

**S.C. No.33/2018**

**The State Vs. Ravikishor**

**Exh.No.96**

**DEPOSITION OF WITNESS NO. 04 FOR THE PROSECUTION**

**I do hereby on solemn affirmation state that :**

My name is : Siddhaling Mallikarjun Swami

My age about : 60 years

My occupation : Retired Govt. servant

My residence : Gharola, Tq. Chakur,

District : Latur

**Examination-in-Chief by Shri R. P. Chavan A.G.P.for prosecution**

1. In the year 2005 I was working as Jr.clerk with the office of Taluka Inspector of Land Records, Latur. The alleged incident took place on 04.04.2005. One Alka Rasure had lodged a complaint with Superintendent Land Records, Latur. For inquiry on the said complaint I, Shri.Waghmare, Shri.Ghadage and T.I.L.R. Shri.Jadhav were called by the Superintendent to his office. After being called we went to the said office. The inquiry was started in our presence. When the inquiry was going on the accused Karkhane came in the chamber of Superintendent of Land Records. At that time Ghadage said that he has no concern and he should be removed from the chamber. At that time the accused uttered vulgar words to Shri.Ghadage. At that time accused said to the Superintendent that he has come to make a complaint against Shri.Jadhav. After that the accused assaulted Shri.Jadhav with a wooden arm of a chair. He

injured him on his forehead, left eye and on right hand elbow. The accused sat on the chest of Shri.Jadhav and threatened to kill him. This incident happened between 3.00 -3.15 p.m. on the day of incident. Thereafter, we intervened and rescued Shri. Jadhav. Thereafter, Shri. Jadhav went to the police station to lodge police report. I can identify the object by which accused assaulted Shri. Jadhav. I am now shown a wooden (log) hand of chair which is marked Article-A. It is the same by which the accused assaulted Shri. Jadhav. The accused Karkhane is present in Court today.

**Cross-examination by Defence Counsel Shri. B.L.Shinde for the accused.**

2. In the year 2005 I had completed 5 years of service at the office of Taluka Inspector of Land Records, Latur. At the said office my chamber and the chamber of Shri. Jadhav were different. It is true that I used to do all work as per instructions and orders of Shri. Jadhav. When the incident occurred at that time there were other junior clerks also working in our office. The accused Karkhane was senior to me. I do not know how many staff members were present in our office in the morning of 04.04.2005. I had received a letter from office of Superintendent of Land records to be present at the said office on the date of incident. In the said letter there were names of 3 persons who were asked to present there. I cannot tell the date when I

received the said letter. Police did not interrogate me. I did not tell anything to police other than contents of my statement. When my statement was recorded by police I did not hand over the letter of Superintendent of Land records to the police. It is not true to say that prior to the incident the accused had put negative remarks against me in the noting book of Superintendent of Land records Office. Now I am shown some pages of the noting book filed in the Court proceeding by accused. The said noting pertains to me. It is true that there are remarks against my name in the said noting book. It is true that the noting book bears signature of the accused. To the extent of signature of the accused on the noting book, the said document is marked **Exhibit -97**. I was a member of the Superintendent of Land Records Employees Society. It is true that at the time of incident accused was the chairman of the said society. I do not remember that I was the surety for the loan taken by Bondge Jivan Gunwantrao from the said society. I did not receive any notice from the said society regarding non-payment of loan by Bondge Jivan Gunwantrao. Before the date of incident I was never called at the office of Superintendent Land Records Office, Latur for the purpose of inquiry on the complaint of Alkabai Rasure. It is true that I was asked to remain present at the office of Director Land Records Office, Pune on 12.04.2005 for the purpose of inquiry on the complaint of Alka Rasure. It is true that similar notice was given to Shri. Swami, Shri. Ghadage and Shri. Jadhav to remain present on that day at the office of

Director Land Records, Pune. It is true that, in the said inquiry allegations were made against us pertaining to corruption. It is not true to say that, Alka Rasure had made allegations that we had accepted Rs.500/- from her son and instead of sending her file to the office of Superintendent we retained her file with us for about 10 months. It is true that, there is no document on record to show that on the date of incident between 3.00 - 3.30 p.m. I was present in the office of Superintendent of Land Record as part of my official duty. On the date of incident I returned to my office from the office of Superintendent of Land Record at about 4.00 p.m.. After returning to my office I performed my duties. On the date of incident the inquiry against accused commenced at around 2.30 - 3.00 p.m.. It is true that for the purpose of inquiry signatures are taken of those who are present for the inquiry. On the date of incident we did not put our signatures. Alkabai Rasure was present at the time of incident.

**3.** It is not true to say that, I believed that on the say of the accused, Alkabai Rasure had lodged complaint against us. It is true that, in the complaint of Alkabai Rasure there were no allegations against accused. It is true that, at the time of incident the accused was not called nor he was given any notice to remain present for the inquiry of Alkabai Rasure. It is true that the accused had no concern with the said inquiry. I did not

inform accused about the date and time about the said inquiry. It is true that on the date of incident there was no dispute between accused with me or with Shri. Jadhav, Shri. Swami, Shri. Waghmare. It is true that, no such thing took place on 04.04.2005 for which the accused had any reasons to come to the Office of Superintendent of Land Records and create ruckus or obstruction during inquiry. At the time of incident Shri.Ghadage was working as clerk. I cannot comment as to whether it will fall in the domain of service rules for Shri. Ghadage to give any orders to Shri. Amberao. The accused did not come with any application on the date of incident, at the time of inquiry. At the time of incident there were about 6 to 7 persons in the chamber of Shri.Amberao including us. It is true that the time between 3.00-4.00 p.m. is a time for hearing on the applications of people in the office of Superintendent of Land Records and at that time applicants / litigants are presents in the office. I cannot tell as to how many private persons were present in the office of Superintendent of Land Records at the time of incident. It is not true to say that at the time of incident all the chairs in the office of Superintendent of Land Records were steel chairs. It is true that the chamber of Superintendent of Land Records is South facing. It is true that there is no way of entry from behind the place where the Superintendent sits in his chamber. It is true that the entrance to the said chamber is on the North-Eastern side of the said chamber. At the time of incident on one side of the table Shri.Amberao was sitting and

other side of the table we all were sitting. It is true that during the incident Shri. Jadhav had fell down. It is not true to say that, he had fallen on his face. I do not know that Smt. Rasure had given a push to Shri. Jadhav during the incident because of which he fell down. It is not true to say that Alka Rasure had already made complaints against us upto our Pune office and so we did not have any courage to make any complaint against her. Police did not come in the chamber of Superintendent of Land Records on the date of incident till we were present in the said chamber. For the purpose of inquiry I had gone to the office of Superintendent of Land Records with a file. I do not remember whether Shri. Ghadage and Shri. Jadhav had come to the office with any file. After returning to my office after the incident I had deposited the said file in my office. It is not true to say that I had grudge / anger against accused as he had made negative remarks against me in the noting register, and that I had doubt that he made Alka Rasure file a complaint against us and because I was given notice to remain present for the inquiry. At the time of incident Sr. Clerk Shri. Kulkarni of the office of Shri. Amberao was present in the chamber of Shri. Amberao. I did not accompany Shri. Jadhav to police station or to the Hospital on the date of incident. I had no occasion to meet the police on the date of incident. Other than the occasion of recording my statement I had no occasion to meet the police. In the year 2015-16 I had occasion to work at our office at Tuljapur. It is

not true to say that, during that period I was suspended from service. It is true that at Tuljapur departmental inquiry was initiate against me. It is not true to say that, Shri. Jadhav was the inquiry officer in the said inquiry. It is true that, in the said inquiry I was absolved from all charges. It is not true to say that I am deposing false against accused because of anger against him. It is not true to say that I and Shri. Jadhav took disadvantage about the injuries sustained by Shri. Jadhav because of being pushed by Alka Rasure. It is true that after the incident I did not see accused working in our office. It is not true to say that I in collusion with Shri. Jadhav got our object fulfilled to remove the accused from our office.

4. While my police statement was taken I had told police that because of being assaulted by accused, Shri. Jadhav sustained injures to "left" eye and "right elbow". I cannot assign any reason as to why police did not mentioned in my statement that because of assault of accused, Shri.Jadhav sustained injures to "left" eye and "right elbow". It is true that to help Shri.Jadhav in this case I am appearing as a witness.

5. It is not true to say that on the date of incident I, Shri. Jadhav, Shri. Swami and Shri. Waghmare were not called at the office of Superintendent of Land Records for the purpose of inquiry regarding complaint of Alka Rasure. It is not true to say that, during inquiry the accused did not come there. It is not

true to say that, at that time Shri. Ghadage said that accused had no concern with this inquiry and he should go out. It is not true to say that, accused did not utter vulgar words to Shri. Ghadage. It is not true to say that, the accused did not assault Shri. Jadhav with a wooden arm of the chair causing injuries to him. It is not true to say that, accused did not sit on the chest of Shri. Jadhav and threatened to kill him. It is not true to say that, I rescued Shri. Jadhav. It is not true to say that, the Article-A shown to me in Court is the same by which accused assaulted Shri. Jadhav. It is not true to say that the incident narrated by me in my examination-in-chief is false.

**Cross-examination completed.**

**No re-examination.**

**R. O. A. C.**

**Sd/-**

**( R. B. Bhagwat )**

**Additional Sessions Judge-2,  
Latur.**

**Date : 26.02.2026.**