

MHRT040003362024 Received on : 10.07.2024



Registered on : 10.07.2024

Decided on : 18.07.2026

Duration : Ys. Ms. Ds.
02 00 08**Exh.No.98****Form No.XXXII****Part 'A'****(Title Page of Judgment)****[Para 44(i) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual]****IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE****AT - KHED, DISTRICT - RATNAGIRI**

[Present: V. G. Patil]

[Date of the Judgment: - 18th July, 2026]

[Sessions Case No. 13/2024]

	FIR (CR) No.366/2023, offence punishable under Sec.328, Sec.272, Sec.273, Sec.188 of Indian Penal Code 1860 (Hereinafter Referred as I.P.C.) Police Station: Khed Police Station
COMPLAINANT (PROSECUTION)	State of Maharashtra through Khed Police Station
REPRESENTED BY	APP Mrs. M. M. Jadkar
ACCUSED	Farhan Farukh Mohammad Patel Age: 36 years, Occu.: - Shop, R/o. Pethmap, Chiplun, Tal. Chiplun, Dist. Ratnagiri.
REPRESENTED BY	Mr.S.S.Sheth, Advocate

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

Date of Offence	09.12.2023
Date of FIR	09.12.2023
Date of Chargesheet	16.03.2024
Date of Framing of Charges	16.10.2025
Date of commencement of evidence	20.11.2025
Date on which judgment is reserved	-----
Date of the Judgment	18.07.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	-----

Accused Details

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428 Cr.P.C.
1	Farhan Farukh Mohammad Patel	09.12.2023	16.12.2023	S. 328, S.272, S.273, S.188 of the I.P.C., 1860	Acquitted	N.A.	N.A.

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered on the 18th day of July, 2026)

The accused is prosecuted for the offence punishable under Section 328, Section 272, Section 273

and Section 188 of Indian Penal Code 1860 (Hereinafter referred as 'I.P.C.').

2. The prosecution's case is that on 09.12.2023, after receiving confidential information, the informant Police Constable Prakash Rajendra Pawar (PC No. 1294) along with other police staff and panch witnesses proceeded in a government vehicle to mouje Excel Phata, Taluka Khed, District Ratnagiri. At about 14.50 hours, they noticed the accused Farhan Farukh Mohammad Patel was allegedly illegally storing and carrying prohibited food articles in silver colour Maruti Suzuki Eco Vehicle bearing registration no.MH-46-X-9857. The articles namely Kesaryukt Vimal Pan Masala (chocolate colour packets) (131 packets valued at Rs.198/- each), Kesaryukt Vimal Pan Masala (blue colour packets) (10 packets valued at Rs.187/- each), Kesaryukt Vimal Pan Masala (yellow colour packets) (40 packets valued at Rs.120/- each), V-1 Tobacco (131 pockets valued at Rs.22/- each), V-1 Tobacco (8 pockets valued at Rs.33/- each), V-1 Tobacco (43 pockets valued at Rs.30/- each), Kesaryukta Goa 1000 Pan Masala (29 packets valued at Rs.120/- each), G-1 Jarda Tobacco (15 packets valued at Rs.30/- each), along with Silver colour Maruti Suzuki Eco Vehicle bearing no. MH-46-X-9857 valued at Rs.4,00,000/-. Total seized muddemal of Rs.4,40,974/-. Said articles were prohibited under the notification issued by the Government of Maharashtra in the interest of public health and were alleged to be adulterated and injurious to health. On the basis of the

report lodged by the informant, the police registered the present the crime for offences punishable under Section 328, Section 272, Section 273 and Section 188 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Accordingly, Crime No.366/2023 came to be registered against the accused. A.P.I. Harshad Hinge conducted the investigation. During the course of investigation, he prepared seizure panchnama, prepared map of the spot, prepared muddemal receipt, issued letter to the Food Safety Officer, recorded statements of material witnesses, received log book extract of vehicle used for investigation, received documents of vehicle in possession of accused. Upon completion of the investigation, the Investigating Officer concluded that the accused had committed the alleged offences and accordingly, filed the charge-sheet.

4. After compliance of provision of Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter referred as Cr.P.C), Learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Khed has committed the case to this Court being alleged offence is exclusively triable by the Court of Session.

5. The Court has framed charge (Exhibit 14) for the offence punishable under Section 328, Section 272, Section 273 and Section 188 of I.P.C. The charge was read over and explained to accused in vernacular. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. In support of its case, the prosecution examined seven witnesses, as mentioned in Part 'C' of the Judgment and relied upon the documents referred in Part 'C' of the Judgment. The learned Public Prosecutor closed the prosecution evidence by filing pursis (Exhibit 94).

7. The statement of the accused was recorded under Section 313 of the Cr. P.C. (Exhibit 96). The defence of accused, as reflected from the cross-examination of the prosecution witnesses and statement under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C., is of total denial and false implication.

8. Considering matter before the court and argument of both the parties, following points arise for my determination and I have recorded my finding thereon for the reasons given below:

SR. NO.	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>FINDINGS</u>
1	Does prosecution prove that the accused on 09.12.2023 at village Lote Excel Phata, Tal. Khed, Dist. Ratnagiri, administered to or causes to be taken by any person any poison or any stupefying, intoxicating or unwholesome drug, or administered poisonous substance to the people through Kesharyukta Vimal Pan Masala, V-1 Tobacco, etc. with intent to cause hurt to any person, or with intent to commit or to facilitate the	No.

commission of an offence or knowing it to be likely that he will thereby cause hurt and thereby committed offence punishable under Section 328 of I.P.C. ?

- 2 Does prosecution prove that accused on aforesaid date and place, adulterated an article of food i.e. Kesharyukta Vimal Pan Masala, V-1 Tobacco, etc. so as to make it noxious as food with intention of selling such article of food, knowing it to be likely that the same will be sold as food and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 272 of I.P.C.?

No.

- 3 Does the prosecution prove that accused, on the aforesaid date and place, sold or offered or exposed for sale as food articles, namely Kesharyukta Vimal Pan Masala, V-1 Tobacco, etc., which had become noxious and were in a state unfit for human consumption, and that the accused knew or had reason to believe that the said articles were noxious as food and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 273 of I.P.C.?

No.

- 4 Does the prosecution has prove that accused, on the aforesaid date and place, knowing that an order had been lawfully promulgated by a public servant duly empowered by the State of Maharashtra, directing him to abstain from manufacturing,

No

producing, selling, or possessing Kesharyukta Vimal Pan Masala, V-1 Tobacco, etc., disobeyed the said order by possessing and selling scented Gutkha under his management and control, and that such disobedience caused or tended to cause danger to human life or bodily harm and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 188 of I.P.C.?

5 What order?

Accused is
Acquitted.

REASONS

Summary of Evidence: -

9. To prove the alleged offence prosecution examined seven witnesses. Police Driver Rohit Ramchandra Joyashi (PW1) (Exhibit P-25), Informant, Prakash Rajendra Pawar (PW3) (Exhibit P-33), and Police Krushna Sadashiv Bangar (PW4) (Exhibit P-45) deposed that on 09.12.2023, while they were present at the police station, informant (PW3) received secret information that a Maruti Suzuki Eeco bearing No. MH-46-AX-9857 was transporting prohibited gutkha. Accordingly, the police party, along with two panchas, proceeded to Excel Phata, Lote, intercepted the vehicle, and on search found Kesaryukt Vimal Pan Masala and tobacco. After drawing samples, the prohibited articles worth Rs.40,974/- were seized under a panchnama. Thereafter, informant, Pawar (PW3) lodged the report (Exhibit P-34/PW3), on the basis of which the printed FIR (Exhibit P-35/PW3) came to be

registered.

10. In his cross-examination, Rohit Joyashi (PW1) admitted that the police party left Khed at about 2:00 p.m. and reached Excel Phata, where they remained for about two hours. The vehicle was intercepted at about 2:50 p.m. amidst several other vehicles. He admitted that he did not participate in the panchnama and after drawing two sample packets, the remaining muddemal was taken to the police station. The contraband was kept in a plastic bag on the middle seat of the vehicle, covered with a bedsheet and was not visible.

11. In his cross-examination, Prakash Pawar (PW3) admitted that, although he had stated in the report that labels signed by the panchas were affixed and that the packets were taken out from gunny bags, these facts are not mentioned in the FIR, for which he could assign no reason. He further admitted that the gunny bags, bundles, bedsheet, and plastic bags allegedly seized were not produced before the Court. He also stated that PSI Hinge was his superior officer.

12. In his cross-examination, Krushna Bangar (PW4) admitted that he had stated during investigation that two packets were drawn as samples, sealed and labelled with the signatures of the panchas and police, and that the contraband was kept behind the rear seat. However, these facts do not find place in his police statement, for

which he could assign no reason. He further admitted that PSI Hinge was his superior officer.

13. Panch witness Anil Suresh Khopatkar (PW2) (Exhibit P-26) did not support the prosecution. He deposed that the police merely called him to the police station, obtained his signatures on the panchnama, and that he did not accompany the police to the spot. He denied that the police had intercepted any vehicle near Lote in his presence.

14. Panch witness Ismail Rahiman Kadiri (PW5) (Exhibit P-53) deposed that, on 09.12.2023, the police called him from Khed Police Station and took him, along with another panch Anil Khopatkar, to Excel Phata. There, the police intercepted an Eeco vehicle, recovered prohibited gutkha, and prepared the seizure panchnama (Exhibit P-54/PW5) in his presence.

15. In his cross-examination, he admitted that the police reached the spot at about 2:45 p.m. in a government vehicle. The accused stopped the vehicle on being signalled by the police. He further admitted that the place was a crowded area with nearby shops, the contraband was kept in bags on the middle seat of the vehicle not in the dicky, and that he could not state the number of bags seized.

16. Police Head Constable Asmita Amit Salvi (PW6)

(Exhibit-P-80) has deposed that on 09.12.2023 she was working as Station Officer at Khed Police Station. Prakash Pawar (PW3) has filed report (Exhibit P-34/PW3) and printed FIR (Exhibit P-35/PW3) and she has recorded it as per narration. The said report was about collection of prohibited food articles i.e. panmasala, tobacco, kesaryukt Vimal etc. The gutakha with vehicle worth Rs.4,40,974/- was seized by police. The crime register No.366/2023, under section 328, 272 and 273 of I.P.C. was registered against accused. The witness has admitted in her cross examination that she has produced the document showing that she was on duty on that day. She has not carried out investigation whether complaint is true or false. She has only recorded the report.

17. PSI Harshad Sunil Hinge (PW7) (Exhibit P-81), the Investigating Officer, deposed that on 09.12.2023 he was entrusted with the investigation (Exhibit P-82/PW7). He conducted the search and seizure at Excel Phata in the presence of two panchas, seized prohibited gutkha worth Rs.40,974/- and the Eeco vehicle worth Rs.4,00,000/-, prepared the seizure panchnama (Exhibit P-54/PW5), spot map (Exhibit P-83/PW7), and muddemal receipt (Exhibit P-84/PW7). He further deposed that he forwarded the seized samples for chemical analysis through the Food Safety Officer (Exhibit P-85/PW7 and Exhibit P-91/PW7), recorded the statements of police witnesses, seized the logbook of the police vehicle (Exhibit P-86/PW7), the accused's vehicle registration certificate (Exhibit

P-87/PW7), relevant Government notifications (Exhibit P-88/PW7 to Exhibit P-90/PW7) and station diary extracts. He arrested the accused under the arrest panchnama (Exhibit P-92/PW7) and, on completion of the investigation, filed the charge-sheet.

Point No.1: -

18. To prove an offence under Section 328 of the I.P.C., the prosecution is required to establish, that the muddemal in question was poisonous, stupefying, intoxicating, or otherwise unwholesome and the accused administered such substance to any person or caused it to be taken and that such administration was done with intent to cause hurt or to commit or facilitate the commission of an offence or with knowledge that hurt was likely to be caused.

19. The evidence of the prosecution witnesses, when read as a whole, does not establish the ingredients of Section 328 of I.P.C. beyond reasonable doubt. The evidence of Rohit Joyashi (PW1), Prakash Pawar (PW3), Krushna Bangar (PW4) and PSI Harshad Hinge (PW7) is substantially similar regarding the receipt of secret information, interception of the Eeco vehicle, and seizure of the alleged prohibited gutkha. However, their testimonies suffer from material omissions and inconsistencies. Prakash Pawar (PW3) and Krushna Bangar (PW4) admitted that important facts, such as affixing labels bearing the signatures of panchas, sealing

of the samples, and removal of packets from gunny bags, were not mentioned in their earlier statements or the FIR, and they could assign no explanation for such omissions. These omissions affect the credibility of the alleged seizure and the integrity of the samples.

20. The evidence regarding the seizure is further weakened by the independent panch witnesses. Anil Khopatkar (PW2) turned hostile and categorically deposed that the police merely obtained his signatures at the police station and that he never accompanied the police to the spot. Though Ismail Kadiri (PW5) supported the prosecution, his solitary testimony is insufficient to inspire confidence in view of the hostility of the other panch witness and the material omissions admitted by the police witnesses. Thus, the independent corroboration to the alleged seizure is not free from doubt.

21. Asmita Salvi (PW6) is formal police witness whose deposition is not helpful to prove the guilt of the accused. Prakash Pawra (PW3) admitted that the gunny bags, bundles, bedsheet, and plastic bags allegedly seized were not produced. Asmita Salvi (PW6), the formal witness, also admitted that the muddemal was not before the Court and Harshad Hinge (PW7), the Investigating Officer, made the same admission.

22. The absence of the chemical analysis report is fatal to the prosecution. Without such report, it is not

proved that the seized articles were poisonous, stupefying, intoxicating, or unwholesome, which is the very foundation of an offence under Section 328 of I.P.C.

23. In addition to above deficiencies, none of the prosecution witnesses have deposed that the accused was found administering, selling or causing any person to consume the alleged substance. No customer or victim has been examined. Mere alleged possession of articles, even if assumed, does not amount to “administering” or “causing to be taken” as required under Section 328 of I.P.C.

24. Intention or knowledge under Section 328 of I.P.C. cannot be presumed merely from alleged possession of goods. The evidence on record, at the most, discloses only alleged possession of certain articles. There is no evidence whatsoever that the accused administered any substance to any person or caused any person to consume the same, nor has any consumer, victim or intended recipient been examined. No reliable proof of sale, administration or commercial transaction has been brought on record and in the absence of proof regarding the exact nature of the substance or its administration, the question of intention to cause hurt or knowledge does not arise.

25. At the costs of repetition, it is important to note that for attracting the offence punishable under Section

328 of the I.P.C., it is mandatory that there must be administration of a poisonous substance or drug to a victim. In the present case, there is no legally identifiable victim who has suffered any effect due to alleged administration of any poisonous substance. In the absence of proof of administration of any poisonous substance or drug to any person, the essential ingredients of Section 328 of the I.P.C. are not satisfied.

26. Though gutakha panmasala, Tobacco and its products are allegedly injurious to human health, mere possession of alleged seized articles does not fall within the scope of Section 328 of the I.P.C. The offence under Section 328 is attracted only when a poisonous or unwholesome substance is administered or caused to be taken by a person with the requisite intent or knowledge. Mere possession of such articles, without any act bridging the gap between possession and consumption, does not constitute the danger or hurt contemplated under the said provision. The crucial link between possession and consumption is completely missing in present case.

27. In view of above serious infirmities, in the prosecution case is the absence chemical analysis report. Even assuming that the accused was found transporting gutkha or tobacco products, the prosecution has not proved the essential ingredients of Section 328 of I.P.C. To attract Section 328 of I.P.C., it must be established that the accused administered, caused to be taken, or

attempted to administer any poison, intoxicating, stupefying, or other harmful substance to any person with the requisite intention of causing hurt or facilitating the commission of an offence. In the present case, there is no evidence whatsoever that the accused administered or attempted to administer the seized articles to any person. No consumer or victim has been examined, and there is no evidence that the articles were intended to be administered to any individual. Mere possession or transportation of alleged prohibited gutkha, by itself, does not satisfy the ingredients of Section 328 of I.P.C. Consequently, I hold that the prosecution has failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt the offence punishable under Section 328 of the I.P.C.. Accordingly, Point No. 1 is answered in the Negative.

Point No.2: -

28. To establish an offence under Section 272 of the I.P.C., the prosecution is required to prove, that the seized article was food or drink, that such food or drink was adulterated, that such adulteration rendered the article noxious, that the adulteration was committed with the intention that it be sold, or knowing it to be likely that it would be sold and that the accused had knowledge or reason to believe the same.

29. In the present case, the seized articles have neither been properly identified nor proved as “gutkha panmasala or tobacco”. Though the prosecution claims

that the articles were adulterated, no reliable scientific or chemical analysis report is proved on record. All witnesses have uniformly relied on packaging and verbal description. No documentary proof exists to show adulteration. In absence of expert evidence, the Court cannot presume adulteration or noxious nature merely on the basis of suspicion or common perception.

30. Further, absence of report of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or any other competent authority has been established on record. There is no legally admissible or reliable evidence to establish that the alleged seized articles were adulterated or injurious to health. Even if, for the sake of argument, it is presumed that the article was adulterated, there is no evidence on record to show that such adulteration was done by the accused. Mere oral assertions of police witnesses cannot substitute mandatory expert reliable evidence in cases involving alleged adulteration of food articles.

31. The prosecution has failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt conscious possession or ownership of the seized articles by the accused and also chain of custody. Not conducted any inquiry or investigation regarding the owner of the seized muddemal or the ownership of the vehicle involved in the offence. Even the prosecution has failed to establish adulteration attributable to the accused. There is no oral or documentary evidence to show that the accused had

tampered with, altered or adulterated the branded and packaged products such as Vimal pan masala and V1-tobacco which are manufactured, storage or sale. There is neither allegation nor proof that the accused was involved in their manufacture, repackaging, or adulteration.

32. In view of the above circumstances the prosecution has failed to prove the ingredients of Section 272 of I.P.C., adulteration of food, intention or knowledge of sale of adulterated food, and accused's involvement in such adulteration. Mere possession of food articles, without proof of adulteration or intent to sell adulterated food, does not attract this provision under Section 272 of the I.P.C. Consequently, the prosecution has failed to prove the offence punishable under Section 272 of the I.P.C. beyond reasonable doubt. Thus, Point No. 2 is answered in the Negative.

Point No. 3: -

33. To prove the offence under Section 273 of the I.P.C., the prosecution is required to establish, that the seized article was food or drink, that such article was noxious or unfit for human consumption, that the accused sold or offered the same for sale and that the accused had knowledge or reason to believe that the article was noxious.

34. There is no evidence whatsoever to show that the accused sold or offered for sale the alleged gutkha or

tobacco products. All prosecution witnesses who are police personnel not deposed that bogus or dummy customer was sent to verify any alleged sale and that no actual transaction was witnessed. Further, as discussed while appreciating the evidence under Points Nos. 1 and 2 the prosecution has not duly proved scientific or expert evidence to establish that the seized articles were noxious, harmful or unfit for human consumption. In the absence of such reliable expert evidence, the very foundation of an offence under Section 273 of I.P.C. remains unestablished.

35. Section 273 of I.P.C. further requires proof that the accused had knowledge that the article was noxious and had intention to sell or offer it for sale. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that chemical analysis would have indicated harmful contents, the prosecution has failed to prove that the accused had conscious production, possession or ownership of the alleged muddemal. No documentary evidence such as business licenses has been produced to connect the accused with muddemal. Mere alleged statements attributed to him, is insufficient in law to establish conscious possession or intention to sell.

36. The prosecution has failed to prove that the seized articles were noxious or unfit for consumption through duly proved scientific evidence. Possession alone, without proof of quality and harmful nature, does not

satisfy Section 273 of I.P.C. Further, no customer, sale transaction or destination of sale is established. In view of the above situation, the prosecution has failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the accused sold or offered for sale any noxious food article with requisite knowledge, as contemplated under Section 273 of I.P.C. Accordingly, Point No. 3 is answered in the Negative.

Point No.4 :-

37. To seek a conviction under Section 188 of I.P.C., the prosecution is required to prove beyond reasonable doubt, (i) that existence of order duly promulgated by a public servant who is lawfully empowered to issue such an order. (ii) accused must have knowledge of the order (iii) accused intentionally disobeys the lawful order (iv) disobedience causes or tends to cause obstruction, annoyance or injury, or risk of it, or causes or tends to cause danger to human life, health or safety as contemplated under the provision.

38. The prosecution has relied upon order (Exhibit P-90/PW7) and Government of Maharashtra Resolutions at (Exhibit P-89/PW7), issued under the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 and the Rules of 2011. A conjoint reading of both these Government Resolutions indicates that the Food Safety Officers are vested with powers to initiate action concerning food safety within their respective jurisdictions. The said Resolutions further provide that the police machinery is required only to

render assistance to the Food Safety Authorities for effective enforcement of the Act.

39. In the present case, admittedly, no action has been initiated by the Food Safety Officer. The entire action has been initiated solely by the police. Therefore, the facts and circumstances of the present case do not fall within the ambit of order and Government Resolutions at (Exhibit P-90/PW7) and (Exhibit P-89/PW7) and the prosecution cannot take any support therefrom.

40. It is also pertinent to note that Section 195 of the Cr.P.C. mandates that an offence under Section 188 of I.P.C. can only be prosecuted on a complaint, which is absent in the present case. In the absence of such a complaint, no ingredient of Section 188 is established.

41. In addition to that, Section 188 of the I.P.C. deals with disobedience of an order promulgated by a public servant, which, if it causes or tends to cause obstruction, annoyance, injury, or risk thereof, or tends to endanger human life, health, or safety, is punishable. In the present case, the prosecution has alleged that the accused stored a prohibited food article. The section specifically employs the words 'causes or tends to cause' and does not use the expression 'likely to cause.' This implies that the prosecution is required to lead positive evidence establishing that such disobedience actually caused, or had a tendency to cause, danger to human

life. Accordingly, Point No. 4 is answered in the Negative.
Point No.5 is answered as follows-

ORDER

- 1.** Accused Farhan Farukh Mohammad Patel is hereby acquitted of the offences punishable under Sections 328, Section 272, Section 273 and Section 188 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, in view of Section 235(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
- 2.** The bail bonds furnished by the accused stand cancelled.
- 3.** The accused shall furnish personal bond and surety bond of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) under Section 437-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, which shall remain in force for a period of six months from the date of this judgment and order.
- 4.** The Safety Officer shall dispose of the muddemal, i.e., the alleged gutkha and allied articles, after the expiry of the appeal period, if not already disposed off in accordance with law.
- 5.** Interim custody of seized vehicle, if any, be absolute after appeal period.

(Pronounced in open Court.)

Khed.
Date :18.07.2026

sd/-
(V. G. Patil)
Additional Sessions
Judge, Khed,
Tal. Khed, Dist. Ratnagiri.

Part 'C' [Para 44(iii) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual] LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT WITNESSES		
A. Prosecution :		
RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
PW1	Rohit Ramchandra Joyashi	Police Witness
PW2	Anil Suresh Khopatkar	Panch Witness
PW3	Prakash Rajendra Pawar	Informant
PW4	Krushna Sadashiv Bangar	Police Witness
PW5	Ismail A. Rahiman Kadiri	Panch Witness
PW6	Asmita Amit Salvi	Police witness
PW7	Harshad Sunil Hinge	Investigating Officer

B. Defence Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT
-------------	-------------	--

		WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
1.	NIL	NIL

C. Court Witnesses, if any :

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
1.	NIL	NIL

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

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	Exh.P-34 /PW3	Report
2.	Exh.P-35/PW3	Printed F.I.R.
3.	Exh.P-54/PW5	Seizure Panchnama
4.	Exh.P-82/PW7	Investigation Order dated 09.12.2023
5.	Exh.P-83/PW7	Map of spot
6.	Exh.P-84/PW7	Muddemal Receipt
7.	Exh.P-85/PW7	Letter dated 15.12.2023 issued to Food and Safety

		Officer, Ratnagiri
8.	Exh.P-86/PW7	Log Book Extract
9.	Exh.P-87/PW7	Copy of R.C. Book of vehicle seized from the possession of accused
10.	Exh.P-88/PW7	Maharashtra Government Gazette dated 18.07.2023.
11.	Exh.P-89/PW7	Maharashtra Government Resolution dated 17.09.2021
12.	Exh.P-90/PW7	Photocopy of order of procedure under section 328 of I.P.C.
13.	Exh.P-91/PW7	Letter Issued to Food Analyst.
14.	Exh.P-92/PW7	Arrest Panchnama of accused.

B. Defence :

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	NIL	NIL

C. Court Exhibits :

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	NIL	NIL

D. Material Objects :

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	NIL	NIL

sd/-

Khed.

(V. G. Patil)

Date :18.07.2026 Additional Sessions Judge, Khed

C E R T I F I C A T E

I affirm that, contents of this P.D.F.file Judgment/order are same, word to word, as per the original Judgment /order.

Case No.	Sessions Case No.13/2024
Name of the Stenographer	Mrs.V.S.Kulkarni
Name of the Court	Addl. Sessions Court, Khed, Dist. Ratnagiri.
Date of Pronouncement	18.07.2026
Judgment/order Signed On	18.07.2026
Judgment/order Uploaded On	18.07.2026