

ORDER SHEET FOR MAGISTRATE'S RECORDS

District: Tinsukia

In The Court Of: Smti. Queensmita Saikia, JMFC,

PRC-291/2025

Sl No	Date	Order	Signature
	30.07.26	Accused person A1-Rajesh Mahahto@ Amit, A-2 Rohit Sah@ Ankur, A-3 Sujit Sah are present before the Court today. The standard of proof in criminal case is to prove the guilt of the accused person beyond all reasonable doubt. But in the instant case the prosecution failed to prove its case, beyond reasonable doubt due to lack of evidence. Judgment is ready and the same is appended with the case record. The operative part of the Judgment is pronounced in the open Court. The accused persons A1-Rajesh Mahahto@ Amit, A-2 Rohit Sah@ Ankur are acquitted of the offence charged U/S 303(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS and	

Contd....


30/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

Sujit Sah
Rohit Sah
Amit
Mahahto

Contd...
(30/07/26)


A-3 Sujit Sah is acquitted of the offense charged **U/S 317(2) of BNS** in the instant case on benefit of doubt and set at liberty forthwith.

The bail bonds shall remain in force for six month from today in compliance with section 481 of BNSS.

Seized item be disposed of as per law

The case is accordingly disposed off on contest.

BA is directed to do the needful.


30/7/26

Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

**IN THE COURT OF QUEENSMITA SAIKIA, JMFC,
TINSUKIA**

Present: *Smti. Queensmita Saikia A. J. S.,
Judicial Magistrate First Class
Tinsukia, Assam*



Date of Judgment: **30/07/2026**

(PRC Case No—291/2025)

Tinsukia P. S. Case No. 157/2025

Under Sections 305(a)/331(4)/317(2)/3(5) of Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

COMPLAINANT:	STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY	Assistant. P. P. Priyanka Maut
ACCUSED PERSON:	A1- Rajesh Mahato @ Amit Mahato S/O Late Kamal Mahato A-2 Rohit Sah @ Ankur S/O- Ramesh Sah A-3 Sujit Sah S/O Umesh Sah
REPRESENTED BY	Ld. Counsels Kishore Kr. Sharma, Surajit Bhattacharjee & S. Sarma


Su
30/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia



Date of Offence	07.05.2025
Date of FIR	07.05.2025
Date of Charge Sheet	19.05.2025
Date of framing of charge	21.07.2025
Date of Commencement of Evidence	08.08.2025 18.09.2025 26.02.2025 15.05.2026
Date on which Judgment is reserved	NA
Date of Judgment	30.07.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	NIL

Accused Details:

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date Release on Bail	Offenses charged with	Whether Acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Sec. 468 BNSS
A1	Rajesh Mahato	08.05.25	23.06.25	Sec.305(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS	Acquitted	NIL	46 days
A-2	Rohit Sah @ Ankur	09.05.25	09.06.25	Sec.305(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS	Acquitted	NIL	31 days
A-3	Sujit Sah	09.05.25	17.05.25	U/S 317(2)	Acquitted	NIL	09 days


 Judicial Magistrate
 1st Class Tinsukia

JUDGEMENT

1) The factual matrix of the case, as narrated in the First Information Report (FIR) lodged by the complainant, Shri Pulkit Chamaria, is that on 07.05.2025, during the morning hours, the informant came to know that on preceding night, some unknown miscreants had allegedly stolen two Kirloskar generator batteries bearing Serial Nos. 16612330E40192 and 16612330E40196 from the generator installed at his premises. It is further alleged that upon checking the CCTV footage, the informant noticed that at about 1:21 A.M., a few persons had allegedly committed the theft by breaking open the lock of the generator door with the aid of a gas cutter. The FIR further states that two persons, namely Saraswati Gogoi and Manju Gogoi, identified the alleged miscreants as Amit Mahato and Rohit Saha, who were allegedly seen removing the batteries after packing them in large jute bags. Hence this case.

2) On receipt of the FIR, OC of Tinsukia Police Station registered a case Vide Tinsukia P.S case No. 157/2025 under section 331(4)/305(a) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (Hereinafter referred as BNS) and set the criminal law in motion. On completion of investigation, the IO submitted Charge Sheet bearing No.156/2025 under Section 305(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS against the



Shri Pulkit Chamaria
30/5/25
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

accused persons **Rajesh Mahato @ Amit** and **Rohit Sah @ Ankur** and U/S 317(2) of BNS against **Sujit Sah** and eventually the case was made over to this court for trial.

3) Cognizance was taken as per the procedure of Section 210 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, on receipt of charge sheet. The accused persons **Rajesh Mahato @Amit** and **Rohit Sah @Ankur** are produced from judicial custody and accused person **Sujit Sah** appeared before this court on receiving of summon.

4) The accused persons stood for the trial. Copies of relevant documents were furnished to the accused person as required by section 230 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (herein after referred to as BNSS). Upon perusal of charge-sheet and material on record, prima facie grounds were found to presume that the accused persons **Rajesh Mahato @Amit** and **Rohit Sah @ Ankur** committed offence U/S 305(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS and Accused person **Sujit Sah** committed offence U/S 317(2) of BNS and accordingly formal charges were framed against the accused persons which were read over and explained to the above named accused person. The accused persons disavowed the accusation and pleaded total denial and claimed to be tried.


Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

- 5) Prosecution in order to prove its case and to nail the guilt of the accused person examined 7 PWs.
- 6) After recording the prosecution evidence, the statement of the accused persons was recorded U/S 351 of BNSS. The defence plea is that of total denial and accused persons claimed innocence and stated that they were falsely implicated in the case.



- 7) I have heard the entire arguments from both sides and perused the entire evidence on record.

8) **POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:**

(i) Whether on 07.05 2025 at about 1.21 a.m in furtherance of common intention A-1 and A-2 committed theft of 02 Nos of Kirloskar Battery having serial NO.16612330E40192 and 16612330E40196 from the premise of the informant Pulkit Chamaria located at Agency House Makum road under Tinsukia Police station and thereby committed an offence under Section 305(a)/3(5) of BNS ?

(ii) Whether on same date, time and place in furtherance of common intention A-1 and A-2 committed house breaking at night by entering into the premise of the informant Pulkit Chamaria which was used as a custody of property, after sunset but before sunrise in order to commit theft


30/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

and thereby committed an offence under Section 331(4)/3(5) of BNS ?

(iii) Whether the on 07.05.2025 and thereafter A-3 in Tinsukia district dishonestly received 02 Nos of Kirloskar Battery having serial NO.16612330E40192 and 16612330E40196 belonging to the informant Pulkit Chamaria knowing or having reason to believe that such properties were stolen and thereby committed an offence under section 317(2) of BNS.



DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASON THEREOF:

9) **PW1 Umesh Sah** deposed that he knew the informant of the case and accused Sujit Sah, but did not know the other accused persons. He stated that the police showed him 2-3 batteries and asked him to sign the seizure list. He further deposed that he was unaware of the contents of the seizure list and had no knowledge as to the place from which the batteries were recovered. The seizure list was marked as Exhibit P1/PW1, and the signature of PW1 appearing thereon was marked as Exhibit P1(1)/PW1.

During cross-examination, PW1 deposed that he could not recall the date and time when he had signed the seizure list. He further stated that he was unaware of the description, quantity, and other particulars of the batteries mentioned therein.

30/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

10) **PW-2 LNK Ganesh Ghatowar** deposed that he did not know the informant of the case. He stated that the accused person **Rajesh Mahato** and **Rohit Sah** is known to him, but he did not know accused person **Sujit Sah**. According to him, on the day of the occurrence, he was posted as a Constable at Tinsukia Police Station. They received information that accused Rohit Sah had sold one green coloured generator battery to accused Sujit Sah. Thereafter, he accompanied S.I. Dhruba Prakash Baishya to the house of accused Sujit Sah, where, upon conducting a search, they recovered two green-coloured batteries covered with a cloth. He further stated that accused Sujit Sah himself pointed out the location where the two batteries were kept. He deposed that S.I. Lohit Gogoi seized the said batteries from the house of accused Sujit Sah. The seizure list was marked as **Exhibit P1**, and his signature thereon was marked as **Exhibit P1(2)/PW2**. The seized batteries were identified as **Material Exhibits A and B**. After the seizure, the batteries were brought to the police station.

During cross-examination, PW2 stated that he could not recollect the source from which he came to know that accused Rohit Sah had sold the generator battery to accused Sujit Sah. He further deposed that he, along with S.I. Dhruba Prakash Baishya, Champak Chutia, Gupinath Chutia, Bidyut



[Signature]
26/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

Gohain, and Jadumoni Gogoi, visited the house of accused Sujit Sah in the month of April during the morning hours. He admitted that the seized batteries (Material Exhibits A and B) are commonly available in the market and that there was no identification mark to establish that they belonged to the informant, Sri Pulakit Chamaria. He also stated that he did not know the voltage, power capacity, or whether the seized batteries were dry-cell or tubular batteries. PW2 further admitted that he had not stated before the Investigating Officer during investigation that accused Sujit Sah himself had shown the location of the two batteries, thereby amounting to an omission in his previous statement. He also deposed that he had not seen the video footage or photographs allegedly taken at the time of seizure and, therefore, could not say with certainty whether Material Exhibits A and B were the same batteries allegedly seized from the house of accused Sujit Sah. He further stated that, apart from the police personnel, about five other persons had gathered at the place of seizure. He clarified that he had accompanied S.I. Dhruba Prakash Baishya to the house of accused Sujit Sah because he was attached to him. He denied the defence suggestions that no batteries were seized from the house of accused Sujit Sah or that he was deposing falsely before the Court.



[Signature]
30/5/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

11) **PW3**, the informant, **Pulkit Chamaria** deposed that, he did not know or recognize any of the accused persons. He stated that he resided at Makum Road, where he had installed a generator. About two to three months prior to his deposition, during the night, two Kirloskar brand generator batteries were stolen. He came to know of the theft only on the following morning when his staff attempted to start the generator during a power outage and found that the batteries were missing. After searching the premises and failing to locate the batteries, he lodged the First Information Report (FIR) on the very same day. PW3 further deposed that he had mentioned the serial numbers of the stolen batteries in the FIR but had not named any suspect therein. He stated that the police recorded his statement, examined the CCTV footage, and seized a 4 GB pen drive containing the CCTV footage. The FIR was marked as **Exhibit P2/PW3**, and his signature thereon was marked as **Exhibit P2(1)/PW3**. The seizure list relating to the pen drive was marked as **Exhibit P3/PW3** and his signature thereon was marked as **Exhibit P3(1)/PW3**. He further stated that although the CCTV footage was not clear, it showed a person stealing the batteries. He also deposed that he was aware that the police had arrested one person in connection with the case.

During cross-examination, PW3 stated that he did not remember the exact date of the theft but affirmed


20/7/24
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia





that he had lodged the FIR on the following day. He admitted that he had not submitted any purchase bill or ownership documents relating to either the stolen batteries or the generator at the time of lodging the FIR. He further admitted that he had not mentioned the voltage or power specification of the batteries in the FIR. He also acknowledged that Kirloskar brand batteries are commonly available in the market. PW3 stated that he had not seen the seized batteries produced before the Court. He further deposed that he had handed over the pen drive containing the CCTV footage to the police on 15.05.2025, but had not obtained any certificate from the person who had transferred the CCTV footage from the storage device to the pen drive. He denied the defence suggestions that the CCTV footage contained in the pen drive had been manipulated or that no theft had occurred and that he had falsely lodged the case due to the absence of ownership documents relating to the batteries and the generator.

- 12) **PW4 Narayan Accharjee** deposed that he knew the informant but did not know any of the accused persons, including the accused who was in judicial custody. He stated that about four months prior to his deposition, when the informant instructed him to start the generator in the morning, he found that the generator batteries were missing. He immediately informed the informant about the missing batteries.



Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

He further deposed that the batteries were of Kirloskar brand and had come along with the generator. PW4 stated that he did not know what transpired thereafter, except that the police visited the place of occurrence on one occasion and carried out certain formalities. He further deposed that he had handed over the pen drive, which had been given to him by the informant, to the police, and the same was seized. The seizure list was marked as **Exhibit P3**, and his signature thereon was marked as **Exhibit P3(2)/PW4**. The seized pen drive was marked as **Material Exhibit C/PW4**. He also stated that the police had recorded his statement during the course of investigation. PW4 further deposed that he did not know whether the police had arrested any person in connection with the case.

Cross examination of PW4 is decline.

- 13) **PW5 Hemant Sharma** deposed that he knew the informant, as he was his employer, but did not know any of the accused persons. He stated that in the month of June, upon arriving at the office, he found that there was no electricity. When he was instructed to start the generator, it was discovered that the generator batteries were missing. Thereafter, the owner of the premises, namely the informant, lodged the FIR, following which the police visited the place of occurrence and conducted the investigation. He

29/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

further deposed that the police subsequently seized a pen drive containing the CCTV footage. He stated that he did not know whether the police had arrested any person in connection with the case. The seizure list was marked as **Exhibit P3**, and his signature thereon was marked as **Exhibit P3(3)/PW5**.

During cross-examination, PW5 deposed that the police seized the pen drive from the place of occurrence two days after the incident. He further stated that it was the police who had downloaded the CCTV footage into the pen drive.

14) **PW6 Mridul Das** deposed that he did not know the informant. He stated that while he was on patrolling duty at Tinsukia Police Station, he received information from the Officer-in-Charge that a suspected thief had been apprehended by the Rider Party and brought to the police station. He interrogated the apprehended person, namely accused Rohit Sah, who allegedly disclosed that he had sold two stolen batteries to accused Sujit Sah. Thereafter, PW6, along with the Rider Party and accused Rohit Sah, proceeded to the residence of accused Sujit Sah at Durgabari Ampara at about 4:30 a.m. He deposed that after interrogating Sujit Sah, two green-coloured batteries were recovered from his house and seized in the presence of witnesses. The seizure list was marked as **Exhibit P1**, and his


Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

signature thereon was marked as **Exhibit P1(3)/PW6**. Thereafter, he handed over accused Rohit Sah and Sujit Sah to the Investigating Officer.

During cross-examination, PW6 admitted that accused Rohit Sah had been apprehended by the Rider Party and that he did not know who had handed him over for interrogation. He further admitted that there was no written endorsement or order from the Officer-in-Charge authorising him either to interrogate accused Rohit Sah or to investigate the case. He also admitted that Rohit Sah had not been formally arrested at the time of interrogation. PW6 further deposed that he had not prepared any separate disclosure statement recording the alleged statement of Rohit Sah that he had sold the stolen batteries to Sujit Sah. He admitted that he could not identify the ownership of the seized batteries and was unable to state their size, specifications, or other distinguishing features. He also admitted that similar batteries are commonly available in the market. PW6 further stated that the seized batteries were not physically produced before the Court.

- 15) **PW7**, the Investigating Officer, **SI Lohit Gogoi** deposed that on 07.05.2025 he was posted as an Attached Officer at Tinsukia Sadar Police Station and was entrusted with the investigation of the case upon the FIR lodged by the informant. He visited the place


Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

of occurrence, met the informant, recorded his statement, and prepared the rough sketch map, which was marked as **Exhibit P4/PW7**. He further deposed that two local witnesses, namely Saraswati Gogoi and Manju Gogoi, informed him that accused Amit Mahato and Rohit Sah were involved in the theft and that they had witnessed them stealing two Kirloskar batteries from the complainant's generator house. He also viewed the CCTV footage installed at the place of occurrence before returning to the police station. PW7 further deposed that he directed the Rider Party to trace the accused persons. According to him, accused Amit Mahato was apprehended from his residence and, during interrogation, admitted his involvement in the offence along with accused Rohit Sah. On the basis of the said statement, the police searched for Rohit Sah but initially failed to trace him. PW7 further stated that on 09.05.2025, pursuant to the direction of the Officer-in-Charge, S.I.(P) Mridul Das, while on night patrol duty, apprehended accused Rohit Sah, who allegedly disclosed that he had sold the stolen batteries to accused Sujit Sah. Thereafter, the police proceeded to the residence of Sujit Sah, recovered two batteries, apprehended Rohit Sah and Sujit Sah, and seized the batteries. PW7 stated that both accused were arrested and produced before the Court on the same day. He further deposed that the CCTV footage was seized on 15.05.2025 and that,



[Signature]
30/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

upon completion of investigation, he submitted the charge-sheet against accused Rohit Sah, Amit Mahato, and Sujit Sah. The charge-sheet was marked as **Exhibit P5/PW7**, and his signature thereon was marked as **Exhibit P5(1)/PW7**.

During cross-examination, PW7 admitted that the informant had not produced any purchase receipt or ownership document to establish that the seized Kirloskar batteries belonged to him. He further admitted that Kirloskar batteries are commonly available in the market. PW7 also admitted that there was no written endorsement by the Officer-in-Charge authorising S.I.(P) Mridul Das to apprehend accused Rohit Sah and Sujit Sah or to recover and seize the alleged stolen batteries. He further admitted that he had not personally seen the batteries allegedly recovered by S.I.(P) Mridul Das. PW7 stated that the CCTV footage was transferred to the pen drive by the complainant himself. He also admitted that he had not moved any application before the Court under Section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita for recording the alleged confessional statements of accused Amit Mahato and Rohit Sah before a Magistrate. He denied the defence suggestions that the recovery was illegal, that no batteries were recovered from the residence of accused Sujit Sah, that the local witnesses had not made the statements attributed to them during investigation, or that he had



[Signature]
20/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

conducted a defective investigation and filed a false charge-sheet.

16) Now the stage has been set **to appreciate the evidence** on record in the light of following essential ingredients of offences alleged to have been committed by the accused person. For the sake of convenience, I have taken all the points together. In the instant case Investigation Officer (hereinafter called as IO) has listed in total 09 witnesses including the informant. Out of which prosecution adduced the evidence of 7 No. of Prosecution witnesses.

17) PW3, the informant, deposed regarding the theft of the generator batteries and proved the FIR. PW4 and PW5 are witnesses who came to know about the theft after discovering that the generator batteries were missing and they also proved the seizure of the pen drive containing CCTV footage. PW6 is the witness connected with the alleged recovery of two batteries from the house of accused Sujit Sah. PW7 is the Investigating Officer. The evidence of PW3 establishes that two batteries were allegedly stolen from the generator installed at his premises. However, during cross-examination, PW3 admitted that he had not produced any purchase bill, receipt, or ownership document either of the batteries or the generator. He further admitted that he had not mentioned the voltage or capacity of the batteries in the FIR. He also



[Signature]
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

admitted that Kirloskar brand batteries are easily available in the market. Thus, except for the assertion of the informant, there is no independent documentary evidence on record to establish ownership or to connect the allegedly recovered batteries with the batteries belonging to the informant.

18) The prosecution has relied upon CCTV footage as a circumstance against the accused persons. PW3 stated that although the footage was not clear, it showed that someone was stealing the batteries. PW5 stated that the police seized the pen drive containing CCTV footage and, during cross-examination, stated that the police had downloaded the footage into the pen drive. PW7, however, stated that the CCTV footage was transferred to the pen drive by the complainant himself. The above evidence creates a discrepancy regarding the manner in which the electronic record was obtained and preserved. Further, no certificate under the relevant provisions governing electronic evidence was produced before the Court to establish the admissibility and authenticity of the CCTV footage. The footage was also admittedly not clear, and no witness has identified the accused persons from the footage itself.

19) PW7 stated that witnesses Saraswati Gogoi and Manju Gogoi had informed him during investigation


30/7/24
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

that they had seen accused Amit Mahato and Rohit Sah committing the theft. However, neither of these alleged eyewitnesses was examined before the Court. Therefore, the alleged identification made by them during investigation remains unproved and cannot be relied upon as substantive evidence against the accused persons. So far as the alleged recovery of two batteries from the residence of accused Sujit Sah is concerned, PW6 deposed that accused Rohit Sah disclosed that he had sold two stolen batteries to Sujit Sah, following which they proceeded to the house of Sujit Sah and recovered two green-coloured batteries. However, PW6 admitted during cross-examination that he had not prepared any separate disclosure statement recording such information given by accused Rohit Sah. He further admitted that at the time of interrogation, Rohit Sah had not been formally arrested. PW6 also admitted that he could not state the ownership of the seized batteries, their size, specifications, or distinguishing features. He further admitted that similar batteries are easily available in the market. PW7 also admitted that no written endorsement or authority from the Officer-in-Charge was available authorising S.I. Mridul Das to apprehend accused Rohit Sah and Sujit Sah or to conduct the alleged recovery. Another important aspect is that the seized batteries were not produced before the Court during the evidence of PW6 and PW7. PW7 admitted



[Signature]
30/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

that he had not personally seen the batteries allegedly recovered by S.I. Mridul Das. There is, therefore, no convincing evidence before the Court to establish that the batteries allegedly recovered from the house of accused Sujit Sah were the same batteries allegedly stolen from the premises of the informant.

20) The prosecution also relied upon the alleged confession of accused Amit Mahato and Rohit Sah before the police. However, PW7 admitted that he did not file any application before the Court for recording their confession before a Magistrate under Section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita. A confession made before police, except to the limited extent permissible under law regarding discovery of facts, cannot by itself form the basis of conviction.

21) In the present case, the prosecution has succeeded in proving that two generator batteries were allegedly stolen from the premises of the informant. However, the prosecution has failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the accused persons were responsible for the theft or that the batteries allegedly recovered from accused Sujit Sah were the stolen batteries belonging to the informant. The absence of ownership documents, lack of identifying marks on the batteries, non-production of the alleged stolen batteries before the Court, uncertainty regarding the



[Signature]
30/7/22
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

CCTV footage, non-examination of the alleged eyewitnesses, and inconsistencies regarding the recovery proceedings create reasonable doubt regarding the prosecution case.



22) It is one of the cardinal principles of criminal jurisprudence that the prosecution must prove the guilt of the accused person beyond all reasonable doubt. It is clear from the above discussion, that the evidence on record is quite inadequate to prove the offence charged **U/Sec 305(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS** against the accused persons **A-1 and A-2** and **U/S 317(2) of BNS** against accused person **A-3** as there is no evidence which directly involves the accused with the offence of committing theft at the shop of the Informant and there is ample scope of reasonable doubt as to the factum of the occurrence alleged. Therefore, extending the benefit of doubt to the accused persons, this Court finds that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges against the accused persons beyond reasonable doubt.

23) Situated thus, I am not inclined to hold the accused persons, **A-1 and A-2** guilty of the offence charged **Under Section 305(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS** and **A-3** guilty of offence charged **U/S 317(2) of BNS**. The accused persons **A-1, A-2, A-3** are **acquitted** in the instant case.


Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

ORDER

In view of the decision made above, the accused person **A-1 Amrit Mahato@ Rajesh Mahato, A-2 Rohit Sah** are acquitted of the offences charged U/S 305(a)/331(4)/3(5) of BNS and **A-3 Sujit Shah** is acquitted of the offences charged U/S 317(2) of BNS and set at liberty forthwith.



Their bail bonds shall remain in force for six month from today in compliance with section **481 of BNSS**.

Seized items shall be dealt as per law.

The case is disposed of on contest.

The judgment is delivered in the open Court in presence of accused persons and their learned counsel.

Given under my hand and the seal of this court on this 30th day of July , 2026.


30/7/26
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia
(Smti. Queensmita Saikia)

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Tinsukia .

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENSE/ COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
PW-1	Umesh Shah	Seizure witness
PW-2	Ganesh Ghatowar	Seizure witness
PW-3	Pulkit Chamaria	Informant
PW-4	Nararyan Acharjee	Seizure
PW-5	Hemant Sharma	Seizure witness
PW-6	Mridul Das	Official witness
PW-7	Lohit Gogoi	IO



LIST OF DEFENCE WITNESSES

B. Defense Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE

C. Court Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE

EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution:

Sl. No.	Exhibit No.	Description
1.	Ext P-1/PW1	Seizure list
2.	Ext-P1(1)/PW1	Signature of PW1 on the seizure list
3.	Ext-P1(2) /PW2	Signature of PW2 on the seizure list
4	Ext-P2/PW3	Is the Ejahar
5	Ext-P2(1)/PW3	Signature on the

SC
20/7/25
Judicial Magistrate
1st Class Tinsukia

		Ejazar.
6	Ext-P3/PW3	Seizure list of Pen Drive
7	Ext-P3(1)/PW3	Signature of PW3 on seizure list.
8	Ext-P3(2)/PW4	Signature of PW4 on seizure list.
9	Ext-P3(3)/PW5	Signature of PW5 on seizure list.
10	Ext-P1(3)/PW6	Signature of PW6 on seizure list.
11	Ext-P4/PW7	Sketch Map
12	Ext-P5/PW7	Charge sheet
13	Ext-P5(1)/PW7	Signature

B. Defense

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
	Nil	

C. Court Exhibits:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
	Nil	

D. Material Objects:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	M. Ext.A/PW2	Seized batteries
2	M. Ext.B/PW2	Seized batteries
3	M. ExtC/PW4	Pen drive

(Smti. Queensmita Saikia)
 Judicial Magistrate First Class
 Tinsukia
 Judicial Magistrate
 1st Class Tinsukia