

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

MHRG140009042025 	Presented on	02.04.2025
	Registered on	02.04.2025
	Decided on	16.07.2026
	Duration	YY – MM – DD 01 – 03 – 14

PART 'A'

(Title Page of Judgment)

<u>IN THE COURT OF C.J.J.D. AND J.M.F.C. AT URAN,</u> <u>TQ- URAN, DIST. RAIGAD</u> - Present :- Santosh P. Wankhade, J.M.F.C. Date : 16.07.2026		
S.C.C. No- 712/2025 Exh. No- 9/B		
(Crime No. 1/2025, U/Sec. 281, 125 (b) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sec. 184 and 134 of Motor Vehicle Act of Police Station, Nhavasheva, Tq- Uran, Dist. Raigad).		
Prosecution	:-	STATE OF MAHARASHTRA Through P.S.O. Nhavasheva

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

			Police Station, Tal. Uran, Dist. Raigad.
Represented By	:-		Shri. P. B. Deshmane Learned A.P.P. for the State
Accused	:-		1. Shri. Dharmendrakumar Ramsharan Pal. Age: 31, Occupation : Driver R/o Trailor No. MH-43-CE-8844, Seagul Shipping Services pvt. Ltd., Seawoods, Navi Mumbai. O/R/at Chedipur, Kandhiya, Ashotar Dist. Fattepur, State Uttar Pradesh.
Represented By	:-		Adv. Shri. Jitendra Katarne, Learned Advocate for accused

PART 'B'

Date of Offence	:-	01.01.2025
-----------------	-----------	------------

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

Date of F.I.R.	:-	01.01.2025
Date of Charge-sheet	:-	02.04.2025
Date of plea	:-	31.07.2025
Date of commencement of Evidence	:-	04.09.2025
Date on which Judgment is reserved	:-	--
Date of the Judgment	:-	16.07.2026
Date of the sentencing order, If any	:-	16.07.2026

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 for the purpose of Section 428 of CrPC /469 of the BNSS

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

1.	Dharmendra kumar Ramsharan Pal	--	20.06. 2025	281, 125 (b) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sec. 184 and 134 of Motor Vehicle Act	Convicted	For the offence u.s 281 of the BNS, the convict is sentenced to undergo R.I. for three (3) months and to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to undergo S.I. for ten (10) days. For the offence u/ s 125(b) of the BNS, the convict is sentenced to undergo R.I. for 1year and to pay a fine of Rs. 5,000/-, & in default of payment of fine, to undergo S.I. for 1 months. For the offence u/s. 184 of the MVA, the convict is	---
----	---	----	----------------	--	-----------	--	-----

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

						sentenced to undergo R.I. for 3 months and to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/-, and in default of payment of fine, to undergo S.I. for 10 days. For the offence u/s. 134 of the MVA, the convict is sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/-, and in default of payment of fine, to undergo S.I. for 10 days.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

PART 'C'

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Witnesses

A. Prosecution :-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
-------------	-------------	---------------------------

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

PW-1	Anilkumar Chotelal Yadav	Spot Panch
PW-2	Akkaleshwar Pradip Mahato	Informant/Injured
PW-3	Harshal Narendra Bagul	Witness
PW-4	Manoj Pradip Mahato	Witness
PW-5	Yogesh Pramod Gole	Witness
PW-6	Ajinath Subhash Misal	Witness
PW-7	Zunzun Saheb Saday	Witness
PW-8	Dr. Shivraj Mallikarjun Shette	Medical Officer
PW-9	Shantaram Gangadhar Lende	I.O.

B. Defence Witnesses, if any :-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
----	---	---

C. Court Witnesses, if any :-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
------	------	--------------------

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

---	---	---
-----	-----	-----

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Exhibits

A. Prosecution's Exhibits:-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	Exhibit- P1 PW-1	Spot Panchnama
2.	Exhibit- P2 PW - 2	Report
3.	Exhibit-P3 PW- 8	Injury Certificate
4.	Exhibit-P4 PW-9	Informant's statement
5.	Exhibit- P5 PW-9	Copy of notice served to accused
6.	Exhibit- P6 PW –9	Vehicle's RTO report

B. Defence's Exhibits :-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
---	---	---

-

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

C. Court's Exhibits :-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
---	---	---

D. Material Objects :-

Sr.No.	Material Object Number	Description
---	---	---

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered on this 16th Day of July, 2026)

1. The accused Dharmendrakumar Ramsharan Pal has been indicted and tried for committing offences punishable under Sections 281 and 125(b) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as "BNS"), and Sections 184 and 134 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (hereinafter referred to as "MVA"), arising out of a motor vehicle accident reported on 1st January, 2025, within the territorial jurisdiction of Nhava Sheva Police Station.

2. The genesis of the prosecution's case lies in the oral report lodged by the complainant, Akaleshwar Pradip Mahto (PW-2), aged 47 years, working as a housekeeper. According to the first information report (FIR) marked as Exhibit P-2/PW-2, the complainant was residing at Room No. 05, Yashwant Lokhande Building, Sonari, Taluka Uran,

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

District Raigad, while his family members resided in his native place in Bihar. He had been working as a housekeeper with Desai Company at Dhutum, Taluka Uran, for about ten years, being the sole breadwinner of his family.

3. On 1st January, 2025, at around 02:00 PM, the complainant left his residence in Sonari on foot to head to his workplace. He walked up to Chandni Chowk, which is a regular boarding point where company vehicles arrive to transport workers. At around 02:05 PM, upon noticing that the traffic signal was red for vehicular flow, the complainant began crossing the main highway (going from JNPT Port towards Panvel) to proceed towards the Sonari side.

4. At that juncture, a motor trailer bearing registration number MH-43-CE-8844, driven by the accused, was coming from the JNPT Port direction towards Panvel. The prosecution alleges that the accused drove the trailer in a rash, negligent, and dangerous manner, entirely disregarding the prevailing traffic signals and road conditions. The trailer dashed against the complainant from behind, knocking him down. The heavy rear wheels of the trailer ran over the complainant's right leg. As a result, his right leg was crushed below the knee, and his right foot was completely mutilated, causing severe, active hemorrhaging. He also sustained multiple injuries to his left foot, mouth, teeth, and lips.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

5. Following the impact, the accused driver did not stop the trailer to render medical assistance or secure hospitalization for the injured, nor did he report the accident to the nearest police station. Instead, the accused drove the trailer further and abandoned it at a short distance before fleeing the spot. Police Constable Ajinath Misal (PW-6), who was on traffic duty at Chandni Chowk, rushed to the spot with the help of bypassers, put the injured complainant into a vehicle, and brought him to Panacea Hospital, Sonari, for immediate treatment.

6. On receiving information from the traffic branch, PSI Shantaram Lende (PW-9) of Nhava Sheva Police Station arrived at Panacea Hospital. Since the complainant was undergoing active medical treatment, his statement was recorded at the hospital, which formed the basis for registering Crime No. 01/2025 at Nhava Sheva Police Station for the offenses under Sections 281 and 125(b) of the BNS, and Sections 184 and 134 of the MVA.

7. During the course of the investigation, PSI Lende (PW-9) visited the spot on the following day (2nd January, 2025) and drew up the Spot Panchnama (Exhibit P-1/PW-1) in the presence of panch witnesses Anilkumar Yadav (PW-1) and Jhunjhun Saheb Saday (PW-7). He served a statutory notice to the driver/accused (Exhibit P-5/PW-9) and recorded statements of company employees Harshal Bagul (PW-3) and Yogesh Gole (PW-5) to verify the identity of the driver. He further collected the vehicle inspection report from the Regional Transport Office (RTO) marked as Exhibit P-6/PW-9. Medical treatment

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

records were obtained from Panacea Hospital and D.Y. Patil Hospital, Nerul, where the complainant was subsequently shifted and underwent amputation of his right leg. Upon finding sufficient incriminating material, the Investigating Officer submitted the chargesheet before this Court.

8. On the appearance of the accused, the particulars of the offences under Sections 281 and 125(b) of the BNS and Sections 184 and 134 of the MVA were formally framed and explained to him on 31st July, 2025. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. His defense is one of total denial, asserting that he has been falsely implicated and that the accident did not occur due to his negligence, but rather because the complainant crossed the road in a reckless manner, or alternatively, that the complainant sustained injuries by falling due to potholes on the road.

9. To adjudicate this matter, the following points arise for determination, and my findings thereon are as under:

Sr. No.	POINTS	FINDINGS
01.	Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that on 1st January, 2025, at about 02:05 PM, at Chandni Chowk, Uran, the accused drove the motor trailer	In the

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

	bearing registration number MH-43-CE-8844 on a public road in a manner so rash or negligent as to endanger human life?	Affirmative
02.	Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that the accused, while driving the said trailer in a rash and negligent manner, knocked down and caused grievous hurt to Akaleshwar Pradip Mahto, leading to the amputation of his right leg?	In the Affirmative
03.	Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that the accused drove the vehicle dangerously in a public place in contravention of Section 184 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988?	In the Affirmative
04.	Whether the prosecution proves beyond reasonable doubt that the accused failed to secure medical attention for the injured person and failed to report the accident to the police, thereby violating Section 134 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988?	In the Affirmative

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

05.	What order?	As per final Order
-----	-------------	-------------------------------

REASONS

10. To establish the guilt of the accused, the prosecution examined a total of nine witnesses. The material aspects of their depositions are evaluated below:

11. PW-1 (Anilkumar Chotelal Yadav) is a panch witness to the spot of occurrence. He deposed that on 2nd January, 2025, at around 11:00 AM, the police summoned him to Chandni Chowk, Sonari. The spot of the accident was shown by Manoj Mahto (PW-4), the brother of the complainant. He stated that a trailer coming from JNPT Port had hit the complainant and run over his leg. He identified the trailer registration number as MH-43-CE-8844 and the driver as the accused, Dharmendrakumar Pal. He proved the Spot Panchnama (Exhibit P-1/PW-1). In his cross-examination, he admitted that the complainant and his brother were known to him as they worked in the same vicinity, and that Chandni Chowk has a functioning traffic signal. He denied the defense suggestion that the complainant fell due to potholes and that no panchnama was conducted in his presence.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

12. PW-2 (Akaleshwar Pradip Mahto) is the victim and complainant. He deposed that on 1st January, 2025, while on his way to the afternoon shift at Ultratech Company in Dhutum, he arrived at Chandni Chowk at around 2:00 PM. He was crossing the road when the traffic signal was red for vehicles. A large trailer bearing number MH-43-CE-8844 hit him from behind. He suffered severe injuries to his right leg, left foot, mouth, teeth, and lips, which ultimately necessitated the amputation of his right leg. His statement was recorded by the police at Panacea Hospital (Exhibit P-2/PW-2). In his cross-examination, he admitted that there was no zebra crossing at Chandni Chowk and that there were potholes on the road, but firmly denied that he was crossing recklessly or that he fell because of a pothole. He asserted that the traffic signal was indeed red for vehicles when he crossed, and he was hit from behind.

13. PW-3 (Harshal Narendra Bagul) was employed as a maintenance supervisor with Segal Shipping, Alibaug, which owned the trailer. He deposed that on 1st January, 2025, the accused, Dharmendrakumar Pal (whom he identified in Court), called him on his telephone and informed him that he had met with an accident at Sonari Signal, where a pedestrian crossing the road was hit, and the vehicle went over his leg. PW-3 then directed his colleague, Amit Thakur, to go to the spot and assist, and he informed the company manager. In his cross-examination, he admitted he did not witness the accident himself but stood firm regarding the telephonic admission made by the accused.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

14. PW-4 (Manoj Pradip Mahto) is the brother of the complainant. He deposed that he received a call on his brother's phone from an unknown person informing him of the accident. He reached Panacea Hospital by 6:30 PM and saw his brother's crushed right leg, which doctors advised would have to be amputated. He pointed out the accident spot to the police on the following day. His cross-examination did not elicit any material contradictions as he was not an eyewitness to the collision itself.

15. PW-5 (Yogesh Pramod Gole) was the Maintenance Manager at Segal Shipping Services, Belapur. He deposed that on the day of the incident, he received information about the accident involving trailer MH-43-CE-8844, driven by the accused. Since he resiled from certain aspects of his previous police statement, the Ld. APP cross-examined him with the permission of the Court. In his cross-examination by the State, he admitted that the accused had loaded an iron coil from JNPT Port and was driving towards the Posco company. He also admitted that he instructed Amit Thakur to visit the spot. In his cross-examination by the defense, he admitted he was not an eyewitness to the accident.

16. PW-6 (Ajinath Subhash Misal) is a Police Constable attached to the Nhava Sheva Traffic Branch. He deposed that on 1st January, 2025, he was on duty at the Chandni Chowk traffic signal. At around 2:00 PM, a trailer knocked down a pedestrian and fled. A crowd gathered, and the bystanders noted the trailer's registration number as

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

MH-43-CE-8844. He immediately took the injured, who disclosed his name as Akaleshwar Mahto, to Panacea Hospital for treatment. In his cross-examination, he admitted that the road has traffic density, but denied that he did not see the vehicle or that he was deposing falsely.

17. PW-7 (Jhunjhun Saheb Saday) is an eyewitness and colleague of the complainant. He deposed that on the day of the incident, they were walking together to Chandni Chowk to board their company vehicle. He was walking slightly behind the complainant. The traffic signal was red for vehicles, and the complainant was crossing the road when the trailer came at a high speed from JNPT Port towards Panvel and hit the complainant from behind, crushing his leg. He testified that the police chased and stopped the trailer further down the road, and the accident was entirely due to the driver's fault. In his cross-examination, he denied that they were in a rush or that there was a green signal for vehicles.

18. PW-8 (Dr. Shivraj Mallikarjun Shete) was the Medical Officer at Panacea Hospital, Sonari. He examined the complainant on 1st January, 2025, at 2:50 PM. He deposed that the patient had a severe crush injury on his right leg below the knee, a lacerated wound in the mouth with a broken lower incisor, and a degloving injury on the left sole with active bleeding. He proved the Certificate of Injury (Exhibit P-3/PW-8) and opined that the injuries were fresh (within 6 hours) and

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

were consistent with a vehicular run-over. He stated that the right leg was beyond repair and required immediate amputation.

19. PW-9 (Shantaram Gangadhar Lende) is the Investigating Officer. He deposed regarding the steps taken during the investigation, including registering the FIR (Exhibit P-4/PW-9), conducting the Spot Panchnama (Exhibit P-1/PW-1), issuing notices, collecting RTO reports (Exhibit P-6/PW-9), and filing the chargesheet. In his cross-examination, he stated that the collision occurred from the back as the pedestrian was crossing from north to south and the trailer was going from west to east.

AS TO POINT NO- 1 TO 4 :-

20. To sustain a conviction under Sections 281 and 125(b) of the BNS (which correspond to the traditional offenses under Sections 279 and 338 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860), the prosecution must establish three essential ingredients:

- (a) that the accused was driving the vehicle on a public road,
- (b) that the driving was rash or negligent, and
- (c) that such rash or negligent driving was the direct and proximate cause of the grievous hurt to the victim.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

21. The defense has raised a plea of denial regarding the identity of the driver. However, the prosecution has placed formidable evidence on record. PW-3 (Harshal Bagul), the maintenance supervisor of the transport company, categorically testified that the accused, Dharmendrakumar Pal, was the designated driver of trailer MH-43-CE-8844 on the day of the accident, and that the accused had personally called him immediately after the occurrence to confess that his trailer had run over a pedestrian's leg at Sonari Signal. This extra-judicial confession is corroborative and fits with the testimony of PW-5 (Yogesh Gole), who confirmed that the accused was driving the trailer carrying an iron coil from JNPT Port on that day. Furthermore, PW-6 (Police Constable Ajinath Misal) and PW-7 (Jhunjhun Saday) corroborated that trailer MH-43-CE-8844 was the offending vehicle, which was pursued and stopped. Therefore, the identity of the accused as the driver of the offending vehicle is proved beyond any shadow of doubt.

22. Ld. APP placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ravi Kapur v. State of Rajasthan, (2012) 9 SCC 284***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court held:

"Rashness consists in hazarding a dangerous or wanton act with the knowledge that it is so, and that it may cause injury, but without conscious intention to cause injury. Negligence is a breach of duty imposed by law... It is the omission to do something which a reasonable man, guided

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

upon those considerations which ordinarily regulate the conduct of human affairs, would do, or doing something which a prudent and reasonable man would not do."

23. Applying this standard to the present facts, the evidence of PW-2 (complainant) and PW-7 (eyewitness) is consistent and highly credible. Both witnesses deposed that at the relevant time, the traffic signal at Chandni Chowk was red for vehicles, and pedestrians were crossing. The accused, driving a massive multi-axle trailer loaded with heavy iron coils, failed to stop at the red signal. He breached his fundamental duty of care by proceeding through the signal at a high speed, knocking down the complainant from behind.

24. It is a well-settled principle that a driver of a heavy vehicle owes a higher duty of care, particularly when approaching traffic intersections and pedestrian crossings. The spot panchnama (Exhibit P-1/PW-1) confirms that the accident occurred on the highway just 20 feet from the Chandni Chowk signal pole. The fact that the trailer struck the pedestrian from behind and ran over his leg demonstrates a total absence of control, attention, and care.

25. In **Govind S/O. Pandurang Birare Vs. The State Of Maharashtra, 2013 ALL MR (Cri) 3471**, the Hon'ble Bombay High Court held that when a vehicle collides with a pedestrian or a stationary

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

object due to sheer disregard for road discipline, the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur (the thing speaks for itself) is attracted, shifting the operational burden to the driver to explain how the accident occurred without his negligence. In the present case, the accused has failed to offer any plausible explanation. The defense's theory that the complainant fell due to potholes is completely belied by the medical evidence. PW-8 (Dr. Shivraj Shete) unequivocally testified that the massive crush injury on the right leg below the knee, the degloving injury on the left foot, and the broken incisor tooth could only be caused by a heavy vehicle running over the limb, and not by a simple fall on a road. Therefore, the defense plea is a mere afterthought and is rejected.

26. The prosecution has proved that the victim sustained 'grievous hurt' within the meaning of the law. Dr. Shivraj Shete (PW-8) proved the Injury Certificate (Exhibit P-3/PW-8). The medical records from Panacea Hospital and the subsequent treatment details show that the victim suffered a devastating crush injury of the right leg, resulting in its surgical amputation. This amputation amounts to permanent disfiguration and loss of a limb, falling squarely under the definition of grievous hurt. The direct and proximate cause of this grievous hurt was the rash and negligent act of the accused in knocking down the complainant with his trailer.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

27. Section 184 of the MVA penalizes driving dangerous to the public, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the nature, condition, and use of the place where the vehicle is driven. Passing through a red traffic signal at a busy junction like Chandni Chowk in a loaded trailer definitely constitutes dangerous driving. Thus, the charge under Section 184 of the MVA is fully established.

28. Section 134(a) and (b) of the MVA mandates that the driver of a motor vehicle involved in an accident causing injury to any person must take all reasonable steps to secure medical attention for the injured person and report the circumstances of the occurrence to the nearest police station within 24 hours. The depositions of PW-2, PW-6, and PW-7 conclusively establish that the accused fled the spot immediately after the accident without rendering any medical assistance to the writhing complainant. It was the traffic police constable (PW-6) and public bystanders who rescued the victim. The accused did not report the matter to the police. Hence, the accused is guilty of violating Section 134 of the MVA.

29. In view of the above-detailed discussion of oral and documentary evidence, this Court is of the firm opinion that the prosecution has successfully established the guilt of the accused for all the charged offenses beyond any reasonable doubt. Consequently, Points 1, 2, 3, and 4 are answered in the affirmative.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

AS TO POINT NO- 5:-

30. I have heard the Ld. APP for the State and the Ld. Counsel for the accused on the point of sentence. The Ld. Counsel for the accused submitted that the accused is a poor driver, the sole breadwinner of his family, and has no prior criminal history. He prayed for a lenient view and requested the benefit of probation or a simple fine.

31. On the other hand, the Ld. APP vehemently opposed any leniency. He argued that the victim, a housekeeper and sole earner, lost his right leg permanently due to the absolute recklessness of the accused. He urged that a strong deterrent sentence is necessary.

32. While considering the appropriate sentence, this Court must keep in mind the observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Punjab v. Saurabh Bakshi, (2015) 5 SCC 182***. The Hon'ble Apex Court observed:

"The criminal law has to be applied with all seriousness. Showing undue sympathy by reducing the substantive sentence is legally unsustainable... Sentencing in motor accident cases must serve a social and deterrent purpose, keeping in view the rising frequency of road hazards."

33. The accused was driving a heavy trailer on a busy public road. He jumped a red traffic signal and crushed the leg of an innocent

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

pedestrian crossing the road. To make matters worse, he abandoned the bleeding victim on the road and fled the spot, displaying a complete lack of humanity. Due to his reckless behavior, the victim has been permanently disabled, losing his livelihood and quality of life. In such circumstances, showing undue leniency would undermine public confidence in the efficacy of the criminal justice system.

34. Therefore, a balance must be struck between the mitigating circumstances of the accused and the severe impact of the crime on the victim and society. In my view, a substantive sentence of rigorous imprisonment along with a fine will meet the ends of justice. In the result, the following operative order is passed:

ORDER

1. Accused **Dharmendrakumar Ramsharan Pal** is hereby convicted under Section 255(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (corresponding to Section 278 (2) of the BNSS, 2023), for the offences punishable under:
 - a) Section 281 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023;
 - b) Section 125(b) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023;
 - c) Section 184 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988; and
 - d) Section 134 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

2. For the offence under Section 281 of the BNS, the convict is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for three (3) months and to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only), and in default of payment of fine, to undergo Simple Imprisonment for ten (10) days.
3. For the offence under Section 125(b) of the BNS, the convict is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for one (1) years and to pay a fine of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only), and in default of payment of fine, to undergo Simple Imprisonment for one (1) months.
4. For the offence under Section 184 of the MVA, the convict is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for three (3) months and to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only), and in default of payment of fine, to undergo Simple Imprisonment for ten (10) days.
5. For the offence under Section 134 of the MVA, the convict is sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only), and in default of payment of fine, to undergo Simple Imprisonment for ten (10) days.
6. All substantive sentences shall run concurrently.

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

7. The convict is entitled to set-off under Section 428 of the Cr.P.C. / Section 469 of the BNSS, 2023, for the period of detention already undergone, if any.
8. The bail bond of the convict stands cancelled. He is ordered to be taken into custody immediately to undergo the sentences.
9. Out of the fine amount collected, an amount of Rs. 6,000/- (Rupees Six Thousand only) shall be paid to the victim, Akaleshwar Pradip Mahto, as compensation under Section 357(1) of the Cr.P.C. / Section 395 of the BNSS, 2023.
10. A copy of this judgment be supplied to the convict free of cost immediately.

(Judgment pronounced and dictated in open Court.)

Uran,
Date – 16.07.2026

S. P. Wankhade
Judicial Magistrate F. C. Uran
Court No. 1

SCC 712/2025
State Vs. Dharmendra
Judgment

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file Order/Judgment are same word to word as per the original Order/Judgment.

Name of Stenographer : Rasika P. Mhatre
Name of Court : CJJD & J. M.F. C., Uran
(Court No.1)
Date : 16/07/2026
Judgment/order signed
by the Presiding Officer on : 16/07/2026
Judgment/Order uploaded on : 16/07/2026
