

MHNG150008252021



Presented on : 18-06-2021
 Registered on : 18-06-2021
 Decided on : 09-04-2026
 Duration : 4 Y, 9 M, 21 D

FORM No. XXXII**Part 'A'**

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

IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS, HINGNA

Before : Shri. V. H. Khedkar

(Date of Judgment : 09/04/2025)

R.C.C. No. 146/2021**Exh. No. 40**

First Information Report -243/2021 Date 29/05/2021

Police Station Hingna, Tah.-Hingna Dist.-Nagpur

PROSECUTION	State of Maharashtra, Police Station Hingna, Tah-Hingna, Dist.-Nagpur
Represented by	Ld. APP Mr. D. I. Baraskar
Accused	1] Mahendra Ghanshyam Sontakke, Age: 44 Yrs., Occupation : Agriculturist, 2] Narendra Ghanshyam Sontakke, Age: 50 Yrs., Occupation : Agriculturist, Both R/o:- Mandavghorad, Tah.-Hingna, Dist.-Nagpur.
Represented by	Ld. Advocate Mr. K. N. Mohile

Part 'B'

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

Date of Offence	24-05-2021
Date of F.I.R.	29-05-2021
Date of Chargesheet	15-06-2021
Date of Framing of Charge	22-09-2021
Date of commencement of evidence	23-02-2023
Date on which judgment is reserved	09-04-2026
Date of the Judgment	09-04-2026
Date of the sentencing order, if any	Not applicable

ACCUSED DETAILS

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of detention undergone during trial.
A-1.	Mahendra Ghanshyam Sontakke	29-05-2021	30-05-2021	Sec. 325 R/w 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860	Acquitted	Not applicable	Not applicable
A-2.	Narendra Ghanshyam Sontakke	29-05-2021	30-05-2021	Sec. 325 R/w 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860	Acquitted	Not applicable	Not applicable

JUDGMENT(Delivered on 09th of April, 2026)

Accused is charged for an offence punishable under Section 325 R/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code 1860 (in short 'the Code').

The case of prosecution in nutshell is as follows:

02. The informant Nitesh lodged the report on 29 May 2021, stating that since his childhood he had been residing with his maternal uncle Vilas Sonthakke, who owns agricultural land situated at Mandav Ghorad Road, adjoining the land of Ghanshyam Sontakke. About eight days prior to the incident, a quarrel had taken place between Vilas Sontakke and both accused, who are sons of Ghanshyam Sontakke regarding agricultural land embankment and grazing of cattle. On the following day, when the informant went to the field to collect stones, accused No. 1 again picked up quarrel with him. On 24 May 2021 at about 9:00 p.m., the informant went in front of the house of accused No. 1 and questioned him as to why he was quarreling with his maternal uncle, when he was alone. At that time, Vilas Sontakke was also present. Thereupon, both accused quarreled with them, and during the altercation, accused No. 1 picked up a wooden *Zilpi* and assaulted Vilas Sontakke on his head, causing him serious injury and rendering him unconscious. Vilas Sontakke was initially taken to Sai Hospital, Hingna, where the doctor advised a CT scan. Subsequently, he was taken to Helix Hospital, Nagpur, where the CT scan revealed a fracture to the skull. Thereafter, he was admitted to Neuron Hospital, Dhanoli, Nagpur for further treatment.

03. On the basis of this report, Crime No. 243/2021 was

registered on 29 May 2021 for the offence punishable under Section 325 read with Section 34 of the Code with Police Station, Hingna. Thereafter, investigating officer Police Constable Mr. Sanjay Rambhauji Badkal (PW-7) investigated the matter. He recorded statement of witnesses, seized the weapon i.e. wooden *Zilpi*, which is referred as MO-1 as per old rule in this proceeding (MO-1), and accordingly, drawn spot cum seizure panchnama. After completion of investigation, final report has been filed through the officer in charge of Hingna Police Station, Hingna Dist. Nagpur for above mentioned offence.

04. The charge has been framed by my Ld. Predecessor for offence punishable under Section 325 read with 34 of Code. The contents of charge were read over and explained to accused in his vernacular to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The statement of accused came to be recorded u/s. 313 (1)(b) of Criminal Procedure Code at Exh. 38 and 39. The defence of accused seen to be of total denial of prosecution case from their above statement.

05. The points for determination along-with my findings thereon are as under:

Sr. No.	<u>Points</u>	<u>Decision</u>
1.	Whether the prosecution proves that on 24/05/2021 at about 9:00 p.m., at Mandavghorad, Tq. Hingna, Dist. Nagpur, the accused No. 1, in furtherance of common intention of both accused, voluntarily caused grievous hurt to Vilas Sontakke by assaulting him with a wooden <i>Zilpi</i> on his head and thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 325 read with Section 34 Code?	..No.
2.	What order ?	As per final order.

REASONS FOR DECISION

Point No. 1:-

06. To establish the offence under Section 325 read with Section 34 of the Code, the prosecution must prove:

- Existence of common intention
- Voluntary act of causing hurt
- Hurt caused is grievous in nature

The prosecution relied on both oral and documentary evidence.

07. Informant – Nitesh (PW-1) deposed in his chief-examination that he knew both accused, who are his relatives. The injured Vilas is his maternal uncle. There was prior enmity regarding grazing of cattle on the embankment. On the day of the incident, he went along with his uncle in front of the accused's house and questioned them. The accused picked up a quarrel, and accused No. 1 assaulted Vilas with a wooden *Zilpi* (MO-1) on his head. At that time, his maternal uncle was feeling giddy, and thereafter he took him home. As his maternal uncle was feeling giddy and suffering from headache, he was taken to Sai Hospital, Hingna and later medical examination revealed skull fracture. Thereafter, he lodged report (Exh. 18) against the accused and accordingly FIR (Exh. 19) has been registered.

08. He deposed in his cross-examination that there were long-standing disputes between the parties. He further deposed that the incident occurred in front of the accused's house on the road. He further deposed that the informant and injured had gone there; the accused did not come to their house. He further deposed that wooden *Zilpi* like MO-1 are commonly available in village households. He further admitted that at the time of the alleged incident, his maternal uncle was accompanying him. He further deposed that on the next

day of the incident, he went for work, but thereafter he did not attend work regularly as usual. He further admitted that he saw MO-1 (wooden *Zilpi*) for the first time in the Court. He further deposed that at the time of giving statement to police, he stated that at the time of the incident, his maternal uncle was feeling giddy, and thereafter he took him home and he was suffering from headache but these facts were not mentioned in his report and he could not assign reason for same. He further deposed that he had disclosed to the police that there was clotting of blood on the head of his maternal uncle but he could not explain why this fact is not reflected in his report.

09. As prosecution case, Vilas (PW-2) is the sole injured of incident. He deposed in his chief examination that he knew both the accused, who are sons of his real uncle. The informant Nitesh Matankar is his nephew. The incident occurred on 24 May 2021 at about 9:00 p.m. in front of the house of the accused. At the time of the incident, a scuffle was going on between the informant Nitesh and accused No. 1. When the quarrel escalated, he intervened to pacify them. At that time, accused No. 1 assaulted him with a wooden *Zilpi* (MO-1) on his head, due to which there was clotting of blood and he became unconscious and fell down. On the next day, he was taken to Sai Hospital, Hingna for treatment, where he was advised to

undergo a CT scan. Accordingly, he went to a hospital at Nagpur for the CT scan, wherein it was revealed that there was a fracture to the skull bone. Thereafter, he was admitted to Neuron Hospital, Nagpur for further treatment.

10. He deposed in his cross-examination his statement was recorded by the police while he was admitted in the hospital, though he could not recall the exact date. He further admitted that there were long-standing disputes between him and the accused. He further deposed that wooden *Zilpi* like MO-1 are commonly available in village households.

11. Ranjana (PW-5) deposed in her chief-examination that informant Nitesh is her son, the injured Vilas Sontakke is her brother, and the accused are her cousin brothers. She further deposed that the incident occurred on 24 May 2021 at about 9:00 p.m. on the road in front of the house of the accused. At that time, accused No. 1 assaulted her brother Vilas on his head with a stick. She further stated that the accused used to quarrel with her brother over agricultural disputes, and therefore her son questioned them about the same. She deposed that due to the assault, her brother sustained injuries and was taken to the hospital; however, she did not know to which hospital he was taken

12. She in her cross-examination, admitted that there were long-standing quarrels between the accused and her brother over agricultural land issues. She further stated that there were no cordial relations between them. She also admitted that her son was addicted to liquor. She Could not state that as to whether he was under the influence of liquor at the time of the incident.

13. Sangita (PW-6) deposed in her chief examination that the informant Nitesh Matankar is her nephew, the injured Vilas Sontakke is her husband, and the accused are her relatives. She further deposed that the incident occurred on 24 May 2021 at about 9:00 p.m. on the road in front of the house of the accused. At that time, the accused were quarreling with her husband over the issue of agricultural land embankment. Her nephew Nitesh went in front of the house of the accused and questioned them as to why they were quarrelling with his maternal uncle. Thereafter, a quarrel ensued, during which accused No. 1 assaulted her husband on the head with a wooden stick, causing injury. She further deposed that her husband was taken to Sai Hospital on the next day for treatment, where he was advised to undergo a CT scan. Thereafter, he was admitted to a Neuron hospital. Police recorded his statement during treatment.

14. She admitted in her cross-examination, that there were long-standing disputes between her husband and the accused regarding agricultural land embankment. Due to such disputes, there were no cordial relations between them. She denied the suggestion that she had not witnessed the incident. However, she voluntarily stated that upon hearing noise, she went to the spot.

15. Dr. Ninaad (PW-8) deposed in his chief examination that on 29 May 2021, he was attached to Neuron Hospital, Nagpur as Trauma In-charge. He further deposed that day, injured Vilas Sontakke was brought by his father with an alleged history of physical assault by a hard and blunt object on 24 May 2021 at about 9:00 p.m. On examination, the injured was conscious and stable, but complained of headache and vertigo. The injured had already undergone a CT scan of the brain as advised by a private practitioner, Dr. Umale. Upon perusal of the CT scan report, the witness found, hairline fracture of the right temporal bone, thin extradural hematoma and subdural hematoma, acute hemorrhagic contusion over the right temporal lobe measuring about 17 mm. He opined that the said injuries were grievous in nature and were most probably caused by a hard and blunt object. He further deposed that he received a requisition letter from Hingna Police Station and issued an injury certificate (Exhibit 31), bearing his signature and hospital seal.

On 9 June 2021, he received another requisition along with a wooden *Zilpi* (MO-1). Upon examination, he opined (Exhibit 32) that the injuries mentioned in the certificate could be caused by such a weapon. The weapon was brought in sealed condition by a police constable, examined by him, resealed, and returned. He identified the said weapon (MO-1) in Court.

16. He deposed in his cross-examination admitted that he had not advised a fresh CT scan at the time of his examination. He further deposed that the patient was brought to his hospital after about five days of the alleged incident. He further deposed that the injuries mentioned in the certificate could also be possible if a person falls on a hard and blunt surface. He further deposed that the injury certificate was issued upon receiving a police requisition; although the requisition letter was dated 9 June 2021, the certificate bears the date 4 June 2021. He further deposed that the patient was treated conservatively with oral medication.

17. Sanjay (PW-7) Police Constable, deposed in his chief examination that on 29 May 2021, he was attached to Hingna Police Station. On the same day, the informant lodged a report alleging that the accused had assaulted his maternal uncle Vilas Sonthakke with a wooden stick. Accordingly, Crime No. 243/2021 was registered, and

the investigation was entrusted to him. During the course of investigation he received the FIR and injury certificate. He visited the spot of the incident and prepared the spot panchnama (Exhibit 30) in the presence of panch witnesses. The spot was shown as being in front of the house of the informant at Mandav Ghorad. He seized a wooden *Zilpi*/stick (MO-1) from the spot, measuring approximately 83 cm in length with a circumference of about 20 c.m.. He visited Neuron Hospital, where the injured was admitted, and obtained the injury certificate by issuing a requisition letter (Exhibit 31). He also sent the seized weapon for medical opinion by issuing a query letter (Exhibit 32), and the corresponding report was received and placed on record. He arrested both the accused and prepared arrest panchnamas (Exhibits 33 and 34). He concluded that accused No. 1, in furtherance of common intention with co-accused, had assaulted Vilas Sontakke with the wooden stick

18. He admitted in his cross-examination the investigation was handed over to him on 29 May 2021, and he prepared the spot panchnama on the same day. He did not issue any written notice to the panch witnesses before conducting the panchnama. The informant did not state in the FIR that the injured had become unconscious after the incident and was taken home, or there was clotting of blood on the head of the injured.

19. Ramchandra and Sunil (PW.-3 & PW.-4) who were panch witnesses to the spot-cum-seizure panchnama, did not support the prosecution case. Despite being cross-examined by the prosecution, nothing material could be elicited from their evidence to support the prosecution version.

20. Upon careful consideration of the entire oral and documentary evidence, it is seen that the material witnesses, namely Informant Nitesh (PW- 1- Nephew of injured), Injured Vilas (PW-2), Ranjana (PW- 5 – mother of informant), Sangita (PW- 6– wife of injured) are all closely related to each other. It is admitted by all key witnesses that there were long-standing disputes between the parties regarding agricultural land embankment. This shows that they are also interest in the conviction of accused. It is a settled principle of law that the evidence of an interested or related witness cannot be discarded merely on that ground. However, such evidence must be subjected to careful and cautious scrutiny. The Court must seek consistency, inherent probability, and corroboration from independent evidence before placing reliance upon such testimony.

21. First of all, it is necessary to see whether there is any evidence which will show that there is common intention of accused

No. 2 in the alleged accident. Therefore, it is necessary to mention the provision which deals with the concept of common intention. Section 34 of the Code speaks about common intention. As per Section 34 of the Code, when a criminal act is done by several persons in furtherance of the common intention of all, each of such persons is liable for that act in the same manner as if it were done by him alone.

22. Section 34 of the Code creates no specific offence. It only intends to cover situations in which a criminal act is committed by several persons; and it is not easy to demarcate the extent and quantum of participation by each one of such several persons. In such a situation it was considered proper that all such persons be declared liable for the criminal act done by them jointly. This section embodies the principle of joint liability in the doing of criminal act, the essence of joint liability being the existence of a 'common intention'. 'Common intention' should not be confused with 'similar intention'; it means 'intention common to all. To come within the mischief of this section the following ingredients must be present:

- i. there must be a common intention to commit a crime;
- ii. such act must be committed in furtherance of the common intention;
- iii. such act must result in the commission of a crime;

- iv. such common intention must be common to two or more persons;
- v. such persons (more than two or more) must have done the act or must have participated in the commission of that act.

23. However, in the present matter, informant Nitesh (PW- 1- Nephew of injured), injured Vilas (PW-2), Ranjana (PW- 5 – mother of informant), Sangita (PW- 6– wife of injured) deposed that accused No. 1 only assaulted the injured by wooden Zilpi but none of them deposed that accused No. 2 was assaulted or done act to cause injury to injured Vikas. Admittedly, the evidence of injured Vilas (PW-2) carried greater evidentiary value. But it is pertinent to note that Vilas (PW-2) himself has not deposed about the presence as well as about the role of accused No. 2 in alleged act. Per contra, he deposed that at the time of incident, the quarrel of accused No. 1 and informant was going on and so, he intervened and then accused No. 1 assaulted him by wooden Zilpi. In his entire evidence, there is no reference came about the role accused No. 2 in the alleged incident. Just on the count of previous animity of injured with accused No. 2, it is not possible to hold that the alleged act has been done with his common intention. Therefore, the common intention of accused No. 2 in the alleged incident is not seen to be proved beyond reasonable doubt.

24. So far as allegations against accused No. 1 is concerned, it is alleged by the prosecution that accused No. 1 beat the injured Vilas

(PW-2) on his head by wooden *Zilpi* (Broken), which is alleged to be seized through spot cum seizure Panchanama (Exh. 30). As mentioned earlier, the independent panch witnesses namely Ramchandra and Sunil (PW-3 & PW-4) did not support the prosecution. Therefore, the prosecution tried to prove the contents of said panchnama through the evidence of IO Mr. Badkal (PW-7). As per contents of said Panchanama (Exh. 30), said wooden *Zilpi* was laying on the spot and seized on 29/05/2021 and identified it by informant Nitesh (PW-1). But informant Nitesh (PW-1) deposed in his cross-examination that he saw said wooden *Zilpi* (MO-1) first time in the Court. Therefore, the contents of said panchanama (Exh. 30) that the wooden *Zilpi*, which is alleged to be used in offence, was found over the spot and identified by informant Nitesh (PW-1) are seen totally doubtful more-particularly when the independent panch witnesses did not support the prosecution.

25. Further-more, the informant Nitesh (PW-1), injured Vilas (PW-2) and Sangita (PW-6) deposed that accused No. 1 assaulted by wooden *Zilpi* and the wife of informant Ranjana (PW-5) deposed that accused No. 1 assaulted by stick. There is different between the wooden *Zilpi* and stick. Therefore, the evidence prosecution witnesses regarding weapon used for assault is not seen consistent. In such circumferences, it is not seen to be proved beyond doubt that

accused No. 1 beat the injured Vilas (PW-2) by wooden Zilpi (MO-1).

26. Further, Vilas (PW-2), informant Nitesh (PW-1) and Sangita (PW-6) deposed in their evidence that accused No. 1 beat the injured Vilas by wooden Zilpi (MO-1) on his head. Further, as per spot cum seizer panchanama (Exh. 30), said wooden Zilpi was blunt and in broken condition. The same discription of weapon shown in query report (Exh. 37), which was issued by Dr. Ninand (PW-8). However, it is pertinent to that as per evidence of Dr. Ninand (PW-8), he has not found any superficial injury over the head of injured Vilas (PW-2). If really some one has been beaten by blunt and broken article, then it is less possible that the injured would have not sustained some superficial injury but it is not happened in the matter in hand. Therefore, the case of prosecution that accused No. 1 beat the injured Vilas (PW-2) by wooden Zilpi is seen highly doubtful.

27. More-over, the injured Vilas (PW-2) himself deposed that after alleged incident, he became unconscious and fell down. Dr. Ninand (PW-8) also admitted in his cross-examination that if a person fell down on hard and blunt surface, the injury mentioned in his certificate can be possible. In such circumstances, the possibility of sustaining injury to due fallen down of injured Vilas (PW-2) also can not be ruled. Further, his silence for near about 5 day in lodging FIR

also supports the defence that the injury sustained by Vilas (PW-2) was not caused due to the act of accused No. 1. Therefore, the accusation leveled against accused about beating are not seen to be proved beyond reasonable doubt.

28. Further-more, though Vilas (PW-2) is an injured witness and his testimony ordinarily carries greater evidentiary value, his evidence is not free from doubt. There are material omissions and improvements in his version, particularly regarding the presence of blood clots, unconsciousness, and the manner of assault. His evidence regarding falling down unconscious after incident and about blood clots in his head is totally improved. There is reference about the same in his statement as well as report (Exh. 18) about the same. Similarly, Nitesh (PW-1) has made significant improvements over his First Information Report, for which he has failed to provide any satisfactory explanation. His admission that he saw the alleged weapon (MO-1) for the first time in Court further weakens the prosecution case.

29. Ranjana (PW-5) and Sangita (PW-6) being close relatives, are also interested witnesses, and their evidence does not inspire full confidence. Notably, Sangita (PW-6) admitted that she reached the spot after hearing noise, thereby casting doubt on her presence at the

time of the actual assault. Further, the existence of prior enmity between the parties is admitted by all these witnesses. While such enmity may provide a motive for the incident, it also raises the possibility of false implication or exaggeration, requiring the Court to exercise greater caution.

30. Further-more, in the present case, the alleged incident occurred on 24 May 2021 at about 9:00 p.m., whereas the First Information Report came to be lodged on 29 May 2021, i.e., after a delay of about five days. It is a settled principle of law that delay in lodging the FIR is not fatal per se, if the same is properly explained. However, when such delay remains unexplained or inadequately explained, it assumes significance and may create doubt about the prosecution case. The prosecution has attempted to explain the delay on the ground that the injured was undergoing medical treatment. It has come on record that the injured was taken to hospital and underwent CT scan and treatment. However, on careful scrutiny of the evidence there is no convincing explanation as to why the report was not lodged promptly, particularly when the informant was available, the police station was accessible. The informant himself admitted that he resumed work on the next day of the incident, which indicates that he was in a position to approach the police earlier. The injured was not shown to be in such a critical condition as

to completely prevent lodging of report immediately. Further, the delay assumes importance in light of admitted prior enmity between the parties, material improvements made in the version of witnesses. This creates a possibility that the FIR was lodged after deliberation and consultation. There may have been embellishment or exaggeration in the allegations. Thus, the delay in lodging the FIR, coupled with absence of satisfactory explanation, affects the spontaneity and credibility of the prosecution version. As discussed earlier, there is also previous animosity between the informant, injured and accused person. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the delay of five days in lodging the FIR remains not satisfactorily explained and therefore, becomes a circumstance creating doubt in the prosecution case.

31. It is a cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that the prosecution must prove its case beyond reasonable doubt, and the accused is entitled to the benefit of every reasonable doubt arising from the evidence on record. In the present case, the evidence led by the prosecution suffers from material contradictions and omissions, lack of independent corroboration, and reliance on interested witnesses whose testimonies do not inspire full confidence. The delay in lodging the FIR has also not been satisfactorily explained. Further, the medical evidence is not conclusive regarding the exact cause of

injury, and the possibility of injury due to accidental fall cannot be ruled out as admitted by Dr. Ninad (PW-8). These circumstances cumulatively create reasonable doubt regarding the prosecution version. In such a situation, it would be unsafe to hold the accused guilty. Hence, the accused are entitled to the benefit of doubt, and accordingly, they deserve to be acquitted from the accusation of offence punishable under Section 325 of the Code. Hence, point No. 1 is answered in negative.

Point No. 2:-

32. In view of finding of point No. 1, accused are entitled for acquittal from an accusation of offence punishable under Section 325 read with 34 of the Code. The weapon seized in the offence i.e. wooden Zilpi is worthless. It is required to be disposed off after appeal period. Further, in view of Judgment of Hon'ble Bombay High Court given in case of *Ranjana Shantilal Suryawanshi V/s. Jaiprakash Tuliram Gupta and ors* (Cri. Apl. No. 380/2019 Decided on 16th July 2020), the copy of this judgment is required to be sent to Collector, Nagpur in compliance of Section 365 of Code of Criminal Procedure. Thus, in answer to point No. 2, following order is passed:-

ORDER

- i. The accused are acquitted under Section 248 (1) of the Code of

Criminal Procedure, 1973 of an offence punishable under Sections 325 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

- ii. The bail bonds of accused stands canceled.
- iii. Accused be set at liberty forthwith.
- iv. Accused are hereby directed to furnish personal bond of Rs. 15,000/- each and surety of like amount to appear before Hon'ble Appellate Court, in case of appeal filed by the prosecution, according to Section 437-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
- v. Seized muddemal wooden *Zilpi* (MO-1) being worthless be destroyed after probation period is over.
- vi. The copy of this Judgment be sent to the Collector, Aurangabad as per Section 365 of the Code of Criminal Procedure Code.

(Pronounced in the open court)

Hingna.

Date:- 09/04/2026

(V.H.Khedkar)

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Hingna.

APPENDIX

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

LIST OF PROSECUTION WITNESSES

Rank	Name	Nature of evidence
PW-1	Nitesh Vilas Mathankar	Informant.
PW-2	Vilas Santosh Sontakke	Witness

PW-3	Ramchandra Rambhauji Shrirame	Spot & Seizer Panch
PW-4	Sunil Narhari Nighot	Spot & Seizer Panch
PW-5	Ranjana Vilas Mathankar	Witness
PW-6	Sangita Vilas Sontakke	Witness
PW-7	Sanjay Rambhauji Badkar	Investigation officer
PW-8	Dr. Ninad Bhaiyyasaheb Gawande	Medical Officer

LIST OF DEFENCE WITNESSES

Rank	Name	Nature of evidence
1	Nil	Nil

LIST OF COURT WITNESSES

Rank	Name	Nature of evidence
1	Nil	Nil

LIST OF PROSECUTION EXHIBITS

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Nature of evidence
1	Exh. 18 /PW-1	Report
2	Exh. 19/PW-1	First Information Report
3	Exh. 30/PW-7	Spot cum seizure panchanama
4	Exh. 31/PW-7	Letter to Neuron Hospital
5	Exh. 32/PW-7	Letter to Doctor
6	Exh. 33 & 34/PW-7	Arrest Panchnama of Accused 1 & 2
7	Exh. 36/PW-8	Injury certificate
8	Exh. 37/PW-8	Query report

DOCUMENTS ADMITTED BY DEFENSE

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Nature of evidence
--------	----------------	--------------------

1	Nil	Nil
---	-----	-----

LIST OF DEFENSE EXHIBITS

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Nature of evidence
1	Nil	Nil

LIST OF COURT EXHIBITS

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Nature of evidence
1	Nil	Nil

MATERIAL OBJECTS

Sr.No.	Material Object No.	Description
1	MO-1	wooden Zilpi

Hingna.
Date:- 09/04/2026

(V.H.Khedkar)
Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Hingna.