecution.

12. So while assaying proof of accused in the trial, prosecution has to choose its witnesses wisely, orderly and meticulously. Prosecution is depended entirely on what its witnesses state during evidence. They must show characteristic of being firm, resolute and reliable. They must demonstrate coherence and corroboration amongst them about the deposed facts. Similarly, those witnesses shall not cause inconsistencies, omissions, contradictions, improvements and incongruities. Because, existence and presence of all these aspects make the witnesses unworthy of credit. So, prosecution has to maintain and manifest such standard of proof and its evidence in any trial.

EVIDENCE BROUGHT BY PROSECUTION

13. Tularam (PW1) panch witness on spot and seizure panchnama deposed that police called him for panchnama at Gandhi Square which is near the house of accused. There was a stick. Police seized it in his presence and wrote down and took his signature on it. He identified his signature on the spot and seizure panchnama (Exh.P1/PW1). He identified the stick (Article-A/PW1) and deposed that same was seized in his presence by the police. Accused failed to cross-examine the witness.

14. Informant (PW2) deposed that the incident took place in the year 2020. At that time, he was purchasing vegetable from vegetable

vendor. His nice namely Rohini Dhore was present with him at that place. The accused suddenly gave blow of stick on front side on his head. He fell dizzy/unconscious. He came conscious at hospital. Doctor stitches to his injury. He came to know that his nephew Gopal brought him at hospital. Police recorded his statement (**Exh.P2/PW2**) and registered FIR (**Exh.P3/PW2**) accordingly. When seized property stick (**Article-A/PW1**) shown to him he stated that same was not used by accused to beat him. He further deposed that the stick used by accused to beat him was round in shape and of Dhawada tree.

15. In cross-examination he admitted that there were good relation of him with the accused. He used to drink liquor with accused. Accused would drink more liquor than him and in that situation used to chatter. Quarrel/fight was occurred between them before the date of incident. On the date of incident also quarrel/fight was occurred between them. The witness voluntarily stated that before the accused came near to the handcart, he had fight with his wife Nandabai Donadkar and had beaten her. Nandabai went to police station and the accused took out his anger on him for that fight. He denied the suggestion that in the said fight he fell down and sustained injury to his head. He admitted that they had reached at settlement at police station with each other and he didn't want to file complaint against the accused. As police recorded his statement in hospital, FIR was registered.

16. Gopal (**PW3**) who is nephew of informant deposed that the informant is his uncle. On 16.02.2020 his sister Rohini told him on phone about beating to informant by accused and called him at the place of incident. He went by his bike at the spot and found that

blood was oozing from head of his uncle. He and his sister sat the informant on vehicle and brought him at hospital. During treatment police came and recorded statement of his uncle.

17. Rohini (PW4) deposed the informant is her uncle. On 16.02.2020 at about 6.00 p.m., the incident was occurred in front of her house at Gandhi Square. She was buying vegetables from handcart along with his uncle. At that time, the accused suddenly came and gave blow on head of her uncle with stick. Blood was flowing out. Her uncle was unconscious. He fainted. She called her brother Gopal (PW3). After that she and her brother brought informant at hospital. Police came there and interrogated. She identified the stick (Article-A/PW1) and stated that same was used by accused to beat her uncle. In cross-examination she admitted that she could not tell name of the vegetable vendor where from they were buying vegetables. She denied all other suggestion put by the defence.

18. Sayam (PW5) who is investigating officer deposed that he received the case dairy in crime bearing No. 50/2020 for investigation. He visited the spot of incident on 17.02.2020 at Kurud and drew spot panchnama (Exh.P1/PW1) in presence of two panchas. On spot itself he seized stick from the accused. He forwarded a letter along with seized stick to the Medical Officer for query. He deposed that the stick (Article-A/PW1) is the same which was seized by him as per spot and seizure panchnama. He denied all suggestions put forth by defence.

19. Dr. Pachkawade (PW6) medical officer deposed that on 16.02.2020 he was at Rural Hospital, Desaiganj. On said date one

Gopal Dhore brought patient namely Dubraj for examination at about 6.45 p.m. On examination he found laceration of 12 X 1.5 X 1.5 c.m. on mid frontal region. It was simple in nature and caused by hard and blunt object. Accordingly, he issued M.L.C. (**Exh.P5/PW6**). He further deposed on 13.07.2020 a wooden stick was brought for weapon query as per letter (**Exh.P4/PW5**) and after examination of said weapon he issued query report (**Exh.P6/PW6**) and opined that injury mentioned in MLC is possible by said weapon. The accused failed to cross-examine the witness.

Ingredients Of Offences

20. Before entering into the scrutiny of evidence brought on record, it will be appropriate to formulate essential requisites of such offence punishable under Section 324 of I.P.C. In order to prove charge under **Section 324 of I.P.C.** prosecution must establish that,

(a) accused voluntarily caused bodily pain, disease or infirmity i.e. hurt,

(b) hurt so caused, must be by means of any instrument of stabbing, cutting or otherwise as provided in the section 324 of I.P.C., used as a weapon of offence, and

(c) hurt is not caused by grave and sudden provocation as contemplated under section 334 of I.P.C.

Ingredients (a) & (c) supra, are also the fundamental components of offence punishable under **Section 324 of I.P.C.** In present case, the question of grave and sudden provocation is not involved. Therefore, ingredient (c) supra, is of no much relevance, rather entire prosecution case revolves around ingredients (a) & (b) supra.

21. Before starting the task of discussing evidence come on record,

I want to put forth some undisputed fact. The informant and accused are neighbors and well known to each other. It is not in dispute that the accused and informant used to drink liquor together and also fight each other on the count of drinking more liquor by the accused.

22. As per prosecution story in the statement (**Exh.P2/PW2**), on the date of incident at 6:00 p.m., when informant was buying vegetable along with his niece (PW4), the accused beat on his head by the stick and he sustained injury. His niece called his nephew (PW3) he carried him at hospital on bike. The informant (PW2) deposed same incident. He stated that when he and his niece were buying the vegetables. The accused beat on his head from back side by stick. He felt unconscious. He became conscious at hospital and came to know that his nephew (PW3) brought him in the hospital. Police recorded his statement (**Exh.P2/PW2**) and accordingly **FIR (Exh.P3/PW2)** was registered. In cross-examination he admitted occurrence of fight between him and accused on the count of drinking liquor on the spot. He denied that in the said fight he fell and sustained injury to his head. Nothing is come on record of the case during his cross-examination to disbelieve his version of causing injury to his head by the accused by using stick.

23. The testimony of informant is dully corroborated by Rohini (PW4) who is eye witness of the incident and on her instance the informant was brought at the hospital with the help of her brother namely Gopal (PW3). The testimony of informant is also corroborated by the Gopal (PW3) who carried him in the hospital with the help of Rohini. Nothing is come on record to disbelieve the testimonies of PW3 and PW4.

24. The testimony of informant in respect injury to his head is supported by medical evidence of PW6. Dr. Pachkawade (PW6) categorically stated that on medical examination of informant/patient he found lacerated wound on mid frontal region on the person of patient and accordingly MLC (**Exh.P5/PW6**) was issued by him. His further testimony that injuries mentioned in the MLC are possible by the stick (**Article-A/PW1**) which was forwarded to him by the police for query and he issued query certificate (**Exh.P6/PW6**) stating that the injuries in MLC are possible by the said weapon stick.

25. Tularam (PW1) who is a panch witness deposed that police called him near the house of accused at Gandhi Chowk where police seized one stick and drew spot cum seizure panchnama (**Exh.P1/PW1**). He also identified muddemal property stick (**Article-A/PW1**) and stated that same was seized by police in his presence. Accused failed to cross-examine this witness and testimony of this witness is unrebutted. Therefore, spot cum seizure panchnama is proved by testimony of this panch witness.

26. Investigating Officer (PW5) stated that he conducted spot cum seizure panchnama (**Exh.P1/PW1**) in presence of panchas. He also deposed that he seized the stick (**Article-A/PW1**) from the accused on the spot. Nothing come on record in testimony of PW5 which is sufficient to disbelieve his version.

27. The prosecution proved report/statement of informant and FIR through the testimony of informant. It also proved spot cum seizure panchnama through the testimony of panch witness(PW1) and I.O. (PW5). The testimony of informant about injury to his head by the accused proved by himself and dully corroborated by testimony of

eye witnesses (PW3 & PW4) and Doctor (PW6). The said injury is caused by the accused is by testimony of informant and eyewitness (PW4).

28. From the discussion supra there is sufficient direct & substantive testimony in regard to incident of beating to the informant on his head by the accused. No evidence is come on record in cross-examination of these witnesses which would be sufficient to create doubt on their testimony.

29. There is absolutely no contradiction and omission in the evidence of witnesses supra with respect to their previous statement. They have deposed consistently with their previous statements. Law provides that, "*the one who is consistent must be believed*". Relying on such principle, the testimonies of above witnesses are found to be cogent, reliable and believable.

30. Obviously, if any person is beaten by stick, he will sustain bodily pain which amounts to "hurt" as per **section 319 of I.P.C.** Therefore, there is sufficient direct and substantive evidence in the form of testimonies of above witnesses in regard to the act of the accused pertaining to beating on head of the informant.

Circumstantial & Corroborative Evidence

31. In order to prove lay support to the direct and substantive evidence supra in regard to injuries, prosecution has examined the medical officer Dr. Pachkawade **PW.6**. He has duly proved the medical certificate of informant at **Exh-P5/PW6**, as per his testimony he found *Laceration, mid frontal region, size 12 cm. X 1.5 c.m. X 1.5 c.m., on the person of patient*. The doctor has opined that it is caused by hard

and rough object. The location of injury mark as deposed by Dr. Pachkawade is exactly identical to the one revealed from direct and substantive evidence supra. Therefore, the expert opinion provides sufficient corroboration to the injury of beating marks on his head. There is no cross-examination by the accused to this witness. Thus, the medical evidence is exactly corroborating direct and substantive evidence.

32. The report is lodged without any sort of delay. Entire evidence is corresponding to the statement (**Exh.P2/PW2**) of informant which was recorded in the hospital by the police and FIR (**Exh.P3/PW2**) was registered on its basis. As per **Section 157 of Indian Evidence Act**, the consistent report with that of evidence acts as corroboration.

33. Even though, the informant/injured stated that seized property stick (**Article-A/PW1**) shown before the Court is not same stick used by the accused to assault, he has also admitted that the accused assaulted him from behind and that he became unconscious after the blow. Therefore, his ability to notice the weapon used in the assault becomes doubtful. On the other hand, Rohini (PW4), who was standing with the injured at the time of incident, has categorically stated that she saw the accused giving a blow by the stick and she has identified the stick before the Court as the same weapon used in the assault by the accused. Her presence at the spot is natural and nothing material has been elicited in her cross-examination to discredit her testimony. Hence, her evidence regarding the identity of the weapon inspite confidence. Hence, the prosecution also proved that the stick (**Article-A/PW1**) is the same which is used by the accused for commission of crime. The spot cum seizure panchanama (**Exh-P1/PW1**) and stick (**Article-A/PW1**) is duly proved by Tularam

(PW1) panch witness, and I.O. (PW.5). It is not a case where the spot of incidence is very much disputed or controverted. Therefore, absolutely strict proof in regard to spot and seizure panchanama is not expected. Apart from that the defence has not disputed the spot of incidence.

34. The medical MLC (Exh. P5/PW6), query report (Exh.P6/PW6), the report (Exh.P2/PW2), spot cum seizure panchanama (Exh-P1/PW1) are the sufficient corroborative evidence which strengthens the substantive evidence supra.

“Stick” As An Instrument Used As Weapon Of Offence

35. An important aspect of consideration is whether injury caused by stick will attract Section 324 of I.P.C. Firstly it is not mandatory that any so called “weapon” must be used to attract Section 324 of I.P.C. In this regard, ingredient (b) supra of Section 324 of I.P.C. itself provides for causing of hurt by any instrument used as weapon of offence. Therefore, what is provided is the use of any “instrument” as a weapon and not a “weapon” as such. The provision provides that the instrument must be either of shooting or cutting or stabbing or otherwise. Thus, the meaning of term “instrument” must be seen. As per **Mitra's Legal and Commercial Dictionary 6th Edition**,

“Instrument” is something by which an injury simple or grievous could be inflicted. It also means a tool by which injury can be inflicted.

The term instrument therefore means any tangible thing with which any injury can be inflicted. No doubt, stick is the instrument used for the purpose of beating. Section 324 of I.P.C. also provides for the use of an instrument as a weapon of offence. Therefore, when

a hurt is caused voluntarily by means of stick used as a weapon of offence, it obviously comes within the purview of section 324 of I.P.C.

Defence of Accused & Arguments Advanced

36. Defence of accused is of total denial and false implication. The reason for it as alleged by accused is that previous tussle/fight between accused and informant. The informant did not dispute the previous fight between him and accused on the count of drinking the quantity of liquor. His further defence is that the accused fell down in the fight and sustained injury to his head. The informant denied the said suggestion. The accused did not bring any such thing on record to prove that the accused fell down and sustained injury. A case has to be decided on the basis of evidence brought on record and not on the basis of evidence which is not brought on record. Thus, such arguments does not appear to be proper.

Conclusion of Points No.01

37. From the above discussion, I have no hesitation to conclude that, prosecution has duly proved beyond reasonable doubt the charge under section 324 of I.P.C. against the accused. Resultantly, I answer point No.01 in affirmative.

As to Point No.2

38. In view of my affirmative finding to point No.1, I hold accused guilty for having committed offence punishable under Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code. Therefore, take pause to hear the accused on the point of sentence.

Desaiganj.

(Satish G. Gore)

Date : 17/03/2026

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Desaiganj.

39. Now, I heard the learned advocate for the accused, accused and the learned Special A.P.P. The facts indicate that the incident was a brawl/quarrel which occurred when the accused was came in anger to the informant.

40. Accused submitted that he is innocent. The incident was occurred as PW.2 Nandkishor was quarreling with him and his family members for the road which was only to visit their house.

41. I have heard the Lrd. Special APP and Lrd. Advocate for the accused No.1 on this point. The learned APP prayed for maximum punishment to be given to the accused as provided under Sec. 324 of I.P.C. On the other hand, the learned advocate of accused prayed for leniency and to consider the age of the accused. The accused is neighbor of the informant. They were having good relations with each other. The informant also admitted that they have settled their dispute in the police station. Under such circumstances, I do not find any aggravating factors warranting and sending the accused to jail, because there is no record of his criminal antecedents. The incident as well as hurt was a simple. The accused has also faced the prosecution since the year 2020 and is in jail 03.02.2026. There is no report of any recurrence of the incident.

42. As per Section 324 of the IPC, a punishment of imprisonment extending up to three years with or without fine is prescribed. Section 3 of the Probation of Offenders Act, is not applicable to the present case as the punishment prescribed is more than two years and the accused is not below 21 years of age.

43. Section 4 of the Probation of offenders Act, is applicable to the case as the offence is not punishable with imprisonment for life. For

want of time, report of Probation officer could not be called. The hurt caused to the informant was simple. Considering these facts, I am of the opinion that it would be just and proper to release the accused on probation of good conduct for a period of one year instead of sentencing him at once. There is no point in directing the accused to pay any compensation to the informant.

44. The stick (**Article-A/PW1**) is unclaimed. It is worthless. Hence, it is liable to be destroyed. Accused is in judicial custody for the breach of bail bonds since 03.02.2026, hence required to be release forthwith if not required in any other crime. Accordingly, I answered point No.2 and pass following order;

ORDER

1. Accused is convicted vide Section 248(2) of Criminal Procedure Code, for the offence punishable under Section 324 of I.P.C.
2. Instead of sentencing him at once he be released on his entering into a bond of Rs.15,000/- and to appear before the court to undergo the sentence whenever ordered and meanwhile to be of a good behavior for one year.
3. Bail bonds of accused are cancelled.
4. The accused shall furnish the bail of Rs.15,000/- in order to comply the provision of Section 437 A of Cr.P.C.
5. On expiry of appeal period, under Section 452 of the Cr.P.C., the seized property stick be destroyed.
6. Copy of judgment be forwarded to the District Magistrate, Gadchiroli for the compliance of provisions of Section 365 of Cr.P.C.

Judgment

.. 19 ..

*R.C.C. No.24 of 2020
State ..Vs..Dipak*

7. Copy of this judgment be given to accused forthwith free of costs.

(Judgment dictated and pronounced in open Court.)

Desaiganj.
Date : 17/03/2026

(Satish G. Gore)
Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Desaiganj.
MH2902