

MHWR010014732023 	Presented on : 11-09-2023 Registered on : 11-09-2023 Decided on : 18-07-2026 Duration : 02Y, 10M, 07D.
---	---

Sessions Case No.65/2023Exh.61**Form - 'A'****IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, (COURT NO.2)
WARDHA.**

(Presided over by S.A.S.M. Ali, A.S.J.)

(FIR No.0651/2023, U/s 302 of Indian Penal Code, of Police Station, Arvi).

<u>COMPLAINANT</u>	: The State of Maharashtra, Through Police Station, Arvi, Tah. Arvi, Dist. Wardha.
REPRESENTED BY	: Shri. A. D. Thakre, Learned Additional Public Prosecutor.
<u>ACCUSED</u>	: Hemraj Mahadevrao Tumsare Aged about 42 years, Occ.: Labour, R/o Benoda (Matoda), Tah. Arvi., Dist. Wardha,
REPRESENTED BY	: Learned Advocate for Accused Shri. D. M. Varma.

Form- 'B'

Date of offence	: 22.05.2023
Date of F.I.R.	: 22.05.2023
Date of Charge-sheet	: 11.09.2023

Date of Framing of Charges :	01.07.2024
Date of commencement of evidence	14.02.2025
The date on which judgment is reserved	---
Date of the judgment	18.07.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	18.07.2026

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 purpose of section 428 Cr.P.C.
1]	Hemraj Mahadevrao Tumsare,	22.05.2023	Under Trial	U/s 302, Indian Penal Code	Convicted.	under Sec.302 IPC R.I. for Life and fine of 5,000/- I/d	22/05/2023 to 18/07/2026

						payment of fine R.I. for six months	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Form- 'C'**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)	EXHIBITS
PW1	Pratibha Sukhdevrao Tumsare	Informant	08
PW2	Mirabai Rangarao Tumsare	Other Witness	20
PW3	Yash Deorao Tumsare	Other Witness	21
PW4	Lekhpal Krishnarao Jasutkar	Panch witness	23
PW5	Dr. Ujwal Ramkrushna Deokate	Medical Officer	33
PW6	Bhanudas Vasudeorao Pidurkar	Investigating Officer	40
PW7	Akash Prakashrao Chaurpagar	Other Witness	57

B. Defence Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
Nil	Nil	Nil

C. Court Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
Nil	Nil	Nil

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

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1]	Exhibit 09	Oral Report.
2]	Exhibit 10	First Information Report.
3]	Exhibit 11	Electricity Bill.
4]	Exhibit 12	Statement of Informant Recorded under section 164 of Cr.P.C.

7]	Exhibit 24	Intimation Letter to panchas.
8]	Exhibit 25	Crime Details Form.
9]	Exhibit 26	Property Search & Seizure Form.
10]	Exhibit 27	Property Search & Seizure Form.
11]	Exhibit 28	Property Search & Seizure Form.
12]	Exhibit 29	Inquest Panchnama
13]	Exhibit 30	Property Search & Seizure Form.
14]	Exhibit 31	Property Search & Seizure Form.
15]	Exhibit 34	Letter of Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi to Medical Officer General Hospital Arvi.
16]	Exhibit 35	Letter of Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi to Medical Officer General Hospital Arvi.
17]	Exhibit 36	Post Mortem Report.
18]	Exhibit 37	Letter of Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi to Medical Officer General Hospital Arvi.
19]	Exhibit 38	Query Report.
20]	Exhibit 41	Letter of Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi to Chief Officer Municipal Council, Arvi.
21]	Exhibit 42	Letter of Chief Officer Municipal Council, Arvi to Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi.

22]	Exhibit 43	Intimation Letter to panchas.
23]	Exhibit 44	Arrest/Court Surrender Form.
24]	Exhibit 45	Letter of Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi to Regional Forensic Science Laboratory, Nagpur.
25]	Exhibit 46	Duty Pass.
26]	Exhibit 47	The Invoice Receipt of Regional Forensic Science Laboratory, Nagpur.
27]	Exhibit 48	The Invoice Receipt of Regional Forensic Science Laboratory, Nagpur.
28]	Exhibit 49 to 52	Examination Report.
29]	Exhibit 53	Letter of Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi to JMFC Arvi.
30]	Exhibit 54	Letter of Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi to the Engineer of MSEB Arvi.
31]	Exhibit 55	Letter of the Engineer of MSEB Arvi to Investigating Officer Police Station Arvi.

B. Defence :

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
Nil	Nil	Nil

C. Court :

Sr.	Exhibit Number	Description
-----	----------------	-------------

No.		
Nil	Nil	Nil

D. Material Objects:

Sr. No.	Material Object Number	Description
1]	Article A	The Wooden Stick.
2]	Articles A/1	Spot Photos Collectively
2]	Articles A/3	The Shirt.
3]	Article A/4	The Pant.
4]	Article A/5	The Blouse.
5]	Article A/6	The Saree.
6]	Article A/7	The Bangle.
7]	Article A/8	Pieces of Bangles.

JUDGMENT(Delivered on this 18th day of July, 2026)

The accused is chargesheeted for the offences punishable under Sections 302 of the Indian Penal Code for killing his own mother Kausalyabai Tumsare.

Facts in brief are as under:

2] The accused is residing at Benod (Matoda), Tah. Arvi, Dist. Wardha along with his family including wife and three daughters. The widow of his bother is also residing adjacent to his house. The mother of

the accused who was residing with the accused and was handicapped and unable to walk. On 21/05/2023 the wife of he accused had gone to village Thar at her parental house along with her daughters and accused as her mother only when present in the home. On that day, the informant i.e. wife of the brother of accused suddenly woke-up at around 01.00 a.m. the power was off. When the light came, the informant heard the sound of beating and when she opened the door she found that the accused was beating his mother Kaushalya Tumsare by means of wooden log. He was constantly inflicting the blows and uttering ‘‘मर म्हणे आता’’. The informant got frightened and then she informed the incident to her cousin sister-in-law Mirabai Tumsare on phone.

3] The information was given to the police. The police arrived and found the dead body of Kaushalya on the spot. There were various injuries on her entire body and even her tooth was broken. The accused was also found on the spot. The informant lodged the report and on the basis of that offence under section 302 of IPC came to be registered against the accused.

4] After registration of the offence, the investigation was taken up by PI Bhanudas Pidurkar. He immediately rushed to the spot along with the panchas. The spot was shown by the informant. The investigating officer found some pieces of bangles, blood stains, a human tooth, pieces of bone, wooden log on the spot which he seized under the seizure panchanama. Photographs were also taken. After the inquest panchanama the dead body was sent for postmortem to Arvi. The

medical officer found as many as 22 injuries on her body. The clothes and the bangles of the deceased were also seized. The samples of nail, tooth and blood were sent for scientific examination. The wooden log found on the spot was also sent to the medical officer for his opinion, and he opined that the injuries be found on the dead body can be caused by the same wooden log.

5] On 22/05/2023, the accused was arrested. His blood samples were also collected. His clothes were also seized and entire muddemal were sent to Forensic Scientific Laboratory, Nagpur. The investigation officer then recorded the statement of witnesses and also got recorded the statements of the witnesses from Id. Judicial Magistrate First Class. After the entire investigation, the chargesheet is down before J.M.F.C. Arvi. The offence under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code being exclusively triable by the Court of Session, the learned Magistrate committed the case to the Court of Sessions for the purpose of trial.

6] I have framed the charge against the accused vide Exhibit 3. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The defence of the accused is that of total denial and false implication.

7] The prosecution led its evidence and examined the witnesses as referred to above. After the closure of prosecution evidence, the accused was examined under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. He denied the entire prosecution case and did not lead any defence evidence.

8] I have heard the learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned Advocate for the accused. Having regard to the submissions made at the

Bar, the following points arise for my determination as I have recorded my findings as under for the reasons to follow:

Sr. No.	Points	Findings
1]	Does the prosecution prove that deceased Kausalyabai died a homicidal death?	Affirmative
2]	Does the prosecution prove that on 22.05.2023 at about 01.00 to 1.30 a.m. at Benod (Matoda), Tah. Arvi Dist. Wardha accused committed the murder by means of wooden stick intentionally or knowingly causing the death of Kausalyabai Tumsare?	Affirmative
3]	What offence, if any, is proved against the accused ?	Section 302 of IPC.
4]	What Order ?	The accused is convicted as per the final order.

REASONS

As to Point No.1:

9] As regards the homicidal death of the deceased namely Kausalyabai Tumsare the material evidence adduced by the prosecution is the testimony of PW-5 Dr. Ujwal Ramkrushna Deokate, the medical officer who has performed the postmortem of the dead body of the deceased Kausalyabai on 22/05/2027 at about 3.35 p.m.. According to him, he started the postmortem at 3.35 p.m. and completed it at 4.35 p.m. and found the internal injuries on the said body which is given in

the column no. 17 of the postmortem report, which are reproduced as under :

1 lacerated wound of 8 x 2 c.m. on central frontal region, two lacerated wounds over left frontal region of 8 x 1 c.m., 1 lacerated wound over forehead above right eye-ball and one above left eye-ball of size 7 x 3 c.m., 1 lacerated wound over mandible maxillary multiple fracture on left jaw and emission of left molar in lower jaw, fracture on left mandible maxillary multiple uera and maximum flesh is missing from jaw, lacerated wound over left lateral forehead of size 1 x 0.5 x 0.5 c.m. abrasion below right eye-ball and right cheek of size 2 x 1 c.m., 1.5 x 1.00 c.m, x 1.5 c.m.

10] The medical officer also found fracture of lateral frontal bone showing brain matter, two fractures on spine of lateral frontal bone showing brain matter. So also he find diffusion of subdural hematoma over left lateral frontal region of size 7 x 3 c.m. and diffusion sub arachnoid hemorrhage over central frontal and left lateral frontal region of size 6 x 3 c.m and 6 x 2 c.m. respectively.

11] He during his evidence proved postmortem report at Exh.36. In his opinion the death is caused on account of head injury, and according to him, the injury mentioned in column No. 17 and 19 were antemortem.

12] During the cross-examination of evidence, he also stated that he had received the weapon in sealed condition which is wooden rod, hard and blunt, 2 ft. 6 inches in length, and its circumference was 10 cm at one end and 14 cm at the other. He opined that the injuries

mentioned in Column Nos.17 and 19 were possible by this weapon. The query report is at Exh.38.

13] During cross-examination, he denied the suggestion that the postmortem report and query report were prepared at the instance of police. Although it is the case of accused that deceased died due to fall of the material of hut on her head, no such suggestion was given by the Id. Counsel for the accused to the doctor. Even otherwise injuries which are found on the person of the deceased is not possible by the fall of hut. The injuries were so severe that the brain material of the deceased came out. It is also apparent from the inquest panchanama that the broken tooth of the deceased was found on the spot and deceased was found in a pool of blood. As such, I have no hesitation to hold that deceased Kausalayabai died a homicidal death. Accordingly, Point No.1 is answered in the affirmative.

As to point No.2 :

14] As regards the occurrence, the prosecution is heavily relied on the evidence of PW1 Pratibha Sukhdevrao Tumsare, who is the eyewitness. According to her, on 22/5/2023 at about 1.00 p.m. the light was gone and therefore, she woke-up and she heard the noise of beating. Therefore, she saw from the फट of the door (open space left in between to planks of the door) that accused Hemraj Tumsare constantly giving blows of stick on the head of her mother-in-law, i.e. the mother of the accused. She further stated that due to fear she did not open the door and when the accused left the place, she open the door and come near the body of deceased Kausalayabai and found that there various marks of

injury on her head, so also the tooth was broken. She also stated that there was no movement in the body of her mother-in-law. Then she made a call to the wife of accused and informed about the incident and then lodged report.

15] The ld. counsel of the accused thoroughly cross-examined the witness. During the cross-examination ld. Counsel for accused has brought one contradiction and pointed out that before the ld. J.M.F.C. the witness has stated “दार उघडून पाहिले” and before the Court she had stated “दाराचे फाटीतून पाहिले”. There is another contradiction pointed out that in examination-in-chief, she has stated that she reached the spot after accused left the spot, while in the cross-examination she stated until arrival of police, she did not open the door. The rest of the cross-examination is in the forms of the suggestion which the witness has denied.

16] PW1 is only eyewitness and therefore, it is necessary to analyze her evidence with care and caution. It is admitted fact that deceased is mother-in-law of the informant and mother of the accused. The spot panchanama and sketch map clearly goes show that the spot of incident is situated in front of the informant house of the informant and the house accused, as well as the informant. Therefore the scene of occurrence is easily visible from the house of the informant, and she is the natural witness.

17] The first objection which is raised is about the identification of the accused. According to him, at the time of incident the lights were off and there was no sufficient light at the site of occurrence and therefore,

it is not possible for the informant to see that the accused assaulting deceased Kausalyabai. In this regards he pointed out from the examination of chief of PW1 that she had deposed at about 1.00 a.m. of 22/5/2023 she woke-up as the lights were off. Furthermore, he pointed out from the cross-examination of PW2 Mirabai Tumsare also that at the time of the incident due to heavy storm, the lights were off. However the investigation officer had called the report from the report prom Deputy Executive Engineer M.S.E.D.C.L. Wardha to know as to whether there was electricity supply on 22/5/2023 in between 1.00 a.m. to 1.30 a.m. and report filed by the concerned Engineer is at Exh.55, wherein it is mentioned that on 22/5/2023, due to some technical work, the electric supply was discontinued from 1.15 to 1.20 a.m. This report itself shows that there was electric supply at the site of occurrence 1.00 a.m.

18] It is also relevant to note that deceased and the accused are close relative of PW1 and even though there was no sufficient electric supply, it was very much easy for PW1 to identify deceased and the accused by their voice. There was no reason for PW1 to deposed false against her brother-in-law.

19] The Id. Counsel for the accused in this regards has relied upon the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Bollavarma Pedda Narsi Reddy & Ors. Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh 1991 AIR 1468**, wherein it is observed that,

in the instant case at the scene of the crime when no natural light was available and the street light was at a distance it is unlikely that the eye witnesses by momentary glance of the assailants who surrounded

the victim had a lasting impression and the chance of identifying the assailants without mistake. Therefore the testimony of PWs 1 and 2 is unsafe to be acted upon.

20] I have gone through the citation carefully and found it inapplicable for the reason that in the above case the deceased and the assailant were totally stranger and at the place of incident also there was sound of explosion of crackers. In the present case, the deceased, accused and the witness are close relatives and even by sound they can be identified. Moreover, the presence of the accused on the spot is also established by neighbour who reached on the spot immediately after the incident namely PW3 Yash Tumsare. No doubt, these witnesses close relatives, but they have no reason to depose false against the accused. The incident took place just in front of the house of the accused and the informant. Their presence on the spot was natural and considering the fact that the incident occurred in the night, there is no possibility of presence of independent witnesses.

21] The prosecution further relied on the evidence of PW2 Mirabai Rangarao Tumsare, that on 22.05.2023 when she was sleeping at about 2.00 a.m., she heard that someone knocking at the door, but she did not open it, but open it after police arrival of police and when she opened the door, she found the mother of the accused was lying outside on the ground. Although, she stated in her examination-in-chief Hemraj had assaulted her and broken her hands and legs, during cross-examination she stated that on the day of of the incident heavy storm and the

electricity had gone and the huts was collapsed and police took out Kauslyabai from the hut and placed her in the courtyard.

22] The Id. Counsel of the accused on the basis of admission given in the cross-examination by PW2, urged that deceased Kauslyabai did not died as the result of assault made by the accused, but due to fall of the roof of the hut on her person. However, there is no evidence on record in that regard. Moreover, the testimony of the medical officer clearly clearly suggest that the injuries which he found on the dead body of deceased clearly shows of homicidal death. Therefore only on the basis of admission given of the PW2 that the the dead body of Kauslyabai was drawn from the hut is not sufficient to infer that she died an accidental death, particularly when the evidence of PW1 is constant, cogent an reliable in this regard.

23] Ld. Counsel for the accused further objected the testimony of PW1 in respect of post conduct of the incident. It is urged that despite the fact that she saw accused mercilessly beat her mother-in-law by means of wooden stick, neither she raised any cries nor tried to save her. Thus according to the Id. Counsel the conduct of the witness in not taking any step towards saving life of her mother-in-law create sufficient doubt about her testimony. In this regard the Id. Counsel has led upon the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Criminal Appeal No. 102 of 2013 Nimai Gosh & Ors. Vs. State of Bihhar**, wherein it held that,

on his own showing PW 3 was an employee of the deceased. He was present according to his testimony, when the deceased was assaulted by the appellants. He admits that after committing the crime

the appellants and their associates fled away. The witness, however, not only did not raise any alarm when his master was being assaulted, he did not go near his employer even after the assailants had fled away to see the condition in which the employer was after having suffered the assault.

24] I have given anxious consideration to the submissions of the Id. Counsel for the accused. It is necessary and relevant to note here that the accused is well known for his aggressive behaviour and in fact he was also a mental patient. It is natural conduct of PW1, when she saw that the accused mercilessly assaulting his mother by means of a stick, she might under fear of her own life did not bother to open the door or raised any cries. Further she has specifically stated that when the accused left the spot she immediately come out and attended the deceased. In this regard, the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Shivasharanappa and Others Vs. (2010) 6 SCC 407 CRIMINAL APPEAL. NO. 102 OF 2013 State of Karnataka** are very relevant wherein it is held that,

the behaviour of the witnesses or their reactions would differ from situation to situation and individual to individual. Expectation of uniformity in the reaction of witnesses would be unrealistic but the court cannot be oblivious of the fact that even taking into account the unpredictability of human conduct and lack of uniformity in human reaction, whether in the circumstances of the case, the behaviour is acceptably natural allowing the variations. If the behaviour is absolutely

unnatural, the testimony of the witness may not deserve credence and acceptance.

25] In present case the behaviour of PW1 cannot be said to be absolutely unnatural and on that count her testimony cannot be discarded. It is not the case that PW1 kept silent and did not inform the other family member for couple of days. On the contrary, the conduct of PW1 immediately coming out of the house after the accused left the scene of occurrence, or on arrival of police is absolutely natural. Hence, submission of the Id. Counsel for the accused in this regard does not hold any force. In the ruling relied by Id. Counsel of the accused, *supra*. The witness has not disclosed the incident to any one for almost 2 days and there was no sufficient explanation as to why she has not told about it any family member or informed the police. Hence, citation relied upon in the facts and circumference of the case is not applicable.

26] The another witness which was examined by the prosecution is panch witness PW4 Lekhpal Krishnarao Jasutkar, in whose presence the spot panchanama was prepared by the investigation officer. The witness during the examination-in-chief, has stated in detailed about the panchanama and the seizure of weapon on the spot. He also identified the weapon, as well as the clothes of the deceased, during his evidence. Finally, prosecution has examined the investigation officer PW6 Bhanudas Vasudeorao Pidurkar, who has carried out the cordal formalities of the investigation. During the cross-examination, the witness has admitted that one Suraj Wankhede had informed him about incident on 22/5/2023, but he has not recorded the statement of said

Suraj Wankhede. The Id. Counsel for the accused has argued that the state of the person who had informed about the incident should have been recorded, but failure of prosecution to examine him clearly creates doubt about guilt of the accused. But, I do not found any force in the submission of Id. Counsel for the accused. Suraj Wankhede is not the eyewitness, but he merely informed the police about the occurrence. There was no reason for the prosecution to examine him. If, according to the accused there was any another story about the happening of the incident, the accused could have easily examine him on his behalf. But, it was not done and therefore, no inference can be drawn from non-examination of Suraj Wankhede.

27] All in all testimony of PW1, the medical evidence clearly goes to show that it is the accused only who cause death of his mother, by inflicting blows of stick on vital parts of her body. Hence, I am no hesitation to hold that, prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt, against the accused under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code. I, therefore, proceed to hear the accused on the question of sentence.

(S.A.S.M. Ali)
Additional Sessions Judge,

28] Heard the learned Advocate for the accused and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State on the point of sentence. The learned Counsel for the accused submitted that if the Court come to the conclusion that the accused is guilty, then this Court may convict him

for lessor punishment. He stated that accused is mental patient and suffering from schizophrenia and he committed the crime in the heat of anger. Therefore, the accused at best would be held guilty of culpable homicide, and this case is covered by exception of section 4 and section 300 of IPC. On the other hand, ld. APP submitted that the accused killed his own mother in most cruel manner and therefore, he may be convicted under section 300 of IPC, as no evidence is adduced by the accused so as to bring the act of the accused under the exception provided under section 300 of IPC. He further submitted that considering the facts that the accused killed his own mother in very brutal and cruel manner, the capital punishment may be imposed on the accused as it is the rarest of the rare case.

29] I have given anxious consideration to the submissions advanced at the bar. In order to bring the case under exception of section 4 of section 300 of IPC there has to be some evidence that the accused was proved by some one and in the heat of anger he lost control and committed the crime. There was no such evidence brought by the accused on record. On the contrary, the accused in the present case assaulted his old aged and handicapped mother by wooden log on the vital part of the the body causing multiple fractures. In fact no space left on the body where there was no injury. The postmortem report and evidence of the medical officer clearly show that there are as many as 22 injuries. Furthermore, the Court cannot lost sight on the fact, Also that deceased Kaulsyabai was handicapped lady and not able to walk

properly and therefore she could not save herself from the continuous and barbaric attack of the accused causing her instantaneous death.

30] The accused committed murder of that lady who by suffering severe pain gave birth to him and in return, the accused by giving her severe pain and caused her death. It is not the case that the accused was satisfied by a single blow, but he inflicted multiple blows on vital part due to which the deceased died on the spot. Therefore, I am of the firm opinion that the present case does not fall under section 304 part-II of IPC.

31] The Court is also conscious of the fact that the mental condition of the accused also led to the assault, However, such mental condition of the accused may not be relevant to judge culpability, it is certainly a factor while considering the question of sentence. Hence, in my opinion the present case does not fall under the rarest of the rare case. Hence, the accused is entitled to be convicted for the alternative punishment provided for the offence punishable under section 302 of IPC i.e. life imprisonment. I answered Points No.2 and 3 accordingly and proceed to pass the following order for Point No.4.

Order

1] The accused Hemraj Mahadeorao Tumsare is hereby convicted under Section 235(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the offence punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to suffer rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹ 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only). In default of payment of the fine, he shall undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months.

2] The seized muddemal property be preserved for one year and if no intimation of appeal is received, it be disposed off according to law.

3] The accused has been in custody since 22/05/2023 till date. The benefit of set-off for this period shall be given to him under Section 428 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

4] The accused is made aware of his right to prefer an appeal before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court against this judgment and the sentence awarded to him.

5] A copy of the judgment be given to the accused free of costs.
(Judgment dictated and pronounced in open Court.)

Date: 18.07.2026

(S.A.S. M. Ali)
Additional Sessions Judge,
(Court No.2), Wardha.

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

(Anil N. Nakhate)
Stenographer Grade-I