

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE
RANGA REDDY DISTRICT AT L.B.NAGAR

Present: **Sri A.KARNA KUMAR**
Principal District & Sessions Judge
Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar

Tuesday, the 30th day of June 2026

S.C. No.241/2024

(P.R.C. No.186/2019 of Metropolitan Magistrate-cum-
Principal Junior Civil Judge
Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar
Connected to Cr. No.301 of 2018 of Pahadishareef Police station)

Name of the Complainant : State represented by
Inspector of Police
Pahadishareef Police Station
Rachakonda Commissionerate

Name(s) of the accused : **A1** Abbas Khan, S/o Jamal Khan
Aged 65 years, Occ: Mason
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A2 Asif Khan, S/o Abbas Khan
Aged 33 years, Occ: Mason
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A3 Syed Baba Faqrudin @ Baba
S/o Syed Hyder Ali
Age 28 years, Occ: Mason
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A4 Shaik Khadeer, S/o Shaik Ayub
Age 25 years, Occ: Labour
R/o Shaheennagar,
Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District
Case against A4 is abated

A5 Smt Naziya Begum, W/o Late
Omer Shareef @ Ajju @ Md. Omer
Ajuda
Age 21 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A6 Smt Sultana Begum
W/o Abbas Khan
Age 50 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A7 Smt Reshma Begum
W/o Syed Baba Akbar
Aged 23 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A8 Smt Shaheda Begum
W/o Mohd. Asif Khan
Age 27 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

Charge(s) : under Sections 302 r/w 34 IPC, 201 r/w
34 IPC and 120-B r/w 34 IPC.

Plea of the accused : Pleaded not guilty

Finding of the Judge : Found not guilty

Sentence or Order : In the result, accused Nos.1 to 3
and 5 to 8 are found not guilty of the
offences punishable under Sections
302, 201 and 120-B read with 34 of the
Indian Penal Code, 1860 and are
accordingly acquitted of the said
offences under Section 235(1) of the

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The bail bonds executed by the accused shall remain in force for a period of six months, to secure their presence in the event of any appeal being preferred against this judgment. MO-1 to MO-9, MO-11 to MO-14 shall be destroyed after expiry of the appeal time. MO-10 shall be confiscated to the State. The unmarked case property, viz., Passion Pro motorcycle bearing Registration No.AP-11-AH-6896 in CPR No.174 of 2019, shall be returned to its owner after expiry of the appeal time under proper identification and acknowledgment.

Prosecution Conducted by : Sri V.Venkateshwarlu
Public Prosecutor

Defence Conducted by : Sri Pujari Venkateshwar Rao
Advocate for accused

This case is coming before me on 15.06.2026 for final hearing in the presence of Sri V.Venkateshwarlu, learned Public Prosecutor and of Sri Pujari Venkateshwar Rao, learned counsel for the accused, and upon hearing both sides, perusal of the material on record and the matter having stood over the matter for consideration till this day, this Court delivered the following—

J U D G M E N T

The Inspector of Police, Pahadi Shareef Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate, laid a charge sheet in Crime No.301 of 2018 against accused Nos.1 to 8 for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are as follows—

(i) This case pertains to the alleged offences of murder, causing disappearance of evidence of offence and criminal conspiracy by the accused. On 25.09.2018 at about 16:00 hours, LW-1, K.Veerawamy, Village Revenue Assistant (VRA) of Mamidipally Village, lodged a report before Pahadi Shareef Police Station stating that on the same day at about 11:30 hours he came to know that an unknown dead body was lying in the forest area situated in Survey No.90/1, near Jalpally Village Gate. Based on the said report, the police registered a case in Crime No.301 of 2018 for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

(ii) During the course of investigation, PW-10, the Inspector of Police, visited the scene of offence, examined the complainant/LW-1, and found an unknown dead body in a partially burnt condition. He secured the presence of PW-5 and LW-10 as mediators, conducted the scene of offence panchanama, prepared a rough sketch of the scene, collected material samples, took photographs, and conducted an inquest over the dead body in the presence of the mediators. Thereafter, the dead body was shifted to Osmania General Hospital, Hyderabad, for post-mortem examination. PW-10 examined LW-15, the Assistant Professor, Osmania General Hospital, who conducted the autopsy and opined that the deceased died due to head injuries. PW-10 also forwarded the photographs and fingerprints of the deceased to the Fingerprint Bureau. On comparison, the fingerprints tallied with those of one Umar Shareef @ Ajju @ Md. Omer Ajuda, who was involved in several criminal cases of Hayathnagar Police

Station and Pahadi Shareef Police Station. Subsequently, the photographs of the deceased were shown to his wife, namely Smt. Naziya Begum (A5), who identified the deceased as her husband.

(iii) On 06.10.2018 at about 6:00 hours, PW-4 along with A1 came to the police station before PW-10 and informed that accused No.1 intended to make an extra-judicial confession. PW-10 recorded the confession of accused No.1, wherein he allegedly confessed that he, along with the other accused No.4, namely Khadeer, entered into a criminal conspiracy to eliminate the deceased, as the deceased had been harassing and subjecting the daughter of accused No.1 to cruelty. Accused No.1 further confessed that on 23.09.2018, when the deceased came to his house in a drunken condition, he was offered liquor and, after the women were sent outside, accused No.1 caught hold of and throttled the deceased, accused No.4 assaulted him with fists, accused No.3 attacked the deceased on the head with an iron rod, and accused No.2 assaulted the deceased on the head with a granite stone. As a result of the said assault, the deceased sustained bleeding injuries and died on the spot.

(iv) Accused No.1 further confessed that thereafter accused Nos.3 and 4 shifted the dead body of the deceased on a motorcycle bearing No.AP-11-AH-6896 to the outskirts of Jalpally Village, threw it in a forest area by the roadside, poured petrol on the dead body and set it ablaze with an intention to destroy the evidence and to prevent identification of the deceased. Pursuant to the confession made by accused No.1, PW-10, in the presence of PW-6 and PW-7 who are the Government Officials, seized the iron rod and granite stone under the cover of seizure panchanama. Since accused Nos.2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were found present in the house of accused No.1, PW-10 apprehended them. Accused No.2 also allegedly confessed about his involvement in the offence, and pursuant to his confession, PW-10 seized the motorcycle bearing No.AP-11-AH-6896 used in the commission of the offence. Thereafter, accused Nos.1 and 2 were arrested.

(v) During further investigation, accused No.1 led PW-10 to the house of accused No.4. PW-10 apprehended accused No.4 and interrogated him. Accused No.4 allegedly confessed that accused No.1 had paid him Rs.2,000/- in advance with a promise to pay a total amount of Rs.5,000/- for assisting in the commission of the offence. Pursuant to the confession, PW-10 seized an amount of Rs.550/- from accused No.4, recorded his confession and effected the arrest of accused Nos.1 and 4.

(vi) PW-10 also collected the CCTV footage from the petrol bunk where accused No.1 allegedly purchased petrol and obtained a certificate under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 from PW-2. He also examined PW-3, who stated that accused No.1 had purchased paint from his shop, and examined LW-8, an employee of the petrol bunk, regarding the purchase of petrol by accused No.1.

(vii) During further investigation, on 14.10.2018, PW-10 deputed police staff to apprehend accused No.3. After accused No.3 was produced before him, PW-10 interrogated him. Accused No.3 allegedly confessed about his involvement in the commission of the offence and, pursuant to the confession, led the police and mediators viz., PW-7 and PW-8 to the scene of offence and produced two plastic cans used in the commission of the offence, which were seized under the cover of panchanama. PW-10 forwarded the seized material objects for forensic examination and obtained the expert reports. He also submitted a requisition to the learned Magistrate for recording the statement of PW-4 under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and the learned Magistrate accordingly recorded the said statement.

(viii) After completion of the investigation, PW-10 filed the charge sheet against accused Nos.1 to 8 for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. Hence, the charge.

3. The learned Metropolitan Magistrate-cum-Principal Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar, took cognizance of the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 against the accused in P.R.C. No.186 of 2019. After furnishing copies to the accused in compliance with the provisions of Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and since the offences are exclusively triable by a Court of Session, the learned committal Court committed the case to the Court of Sessions, Ranga Reddy District, under Section 209 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. Upon receipt of the committal records, the Sessions Court took cognizance of the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and the case was numbered as S.C. No.241 of 2024.

4. Upon hearing the learned Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel for the accused on the question of framing of charges and on perusal of the material available on record, this Court framed charges under Section 228 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 against accused Nos.1 to 3 and 5 to 8 for the offences punishable under Sections 302 read with 34, 201 read with 34 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. The charges were read over and explained to the accused in the vernacular language, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. It is a matter of record that the proceedings against accused No.4 stood abated on account of his death.

5. In order to prove the case of the prosecution, the prosecution examined PW-1 to PW-10, got marked Exs.P-1 to P-37 and MOs.1 to 14. The learned Public Prosecutor gave up the evidence of LW-16, LW-17 and LW-19. The evidence of LW-1, LW-2, LW-4, LW-8, LW-10, LW-14 and LW-15 was closed. Hence, the prosecution evidence was closed. On behalf of the defence, no oral or documentary evidence was adduced.

6. After closure of the prosecution evidence, the accused were examined under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 with reference to the incriminating circumstances appearing against them in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses. The accused denied the incriminating material and did not choose to adduce any defence evidence. Hence, the defence evidence was closed.

7. Heard the learned Public Prosecutor and the learned Defence Counsel. Perused the entire material available on record.

8. Now, the point that arises for determination is ***Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that accused Nos.1 to 3 and 5 to 8, in furtherance of their common intention and pursuant to a criminal conspiracy, committed the murder of the deceased, caused disappearance of the evidence of the offence and thereby committed the offences punishable under Sections 302 read with 34, 201 read with 34 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, as alleged?***

9. It is the specific allegation of the prosecution that accused Nos.1 to 3 and 5 to 8, in furtherance of their common intention and pursuant to a criminal conspiracy, committed the murder of Umar Shareef @ Ajju @ Md. Omer Ajuda. It is alleged that the deceased had been harassing and subjecting the daughter of accused No.1 to cruelty. Bearing grudge against the deceased, the accused entered into a criminal conspiracy to eliminate him. In pursuance of the said conspiracy, on 23.09.2018, when the deceased came to the house in an intoxicated condition, he was offered liquor and, after the women were sent outside, accused No.1 caught hold of and throttled the deceased, accused No.4 assaulted him with fists, accused No.3 attacked him on the head with an iron rod, and accused No.2 assaulted him on the head with a granite stone, causing fatal injuries. As a result of the said assault, the deceased died on the spot.

(i) It is the further case of the prosecution that, in order to evade prosecution and to cause disappearance of the evidence of the offence, accused Nos.3 and 4 shifted the dead body of the deceased on a motorcycle to the forest area near Jalpally Village, poured petrol over the dead body and set it ablaze with an intention to prevent its identification. Thus, according to the prosecution, the accused committed the offences punishable under Sections 302 read with 34, 201 read with 34 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

10. To substantiate the case of the prosecution, the prosecution examined PW-1 to PW-10 and got marked Exhibits P-1 to P-37 on its behalf. MO-1 to MO-14 are marked.

→ **In relation to the prosecution witnesses; PW-1 to 3** are the circumstantial witnesses, **PW-4** is the circumstantial witness of A1 who made extra judicial confession, **PW-5** is the panch witness for the scene of offence, rough sketch and inquest panchanama, **PW-6** is the panch witness for the confession of A1 and seizure panchanama, **PW-7 and PW-8** are the panch witnesses for confession panchanama of A3 and seizure panchanama, **PW-9** is the ASI, Finger Print Expert, CID and **PW-10** is the Investigation Officer.

→ **In relation to the exhibits; Exs.P1 to P4** are the 161 Cr.P.C. statement of PW-1 to PW-4, **Ex.P5** is the 164 Cr.P.C. statement of PW-4, **Exs.P6 and P7** are the signatures of PW-5 on inquest panchanama, **Ex.P8** is the signature of PW-5 on scene of offence panchanama, **Ex.P9** is the signature of PW-5 on rough sketch, **Ex.P10** is the four photographs taken at the scene of offence, **Ex.P11** is the signature of PW-6 on confession panchanama of A1, **Ex.P12** is the signature of PW-6 on seizure panchanama of A1, **Ex.P13** is the signature of PW-6 on confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A2, **Ex.P14** is the signature of PW-6 on confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A4, **Ex.P15** is the signature of PW-6 on confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A5, **Ex.P16** is the signature

of PW-7 on confession panchanama of A1, **Ex.P17** is the signature of PW-7 on seizure panchanama of A1, **Ex.P18** is the signature of PW-7 on confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A2, **Ex.P19** is the signature of PW-7 on confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A4, **Ex.P20** is the signature of PW-7 on confession panchanama of A5, **Ex.P21** is the signature of PW-8 on confession panchanama of A3, **Ex.P22** is the signature of PW-8 on seizure panchanama of A3, **Ex.P23** is the report given by PW-9 containing 3 pages, **Ex.P24** is the complaint, **Ex.P25** is the FIR, **Ex.P26** is the scene of offence and seizure panchanama, **Ex.P27** is the rough sketch of scene of offence panchanama, **Ex.P28** is the inquest panchanama, **Ex.P29** is the post-mortem examination report, **Ex.P30** is relevant portion of confession panchanama of A1, **Ex.P31** is the seizure panchanama of iron rod and one granite stone, **Ex.P32** is the relevant portion of confession panchanama of A2, **Ex.P33** is the relevant portion of confession panchanama of A4, **Ex.P34** is the Section 65-B of Indian Evidence Act certificate, **Ex.P35** is the relevant portion of the confession panchanama of A3, **Ex.P36** is the seizure panchanama of A3, **Ex.P37** is the FSL report

➔ **In relation to the material objects; MO-1** is empty quarter liquor bottle, **MO-2** is blood stained earth, **MO-3** is controlled earth, **MO-4** is the blood stained partly burnt white colour, black and blue lines shirt, **MO-5** is blood stained partly burnt black colour pant, **MO-6** is the blood stained partly burnt chocolate colour underwear, **MO-7** is iron rod, **MO-8** is granite stone, **MO-9** is photos of motorcycle Passion Pro bearing No.AP-11-AH-6896, **MO-10** is net cash of Rs.550/-, **MO-11** is CD containing of CCTV footage, **MO-12** is empty Naturralle oil labelled can, **MO-13** is another empty plastic can without label, **MO-14** is the CD pertains to photographs of unknown dead body of the deceased.

EVIDENCE ON RECORD

11. In order to prove its case, the prosecution examined PW-1 to PW-10 and got marked Exs.P-1 to P-37 and MOs.1 to 14.

12. The burden lies upon the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. In order to establish the charges, the prosecution examined PW-1 to PW-10.

(i) PW-1 is a circumstantial witness, who, according to the prosecution, witnessed a quarrel between the accused and the deceased in the house of accused No.1. However, PW-1 did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. He denied the statement alleged to have been given by him to the police, which was marked as Ex.P-1.

(ii) PW-2 is also a circumstantial witness and was working as Cashier at Metro Petrol Pump, Shaheen Nagar. According to the prosecution, he supplied the CCTV footage and the certificate under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act to the police, showing the purchase of petrol by accused No.1. However, PW-2 did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. He deposed that the CCTV footage played in the open Court did not pertain to the petrol bunk where he was working and further stated that he could not identify the persons visible in the footage. He denied the statement alleged to have been given before the police, which was marked as Ex.P-2.

(iii) PW-3 is another circumstantial witness from whose shop accused No.1 is alleged to have purchased one litre of white colour paint. He also did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. He denied the statement alleged to have been given before the police, which was marked as Ex.P-3.

(iv) PW-4 is the witness before whom accused No.1 is alleged to have made an extra-judicial confession. He also did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. He denied both his statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. and his statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., which were marked as Exs.P-4 and P-5 respectively.

(v) PW-5 is the panch witness for the scene of offence panchanama, rough sketch and inquest panchanama. He also did not support the case of the prosecution and denied acting as a mediator for the said proceedings. However, he identified his signatures on Exs.P-6 to P-9. Ex.P-10 consists of photographs taken at the scene of offence.

(vi) PW-6 is one of the mediators for the confession and recovery panchanamas relating to accused Nos.1, 2, 4 and 5. He also did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. Except identifying his signatures on Exs.P-11 to P-15, nothing useful to the prosecution could be elicited from his evidence.

(vii) PW-7 is another panch witness for the confession and seizure panchanamas. He also did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. Except identifying his signatures on Exs.P-16 to P-20, his evidence does not advance the case of the prosecution.

(viii) PW-8 is the mediator for the confession and seizure panchanama relating to accused No.3. He also did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. Except identifying his signatures on Exs.P-21 and P-22, nothing favourable to the prosecution could be elicited from his evidence.

(ix) PW-9 is the Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police of the Finger Print Bureau, CID. He deposed that he compared the fingerprints of the unknown deceased with the fingerprints available in the Finger Print Bureau records and found that they tallied with those of Umar Shareef @ Ajju @

Md. Umar Ajudha. He accordingly submitted his report under Ex.P-23. His evidence only establishes the identity of the deceased.

(x) PW-10 is the Investigation Officer, who supported the case of the prosecution. He deposed regarding the registration of the case, conduct of investigation, inspection of the scene of offence, inquest over the dead body, seizure of material objects, recording of statements of witnesses, arrest of the accused, recoveries allegedly effected at the instance of the accused, collection of scientific evidence and filing of the charge sheet. However, being the Investigation Officer, his evidence is required to be appreciated in the light of the other evidence available on record.

13. On careful appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence on record, it is evident that the evidence of PW-1 to PW-8 is of no assistance to the case of the prosecution, as all of them turned hostile and did not support the prosecution in any material particular. Though they were cross-examined by the learned Public Prosecutor, nothing useful could be elicited to substantiate the prosecution case. The evidence of PW-9 only establishes the identity of the deceased as Umar Shareef @ Ajju @ Md. Umar Ajudha, whose dead body was found at the scene of offence. However, the evidence of PW-9 does not, in any manner, connect the accused with the commission of the offences alleged.

14. The entire prosecution case, therefore, substantially rests upon the evidence of PW-10, the Investigating Officer, and the documents marked through him, namely Exs.P-24 to P-37, besides MOs.1 to 14. In the absence of corroboration from the material witnesses, particularly PW-1 to PW-8, the evidence of the Investigating Officer alone is insufficient to establish the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. The alleged extra-judicial confession, recovery of material objects, seizure panchanamas and other incriminating circumstances have not been proved through the independent witnesses, as all the concerned mediators and circumstantial witnesses turned hostile. Consequently, the prosecution has

failed to establish the chain of circumstances connecting the accused with the commission of the offences.

15. There is absolutely no reliable and convincing evidence on record to prove that accused Nos.1 to 3 and 5 to 8 entered into a criminal conspiracy to commit the murder of the deceased, Umar Shareef @ Ajju @ Md. Umar Ajudha, or that, in furtherance of their common intention, they committed his murder by assaulting him in the manner alleged by the prosecution. Likewise, the prosecution has failed to establish that after the alleged murder, the accused transported the dead body to the forest area near Jalpally Village, poured petrol over it, set it ablaze and thereby caused disappearance of the evidence of the offence with an intention to screen themselves from punishment.

16. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove the guilt of accused Nos.1 to 3 and 5 to 8 beyond all reasonable doubt for the offences punishable under Sections 302 read with 34, 201 read with 34 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. Accordingly, the point for determination is answered against the prosecution and in favour of the accused.

17. In the result, accused Nos.1 to 3 and 5 to 8 are found not guilty of the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 120-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and are accordingly acquitted of the said offences under Section 235(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The bail bonds executed by the accused shall remain in force for a period of six months, to secure their presence in the event of any appeal being preferred against this judgment. MO-1 to MO-9, MO-11 to MO-14 shall be destroyed after expiry of the appeal time. MO-10 shall be confiscated to the State. The unmarked case property, viz., Passion Pro motorcycle bearing Registration No.AP-11-AH-6896 in CPR No.174 of 2019,

shall be returned to its owner after expiry of the appeal time under proper identification and acknowledgment.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, this the 30th day of June 2026.

Sd/-

Principal District & Sessions Judge
Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Prosecution

PW-1: Naseer Khan
PW-2: Mohd. Yousuf
PW-3: Syed Hamed
PW-4: Omar Baom
PW-5: Syed Khaja Pasha
PW-6: Gondyala Siddulu
PW-7: Yamjala Suresh Kalpana
PW-8: Baikar Narendra
PW-9: K.Kishore
PW-10: M.Shanker

For Defence

NONE

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Prosecution

Ex.P1: Statement of PW-1 recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C.
Ex.P2: Statement of PW-2 recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C.
Ex.P3: Statement of PW-3 recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C.
Ex.P4: Statement of PW-4 recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C.
Ex.P5: Statement of PW-4 recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C.
Ex.P6: Signature of PW-5 on the inquest panchanama.
Ex.P7: Signature of PW-5 on the inquest panchanama.
Ex.P8: Signature of PW-5 on the scene of offence panchanama.

- Ex.P9: Signature of PW-5 on the rough sketch.
- Ex.P10: Four photographs taken at the scene of offence.
- Ex.P11: Signature of PW-6 on the confession panchanama of A-1.
- Ex.P12: Signature of PW-6 on the seizure panchanama of A-1.
- Ex.P13: Signature of PW-6 on the confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A-2.
- Ex.P14: Signature of PW-6 on the confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A-4.
- Ex.P15: Signature of PW-6 on the confession panchanama of A-5.
- Ex.P16: Signature of PW-7 on the confession panchanama of A-1.
- Ex.P17: Signature of PW-7 on the seizure panchanama of A-1.
- Ex.P18: Signature of PW-7 on the confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A-2.
- Ex.P19: Signature of PW-7 on the confession-cum-seizure panchanama of A-4.
- Ex.P20: Signature of PW-7 on the confession panchanama of A-5.
- Ex.P21: Signature of PW-8 on the confession panchanama of A-3.
- Ex.P22: Signature of PW-8 on the seizure panchanama of A-3.
- Ex.P23: Finger Print Expert's report.
- Ex.P24: Complaint.
- Ex.P25: First Information Report.
- Ex.P26: Scene of offence-cum-seizure panchanama.
- Ex.P27: Rough sketch of the scene of offence.
- Ex.P28: Inquest panchanama.
- Ex.P29: Post-mortem examination report.
- Ex.P30: Relevant portion of the confession panchanama of A-1.
- Ex.P31: Seizure panchanama relating to the iron rod and granite stone.
- Ex.P32: Relevant portion of the confession panchanama of A-2.
- Ex.P33: Relevant portion of the confession panchanama of A-4.
- Ex.P34: Certificate issued under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act.
- Ex.P35: Relevant portion of the confession panchanama of A-3.

Ex.P36: Seizure panchanama of A-3.

Ex.P37: Forensic Science Laboratory (FSL) report.

For Defence

NIL

MATERIAL OBJECTS

- MO-1: Empty quarter liquor bottle.
- MO-2: Blood-stained earth.
- MO-3: Controlled earth.
- MO-4: Partly burnt blood-stained white coloured shirt with black and blue stripes.
- MO-5: Partly burnt blood-stained black coloured pant.
- MO-6: Partly burnt blood-stained chocolate coloured underwear.
- MO-7: Iron rod.
- MO-8: Granite stone.
- MO-9: Photographs of Passion Pro motorcycle bearing Registration No. AP-11-AH-6896.
- MO-10: Net Cash of Rs.550/-.
- MO-11: CD containing CCTV footage.
- MO-12: Empty Naturalle Oil labelled plastic can.
- MO-13: Empty plastic can without label.
- MO-14: CD containing photographs of the unknown dead body of the deceased.

Sd/-

Principal District & Sessions Judge
Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar

CALENDAR

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE
RANGA REDDY DISTRICT AT L.B.NAGAR

Present: **Sri A.KARNA KUMAR**
Principal District & Sessions Judge
Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar

Tuesday, the 30th day of June 2026

S.C. No.241/2024

(P.R.C. No.186/2019 of Metropolitan Magistrate-cum-
Principal Junior Civil Judge
Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar
Connected to Cr. No.301 of 2018 of Pahadishareef Police station)

Name of the Complainant : State represented by
Inspector of Police
Pahadishareef Police Station
Rachakonda Commissionerate

Name(s) of the accused : **A1** Abbas Khan, S/o Jamal Khan
Aged 65 years, Occ: Mason
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A2 Asif Khan, S/o Abbas Khan
Aged 33 years, Occ: Mason
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A3 Syed Baba Faqrudin @ Baba
S/o Syed Hyder Ali
Age 28 years, Occ: Mason
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

A4 Shaik Khadeer, S/o Shaik Ayub
Age 25 years, Occ: Labour
R/o Shaheennagar,
Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District
Case against A4 is abated

- A5** Smt Naziya Begum, W/o Late
Omer Shareef @ Ajju @ Md. Omer
Ajuda
Age 21 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District
- A6** Smt Sultana Begum
W/o Abbas Khan
Age 50 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District
- A7** Smt Reshma Begum
W/o Syed Baba Akbar
Aged 23 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District
- A8** Smt Shaheda Begum
W/o Mohd. Asif Khan
Age 27 years, Occ: Housewife
R/o H.No.7-50/1, Sadathnagar
Shaheen Nagar, Balapur Mandal
Ranga Reddy District

DATES OF

Offence: : 25.09.2018

Complaint: : 25.09.2018

Apprehension of Accused: : A1 arrested on 06.10.2018.
A2 arrested on 06.10.2018.
A3 arrested on 15.10.2018.
Case against A4 is abated on account
of his death.
A5 arrested on 06.10.2018.
A6 arrested on 06.10.2018.
A7 arrested on 06.10.2018.
A8 arrested on 06.10.2018.

Release on bail: : A1 released on 24.12.2018.
A2 released on 24.12.2018.
A3 released on 28.12.2018.
Case against A4 is abated on account
of his death.
A5 released on 03.12.2018.
A6 released on 16.11.2018.
A7 released on 16.11.2018.
A8 released on 16.11.2018.

Committal: : 26.12.2022

Commencement of Trial: : 05.03.2026

Close of Trial: : 05.05.2026

Sentence or Order: : 30.06.2026

REASONS FOR THE DELAY: NO DELAY.

Sd/-

Principal District & Sessions Judge
Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar